



Richland County Council

Transportation Ad Hoc Committee

April 28, 2020 – 1:00 PM

Conference Call

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes: February 25, 2020 [PAGES 2-9]**
3. **Adoption of Agenda**
4. **Project Descopes [PAGES 10-41]**
5. **Greene Street Phase II Material Testing Contract [PAGE 42]**
6. **Greene Street Phase II CE&I Contract [PAGES 43-44]**
7. **Clemson Road CE&I Contract [PAGES 45-46]**
8. **Adjournment**

The Honorable Calvin Jackson, Chair
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020 – 1:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio, Michelle Onley, Eden Logan, Kimberly Toney, Michael Niermeier, Allison Steele, Quinton Epps, Rasheed Muwwakkil, Jennifer Wladischkin, Leonardo Brown, John Thompson, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Nathaniel Miller, James Hayes, Michael Maloney, Ali Eliadorani, Jeff McNesby, Sierra Flynn, Christine Keefer, Beverly Harris and Casey White

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.

Mr. Jackson welcomed the returning and new members of the committee. He thanked the Transportation Department for continuing to move the projects forward. He also thanked the staff involved with planning the Council Retreat. He stated there was substantive discussion with the Charleston County personnel surrounding transportation issues that we are currently dealing with. The presentation by the Assistant County Administrator on how they have handled similar issues was encouraging to him.

2. **Approval of Minutes: October 22, 2019** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

- a. **Gills Creek Maintenance Agreement** – Mr. Niermeier stated in January 2020 they received the agreement from the City of Columbia. Essentially, the agreement identifies the City’s roles and responsibilities once the project is completed, and is turned over to the City.

Mr. Malinowski noted on p. 9 of the agreement Subsection (i) has been completely eliminated;

Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020

therefore, the subsequent subsections needed to be re-lettered.

Ms. Terracio inquired if this agreement is the same form of agreement as the Three Rivers Greenway.

Mr. Niermeier stated the Three Rivers agreement does not look like this. The content is very similar, but the form is slightly different.

5. ITEMS FOR ACTION

- a. **SERN Financial Participation Agreement between SCDOT and Richland County** – Mr. Niermeier stated in 2017 the PDT, on behalf of the County, submitted a drainage participation request to SCDOT. An improvements to the Rabbit Run, and the drainage there, would take some of the responsibility away from the State. In order to participate, SCDOT committed 12% of project budget to the County. The request today is to approve the agreement and allow the County to invoice the State for the funds.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Livingston and McBride

- b. **Mitigation Bank Credit Sales – City of Sumter, Shot Pouch Greenway** – Mr. Niermeier state before the committee is a request from the City of Sumter to purchase \$122,658.82 worth of credits for a greenway project they are beginning. The purchase will support their Army Corp of Engineer 404 permit.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve this item.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, these are credits we will not need for the Penny Program.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the funds will go into the Penny funds.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Livingston and McBride

- c. **Shop Road Extension Phase I Road Transfer** – Mr. Niermeier stated as a part of their agreement with the State for the construction of Shop Road Extension Phase I, and the turnover of that road, the State cannot take more roadways into their system without giving up certain roadways. What is before the committee is the agreement to accept 9 State roads, with the equivalent mileage for Shop Road Phase I.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item.

Mr. Malinowski stated, under “Fiscal Impact”, it says, “The long-term fiscal impact will be the maintenance of the nine (9) roads.” He inquired if we know what the current impact is.

Mr. Niermeier stated he does not have that information, but he can provide it.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020**

-2-

Mr. Malinowski inquired if these roads can be transferred back to the State in the future.

Mr. Niermeier stated with the approval of this motion they will officially become County roads.

Mr. Malinowski noted, it says, "SCDOT no longer allows for an increase in their road system mileage..." but from the background information SCDOT agreed to take over the right-of-way once the construction was completed. He inquired if SCDOT has exceptions for agreements they entered into prior to coming up with a later rule.

Mr. Niermeier stated he cannot speaker to the latter agreement, but with the current IGA between the County and the State, for the Shop Road Extension, that was the language, and what the County and State agreed to.

Mr. Malinowski requested a legal opinion on whether the County has to take the roads over, since there was a contractual agreement prior to the State changing their rules.

Mr. Niermeier stated he believes the agreement was always for the County to take over the roads. He will review the agreement to confirm that is correct.

Ms. McBride stated the majority of these roads are connected to community, or are a part of a community. She noted we have received numerous complaints, and the residents are told that some are State roads and some are County roads. She stated it is difficult, working in this situation, because we are telling our communities these are State roads, and we cannot do anything about it. She is sure the Ombudsman's Office will support her in the number of complaints we get, regarding this issue. She inquired if the majority of these are within subdivisions.

Mr. Niermeier stated the four in Ms. McBride's district are in subdivisions, and the others are primarily within a neighborhood.

Ms. McBride stated oftentimes we receive motions/recommendations for road repairs that are concentrated in one district, and other districts are not afforded the opportunity to receive the services. She believes it will be a positive thing for the County to take on these roads, so we can have more control over them.

In Favor: Jackson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- d. **Department Transfer of Funds between Projects** – Mr. Niermeier this item is the department's request to be allowed to transfer up to \$100,000 between projects. In the past, as we have discussed, construction moves faster or slower, or there are other delays. There is even human error in setting up the dollar figure for specific project budgets. He noted that transfers would be reported out quarterly to the committee. Anything above the \$100,000 would come back to committee/Council.

Mr. Jackson stated this was an issue before when we almost came to a stalemate because there was a temporary "shortage" of funds, and we had to come to Council to get permission to access some funds because of an overlap in the fiscal year. Because the funds were not readily available we had to come back to Council to get funding for projects that were moving faster than anticipated. There

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020**

were other projects that were moving slower; therefore, would not need the funds at that time.

Mr. Livingston moved, Mr. Jackson, to approve this item.

Mr. Malinowski stated the briefing document says, “some projects [were] underfunded and others [had] funding that was not immediately needed”. He could see the funding not immediately needed being moved, but it also says, “...project schedule changes delayed some projects and that funding could address shortfalls in others projects”. If you have a shortfall, and you take from “Pot A” to put it in “Pot B”, where does the money come from to cover the shortfall.

Mr. Niermeier stated it is still within the budget.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, the use of the term “shortfall” does not mean the project was underfunded.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston stated it is based on an approved budget, and he thinks it is extremely important in case they run into a delay or a material shortage. Charleston County does this and they send Council a briefing document notating the change that was made.

Ms. McBride stated this is a common practice. Her concern is how projects are selected to move the funds from, and if that has been taken into consideration.

Mr. Niermeier stated they would not knowingly take funds from a project if they knew it was needed.

Ms. McBride inquired if there was a reason they chose a cash amount rather than a percentage of the funding.

Mr. Niermeier stated he and Mr. Jackson spoke about this, and he was comfortable with not to exceed \$100,000, as a benchmark. The committee could recommend a different number.

Mr. Jackson stated he would hope staff would make Council aware of where funds were taken from.

Ms. Terracio requested the dollar amount be included in the briefing documents when this item goes to full Council. She inquired what would happen if there were a need for more than \$100,000.

Mr. Niermeier stated anything that would be above the \$100,000 threshold would come back to the committee, and ultimately Council, for approval.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. **Staff Augmentation Selection Approval** – Mr. Niermeier stated they went through a RFQ solicitation to find resources for the Transportation Department, in the way of staff augmentation, for positions that were not necessarily organic to the County. The list before you are the responsive consultants that were evaluated and deemed qualified to provide these services. The request is approval of the list of seven vendors, so staff can move forward with selecting individuals to help support the program.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020**

-4-

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve staff's request.

Mr. Livingston stated with the Program Development Team, in terms of staff, we were able to keep up with that because we had positions, and a certain amount for those positions. He has no idea how he will be able to keep up with how much it is costing, staff wise, with the way it is structured now. He inquired how we keep up with how much we are paying (i.e. Utility Coordinator). He inquired if there is a certain amount that is budgeted, or will be negotiating.

Mr. Niermeier stated initial estimates for 6.5 FTE is approximately \$988,000 annually. We are looking at phasing these positions in. All of the positions will be under contract, and will be brought back to Council for approval.

Ms. McBride inquired if these positions were under consideration when Council received the initial budget to bring the program in-house, and the staffing needed.

Mr. Niermeier stated, if Ms. McBride is referring to last Spring, he does not know the answer. He stated this was a part of the cost that was presented to Council at the 2020 Council Retreat.

Ms. McBride stated she wants to make sure that we are clear if we are saving money, or breaking even. She stated, for clarification, that we have identified these companies to provide us with these consultants.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if we did this through an RFQ, and if we did it individually, per position, or as a group of positions.

Mr. Niermeier stated in the RFQ the responders were allowed to identify who they had to fill the positions. He noted the last three (3) on the list are recruiting companies, so they will be able to fill all of the positions.

Ms. McBride inquired as to what the recruiting agencies specialize in.

Mr. Niermeier stated he does not know if they specialize in any particular field. In his working with recruiting agencies, they tell you they can find anybody for anyone.

Ms. McBride requested to look at the breakdown of these agencies.

Ms. Terracio inquired if this is coming out of General Fund or the Transportation Penny.

Mr. Niermeier stated the funding will be from Penny funding.

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, these positions will be dedicated to the Penny projects only.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston stated one of the significant concerns of the community, when the program started, was to ensure that Small Local Business Enterprises were included in the process. He inquired if we are still tracking that, and if any of these companies SLBEs.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020**

Ms. Wladischkin stated there are two (2) companies that may be SLBEs, but they will have to research that and bring it back.

Mr. Jackson inquired as to what kind of background check was done by the committee on the selected companies.

Mr. Niermeier stated the main evaluation areas: Ability & Capability, Performance History, Personnel Qualifications, and References were checked, as a part of the evaluation.

Mr. Jackson stated we can do that on the ones that are not the recruiting agencies. The recruiting agencies are the ones that he has the most concern about because they said they could find someone to fill the positions. In them saying they can find someone to fill the positions, do we have some degree of certainty that their track record has been proven.

Mr. Niermeier stated if something came up where we found they were not qualified, or had a troubled history, they would have lost points and likely would not have been selected.

Mr. Livingston stated, it was his impression, when we were discussing staff augmentation that we were selecting firms that had individuals on staff which could provide the services we needed.

Ms. McBride inquired if the County has used any of these firms before. Additionally, she inquired if the evaluators were County employees.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if it was a blind review.

Mr. Niermeier stated the qualifications were in the proposal that was submitted to the County.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if any of the evaluators have to advise if there is any conflict of interest.

Ms. Wladischkin responded that the evaluators have to sign a confidentiality and conflict of interest forms.

Mr. Jackson inquired, if this item is approved by the committee and Council, what will be the process for selecting which companies are utilized.

Mr. Niermeier responded they will go back to the companies and state which positions they need to immediately hire for. They will then evaluate the qualifications, negotiate an agreement with the most qualified and bring the agreement back to Council for approval.

Mr. Jackson stated it would probably be helpful, before this item goes to Council, which shows the positions that have been filled since this has been brought in-house.

Mr. Niermeier stated the intent was, if we needed a specialty that we do not have in-house, we would have this group of qualified companies that we could call on.

Mr. Jackson stated he would imagine that there is a pool of individuals, which are unemployed, and have these skill sets. Our challenge is trying to find individuals that is available to come to work with the County, at the rate we are going to pay them, versus what SCDOT, or some other agency.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020**

Mr. Niermeier stated the potential is to transition some of these positions into the County, in the future.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson and Livingston

Opposed: McBride

The vote was in favor.

- f. **North Main CEI Services Contract Approval** – Mr. Niermeier stated the item before you is the evaluation team’s recommendation to award the North Main CEI Services contract to Brownstone Construction in the amount not to exceed \$165,473.19, with an additional contingency of \$35,484.08.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve staff’s recommendation to award the North Main CEI Services contract to Brownstone Construction in the amount not to exceed \$165,473.19, with an additional contingency of \$35,484.08.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the qualification methodology different than the previous one. In the previous one we were given consolidated evaluations, but we have nothing to show us how these companies were ranked.

Mr. Niermeier stated there were eight (8) companies that responded to a previous RFQ to be qualified to provide CEI Services for Richland County Transportation Penny. Subsequent, we sent out solicitations for work that is going to exceed \$100,000 (i.e. North Main, Greene Street, Clemson Road). The solicitation only goes out to the eight (8) qualified vendors, and they have an opportunity to respond. In this case, five (5) of the eight (8) responded back, and we followed the procurement process.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if they are responding with a bid.

Ms. Wladischkin stated, for clarification, that she believes Mr. Malinowski is looking for the scoring packet.

Mr. Malinowski responded the scoring packet, as well as the bid amounts.

Ms. Wladischkin stated it was a Request for Proposal, so they did not include the bid amounts. She has the scoring, and she can provide the costs to the committee. She stated they normally do not include costs because it could affect negotiations.

Mr. Malinowski stated he agrees with not “showing our hand” before all of the vetting is done. He inquired if there is a possibility to take this up in Executive Session, since it is a contractual matter.

Ms. Wladischkin responded that she had approached Legal about this matter, and their viewpoint is that because it is not under contract it would not qualify for Executive Session as a contractual matter.

Ms. Terracio inquired as to when the list of eight (8) vendors was presented to Council.

Mr. Jackson stated it was presented in the last few months.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
February 25, 2020**

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, we re-evaluated and re-determined the list.

Mr. Niermeier responded in October/November a list was presented of the respondents who were qualified to provide the services. Subsequent, when there is work to be let an RFP goes out, and those eight (8) can respond to the solicitation.

Ms. Terracio inquired how we came up with the list of eight (8) respondents.

Mr. Niermeier responded that they released an RFQ in August/September 2019.

Mr. Jackson stated, when we discussed the list, someone on Council raised the issue of ensuring the list was diverse, and when they made a selection, from the list, that Council was informed.

Mr. Brown stated this was one of his early meetings, and he spoke to the presentation of the list. Part of the discussion was what Council was being asked to approve. The list had gone through the procurement process, and staff was simply responding to a request to inform Council.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **ADJOURN** - The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:56 PM.



Agenda Briefing

To: Chair of the Committee and the Honorable Members of the Committee
Prepared by: Michael A. Niermeier, Director
Department: Richland County Transportation
Date Prepared: April 20, 2020 **Meeting Date:** April 28, 2020

Legal Review		Date:	
Budget Review	N/A	Date:	
Finance Review	N/A	Date:	
Other Review:	N/A	Date:	
Approved for Council consideration:	Assistant County Administrator	John Thompson, Ph. D	

Committee Subject: Project Descopes to Bring Costs Back Under Referendum Amounts

Background Information:

Since the implementation of the Penny Tax, the program has experienced a significant amount of cost increases. These increases throughout the last several years are primarily due to the increase in the cost of construction and materials, project overdesigns and the cost of utility relocations that were not originally included in the Parsons Brinckerhoff study (the study that was the basis for the project list and project costs included in the referendum).

Transportation staff has revisited most projects that are not currently under construction to see if the scope of these projects can be reduced to bring their costs back down to referendum amounts. The only projects that were not re-evaluated are greenways and sidewalks since Council already approved a path forward on those categories. A summary of these re-evaluations can be seen in the Transportation Project Summary (Attachment 1). A detail of each project re-evaluation can be seen in the Over-Referendum attachment (Attachment 2) and Under-Referendum attachment (Attachment 3).

Recommended Action:

Staff recommends the approval of the recommended descopes presented in the attachments and to use any remaining funding as a contingency to cover any unforeseen costs.

Motion Requested:

Move to approve the Recommended Action.

Request for Council Reconsideration: No

Fiscal Impact:

None

Motion of Origin:

This request did not result from a Council motion.

Council Member	N/A
Meeting	N/A
Date	N/A

Discussion:

None

Attachments:

- (1) Transportation Project Summary
- (2) Over-Referendum Project Re-Evaluations
- (3) Under-Referendum Project Re-Evaluations
- (4) Level Of Service Exhibit

Transportation Project Summary

General

Since the implementation of the Penny Tax, the program has experienced a significant amount of cost increases. These increases throughout the last several years are primarily due to the increase in the cost of construction and materials, project overdesigns and also the cost of utility relocations that were not originally included in the Parsons Brinckerhoff study (the study that was the basis for the project list and project costs included in the referendum).

To date, some of the projects whose construction is already complete had costs that were less than their referendum amounts. These remaining funds can be applied to other projects.

In order to bring the program back into the total program budget, all projects that are not currently under construction were re-evaluated to determine a path forward. The two options available to best achieve this goal are:

1. Evaluate the remaining projects in order to de-scope them based on the following criteria:
 - a. Addressing and improving safety issues (based on crash data analysis)
 - b. Addressing and improving traffic capacity\flow issues (traffic study data)
 - c. Economic development
2. Complete projects in each category based on their rank. This will require that some projects not be completed.

Safety

Currently safety on their roadway system is one of the top goals for the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT). This is due to South Carolina roadways having such a high fatality rate, including drivers, motorcyclists, and pedestrians. See **Table 1** below for Richland County fatalities from January 1 through December 8 over the last several years. Addressing safety issues should be a top priority for Richland County as well.

Table 1 – Richland County Fatality Data (SC Dept. of Public Safety)

2019	2018	2017	2016
46	48	48	62

The following roadways near the proposed project locations had fatalities occurring during their crash data analysis timeframes: Atlas Rd. between Shop Rd and Garners Ferry (1), Broad River Rd. (1), Shop Rd. (2), and Decker Blvd. (1).

Also for the projects where crash data was provided, all had crashes during the analysis timeframe that had injuries as the result of the crashes.

Recommendation

The Transportation Department recommends proceeding with option 1. This will allow at least some portion of every project voted in by Richland County citizens to be completed. It is recommended to evaluate and address any safety issues with each project first. If a project does not have a specific safety issue, it is then recommended to apply the second criteria and address traffic capacity\flow issues. Finally, if a project does not specifically address safety or capacity\flow issues, it will be evaluated to determine any economic development benefits which only applies to three projects.

The remaining projects not under construction have been broken up into two groups: Under Referendum Amount and Over Referendum amount. The above mentioned process has been applied to each group, with the following exceptions:

1. Sidewalks – Council has already approved completing the first 50 out of 56 projects
2. Dirt Road Paving Program – The number of roads completed will automatically be capped at the referendum amount
3. Resurfacing Program - The number of roads completed will automatically be capped at the referendum amount
4. Greenways – Council has already approved changes to the Greenway to stay within the referendum amount
5. Bikeways - The number of bikeways completed will automatically be capped at the referendum amount

See **Table 2** for a list of completed construction projects, their referendum amounts, their original cost estimates, and their final costs.

See **Tables 3.A and 3.B** for a list of remaining projects not under construction, their referendum amounts, their revised cost estimates based on descopes, and their projected cost savings.

Tables 4.A-D show how many projects can be completed if no projects are descoped. The projects in each category are listed in ranked order.

Table 2 – Completed Projects

Project	District	Referendum	Original Estimate	Final Cost
Bluff Widening Ph. 1	10	\$11,400,000 *	\$9,598,720	\$9,724,498
Clemson\Rhame Int.	8, 9	\$3,500,000	\$4,096,203	\$3,852,225
Broad River\Rushmore	2	\$3,700,000	\$1,213,739	\$1,196,893
Farrow\Pisgah Church	7	\$3,600,000	\$2,243,860	\$2,068,722
N. Springs\Risdon	8, 9	\$1,800,000	1,936,802	\$1,883,943
Summit\Summit Ridge	8, 9	\$500,000	\$1,425,120	\$1,407,819
Kennerly\Coogler	1	\$1,900,000	\$2,736,144	\$2,598,629
Wilson\Pisgah Church **	7	\$3,600,000	\$0	\$405
Wilson\Killian ***	7	\$2,600,000	\$0	\$405
Zoo Ped. Bridge	5	\$4,000,000	\$3,345,525	\$3,345,525
Innovista Ph. 1	5	\$17,897,970	\$18,119,764	\$17,897,970
Shop Ext. Ph. 1	10	\$35,163,888	\$35,163,888	\$32,446,866
Lincoln Tunnel	4, 5	\$892,739	\$1,496,947	\$1,512,061
Ped. Improvements	3-10	\$2,836,080	\$1,136,080	\$802,664
TOTAL		\$93,390,677	\$82,512,792	\$78,738,625

* Amount from original referendum amount plus \$1.8M from outside funding

**Wilson\Pisgah Church Rd. Intersection was completed by SCDOT.

*** Wilson\Killian Intersection was completed by SCDOT.

There is approximately \$14,652,052 remaining from these completed projects.

Table 3.A – Remaining Projects Over Referendum And Not Under Construction

Project	District	Referendum	Original Estimate	Descope Estimate
Atlas Widening	10,11	\$17,600,000	\$45,308,464	\$36,300,000
Bluff Ph. 2	10	\$8,800,000 *	\$40,341,854	\$3,500,000
Blythewood Widening	2	\$8,000,000	\$13,208,127	\$13,208,127
Broad River Widening	1	\$29,000,000	\$39,663,756	\$30,000,000
Lower Richland Widen.	11	\$6,100,000	\$6,708,092	\$5,000,000
Polo Widening\Bike	8-10	\$13,875,853	\$15,865,241	\$10,600,000
Shop Widening	10	\$33,100,000	\$46,461,612	\$32,000,000
Spears Creek Church	9,10	\$26,600,000	\$49,492,027	\$20,000,000
Pineview Rd.	10,11	\$18,200,000	\$39,927,057	\$8,000,000
Bull\Elmwood Inter.	4	\$2,000,000	\$3,798,911	\$3,798,911
Clemson\Sparkleberry	9,10	\$5,100,000	\$12,780,946	\$12,500,000
Screaming Eagle\Perc.	9,10	\$1,000,000	\$3,105,147	\$1,600,000
TOTAL		\$169,375,853	\$316,661,234	\$176,507,038

* Amount leftover from combined phases 1 and 2 referendum amount

Table 3.B – Remaining Projects Under Referendum And Not Under Construction

<u>Project</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Referendum</u>	<u>Original Estimate</u>	<u>Descope Estimate</u>
Blythewood Area Impr.	2	\$21,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000
Leesburg Widening	10,11	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
I-20 Interchange	2,4,5	\$52,500,000	\$52,500,000	\$52,500,000
Garners Ferry\Harmon	11	\$2,600,000	\$1,583,878	\$50,000
Shop Ext. Ph. 2	10,11	\$42,300,000 *	\$40,112,788	\$27,000,000
Innovista Ph. 3	5	\$5,700,000 *	\$23,907,450	\$0
Kelly Mill Rd.	2,9	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000
Commerce Dr.	5,10	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Broad River Corridor	2,4,5	\$20,435,500	\$21,818,057	\$14,200,000
Crane Creek NIP	4,7	\$14,385,000	\$14,385,000	\$8,000,000
Decker\Woodfield NIP	3,8,10	\$12,343,000	\$13,156,741	\$8,000,000
Trenholm NIP	3	\$5,390,658	\$5,390,658	\$4,900,000
Bikeways	2-11	\$22,008,773	\$22,008,773	\$22,008,773
TOTAL		\$212,162,931	\$221,363,345	\$163,158,773

* Amounts left over from original referendum amounts after earlier phases were completed.

Total Referendum Amounts	-	\$381,538,784 (Excludes projects under construction)
Total Original Estimates	-	\$538,024,579
Total Descope Estimates	-	\$339,665,811

If descope recommendations are approved, the new estimates will be \$41,872,973 under the referendum amount. Adding this to the approximately \$14,652,052 leftover from completed projects, there is estimated to be roughly \$56,525,025 remaining. Options to use this funding are 1) as a reserve for any needed contingencies if the descope estimates need to be adjusted, 2) put towards completing more Dirt Road Paving or Resurfacing projects, or 3) put towards completing additional sidewalk projects.

However, as shown in the projects highlighted in red in **Tables 3.A-D**, to proceed down the ranked list and complete the projects with their original scopes, four widening projects and one intersection project will not be constructed.

Table 4.A – Remaining Widening Projects Without Descopes

Category	Project	Referendum	Original Estimate
Widening	Leesburg Rd.	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
Widening	Lower Richland Blvd.	\$6,100,000	\$8,738,400
Widening	Bluff Area Impr.	\$16,700,000	\$40,341,854
Widening	Polo Rd.	\$12,800,000	\$15,865,241
Widening	Pineview Rd.	\$18,200,000	\$39,927,056
Widening	Shop Rd.	\$33,100,000	\$44,011,687
Widening	Atlas Rd.	\$17,600,000	\$44,797,948
Widening	Blythewood Rd.	\$8,000,000	\$14,713,963
Widening	Broad River Rd.	\$29,000,000	\$39,663,756
Widening	Spears Creek Church	\$26,600,000	\$49,492,027
TOTAL		\$172,100,000	\$301,551,932

Table 4.B – Remaining Intersection Projects Without Descopes

Category	Project	Referendum	Original Estimate
Intersection	Garners Ferry\Harmon	\$2,600,000	\$1,583,878
Intersection	Clemson\Sparkleberry	\$5,100,000	\$12,780,946
Intersection	Bull\Elmwood	\$2,000,000	\$3,798,811
Intersection	Screaming Eagle\Perc.	\$1,000,000	\$3,107,149
TOTAL		\$10,700,000	\$21,270,784

Table 4.C – Remaining Special\NIP Projects Without Descopes

Category	Project	Referendum	Original Estimate
Special	Shop Ext. Ph. 2	\$42,300,000	\$40,112,788
Special	Kelly Mill Rd.	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000
Special	Innovista Ph. 3	\$5,700,000	\$23,907,450
Special\NIP	Broad River Corridor	\$20,435,500	\$14,200,000 *
Special\NIP	Crane Creek	\$14,385,000	\$8,000,000 *
Special\NIP	Decker\Woodfield	\$12,343,000	\$8,000,000 *
Special\NIP	Trenholm	\$5,390,658	\$4,900,000 *
Special	Commerce Dr.	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
TOTAL		\$110,054,158	\$108,620,238

* NIP project estimates are listed as the revised estimates after the removal of landscaped medians, lighting, mast arms, and undergrounding of utilities.

Table 4.D – Remaining Other Projects Without Descopes

Category	Project	Referendum	Original Estimate
Interchange	I-20\Broad River	\$52,500,000	\$52,500,000
Bikeways	Bikeways	\$22,008,773	\$22,008,773

ATLAS RD. WIDENING

Original Project Scope

- The project scope for Atlas Road is to widen the two lane roadway to alleviate existing and projected traffic for this travel way. Proposed improvements include widening the road to three lanes between Bluff Road and Shop Road and widening to five lanes between Shop Road and Garners Ferry Road. Additional improvements include two four-foot wide bike lanes and two five-foot wide sidewalks.

Referendum Funding - \$17,600,000.00

Current Cost Estimate - \$45,308,464.22

Traffic Analysis and Results

- The traffic analysis report showed that widening the road from two to three lanes between Bluff Road and Shop Road had minimal improvements to the 2040 Level of Service (LOS) for this section of Atlas Road. Both the “build” and “no-build” alternatives provided the same LOS.
- However, the report did show a significant improvement to Atlas Road between Shop Road and Garners Ferry Road in 2040 based on widening the road to five lanes of travel. The Level of Service improves from a D in the “no-build” scenario to an A in the “build” scenario.
- Crash Data between 1/1/12 and 7/14/15 (3.6 years) most crashes were rear-end collisions
 - **Intersections:** Atlas\Bluff – 5 Atlas\Garners Ferry – 107 Atlas\Shop – 50
 - **Road Sections:** Shop to Garners Ferry – 74 Bluff to Shop – 18
 - 1 fatality

Public Input Results

- While the public was mostly supportive of the proposed improvements, Bible Way Church representatives expressed concerns with pedestrian traffic access to church buildings located on both sides of Atlas Road. Several comments were in opposition of the widening, and several requested a traffic signal at the intersection of Atlas and Richard St.
- Other frequent comments were related to right-of-way acquisition.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 110 parcels, 7 permissions, 8 condemnations (22 condemnations are outstanding)
- Expended To Date - \$2,977,978.96

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

- Option #1- Proceed with widening Atlas Road between Shop Road and Garners Ferry Road while including pedestrian improvements between Bluff Road and Shop Road.
New Approx. Estimate: \$36.3M (Approx. Savings \$9M)
Note: This is the only option that addresses capacity issues and addresses the greater amount of crashes (safety).
- Option #2- Proceed with widening Atlas Road between Bluff Road and Shop Road while removing the section between Shop Road and Garners Ferry Road **New Approx. Estimate: \$22.2M (Approx. Savings \$23.1M)**
Note: This option could be implemented in Penny 2.0
- Option #3- No road widening improvements but install sidewalks and bike lanes along full length of road
New Approx. Estimate: \$14M (Approx. Savings \$31.3M)

BLUFF ROAD PHASE 2 IMPROVEMENTS

Original Project Scope

- The original project scope for the Bluff Road Phase 2 Improvements project was to widen Bluff Road to five lanes with bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. On June 05, 2018, Richland County Council approved to revise the project scope to only include constructing shared use paths on both sides of Bluff Road with asphalt resurfacing from National Guard Road/Berea Road to South Beltline Blvd. A second and third reading was not found. The project length is 2.00 miles.

Referendum Funding - \$16.7M for Phases 1 and 2

- Bluff Road Phase 1 (Rosewood Avenue to National Guard Rd) had \$9.6M allocated for it, with additional outside funding in the amount \$1.8M. The final cost to complete Bluff Ph. 1 was \$9,724,498. Therefore, \$8.8M is the remaining allotment for Bluff Road Phase 2.

Current Cost Estimate: \$40,341,854.39

Traffic Analysis and Results

- The traffic analysis was conducted at the intersections along the length of this project. Providing turning lanes for these intersections would improve the LOS at each. The intersection of Bluff Road and Bluff Industrial Blvd meets several signalization warrants.
- Crash Data between 1/1/11 and 10/31/14 (3.8 years) shows that there have been 327 crashes in this timeframe between Rosewood Dr. to South Beltline Rd., the majority being rear-end collisions. 98 of these crashes were near intersections, with 49 being near the intersection of Bluff Rd. and Bluff Industrial Blvd.

Public Input Results

- A public hearing was held for the original scope of widening the road. The majority of attendees were in favor of bike lanes adjacent to the travel lanes on both sides of the roadway and sidewalks for pedestrians.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 0 Expended To Date - \$4,500.00

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

- Option # 1 - Remove the ten-foot shared use path, only resurface and construct five foot sidewalks with 4' bike lanes, and shorten the ending termini to Southern Dr., which is the last road with residential use. Install traffic signal at Bluff\Bluff Industrial **New Approx. Estimate: \$8M (Approx. Savings \$33.3M)**
- Option # 2 – Because the intersection of Bluff Rd. and Bluff Industrial Blvd. has a significant number of crashes and warrants a traffic signal, install the traffic signal at this location. Remove the sidewalk and bike lanes from the project, perform intersection improvements as needed at the remaining intersections, and then resurface the road. **New Approx. Estimate: \$3.5M (Approx. Savings \$36.8M)**

Note: This area is mostly commercial\industrial so except during football games, it is unclear that there would be much pedestrian\cyclist traffic in this area.

BLYTHEWOOD RD WIDENING

Original Project Scope

- The proposed scope recommends a 5-lane (4 travel lanes with a center turn lane) improvement from I-77 west to Syrup Mill Road. Provisions for bicycle and pedestrian accommodation are proposed through the construction of offset, shared-use paths. This project also includes a double-lane roundabout at the intersection of Community Rd and Blythewood Rd. (as part of Blythewood's Master Plan.) This project has economic development tie-ins with the future Blythewood Industrial Park.

Referendum Funding - \$8,000,000.00 **Current Cost Estimate** - \$13,208,127.44

Traffic Analysis & Results

- The traffic analysis was conducted along this road and at the intersections along the length of this project. Widening this roadway greatly increases the LOS both along the roadway and at these intersections.
- A signal warrant analysis performed at the intersection of Syrup Mill Rd. and Blythewood Rd. was performed. Based on warrant analysis results and field reviews a signal is not recommended at this location.
- Crash Data between 1/1/13 and 12/31/15 (3 years) shows that there were 22 crashes between I-77 southbound ramp and Muller Road with the majority being rear-end collisions.

Public Input Results

- Many citizens support the project with the shared-use paths.
- Many citizens do not support the roundabout.
- Many citizens requested a traffic signal at the intersection of Syrup Mill Rd. and Blythewood Rd.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date– 15 parcels, 7 condemnations (Pending Approval) Expended To Date - \$484,265.00

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

- The Blythewood Area Improvements project includes 4 projects, ranked in priority by the Town of Blythewood by resolution on January 28, 2019. There will not be enough referendum funding to complete all 4 projects so only the first two projects, chosen by the town, are being moved forward. After completing the first two projects, there will be approximately \$8,000,000 remaining that would not be sufficient to fund either of the last two projects. If this funding were transferred to the Blythewood Rd. Widening project, it would be sufficient to cover the difference in the referendum and cost estimate amounts.

Note: This option was discussed with the Town of Blythewood and is acceptable to them.

BROAD RIVER RD. WIDENING

Original Project Scope

- The project scope for the Broad River Road Widening Project was to widen the roadway to 5 lanes between Royal Tower Drive and Dutch Fork Road in the Irmo community. In addition, the road was to be widened to 3 lanes between Dutch Fork Road and I-26 (Exit 97).
- (2) 4-foot wide bike lanes and (2) 5-foot wide sidewalks are included in the project scope.

Revised Project Scope - Based on traffic volumes, public input, and funding, the PDT recommended to only include the widening from North Royal Tower to Dutch Fork.

Referendum Funding - \$29,000,000.00

Current Cost Estimate: \$39,663,756.37

Traffic Analysis and Results

- The traffic study evaluated 15 intersections along the length of this project along with the intersections of the off/on ramps of I-26. SCDOT plans to widen I-26 in this area, so the off/on ramps would be addressed with their project.
- The 2043 Level of Service in this corridor has been identified as “Adequate” for the proposed improvements while the 2043 “No- Build” evaluation showed that the majority of the intersections would operate at a “F” Level of Service. The recommended proposed improvements from the traffic study are to improve the intersections by increasing turning bays.
- Crash Data between 1/1/13 and 12/31/15 (3 years) shows that there were 161 crashes near these 15 intersections with the majority being rear-end collisions.
- 1 fatality

Public Input Results

- 185 residents attended the December 15, 2016, Public Meeting
- The design alternative supported by the most residents was a 5 lane travel way that included 2 4-foot wide bike lanes and 2 5-foot wide sidewalks
- Residents agreed that removing the 3 lane section between Dutch Fork Road and I-26 was preferred

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 0 Expended To Date - \$0

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

- Widen the road to 3 lanes (2 driving lanes and a median) and also provide turning lanes at the intersections that are missing them at this time. This could improve turning movements in and out of the many businesses in the corridor and decrease the number of rear-end collisions.

New Approx. Estimate: \$30M (Approx. Savings \$9.6M)

Note: This option would not improve capacity but would improve safety and would improve flow since left-turning vehicles would be able to pull into the median instead of block the flow of traffic.

- The cost estimate includes approximately \$1,150,000 to relocate a 54” waterline at SCDOT’s request. Staff is currently working with SCDOT to possibly have this requirement removed.

LOWER RICHLAND BOULEVARD WIDENING

Original Project Scope:

The proposed scope recommends a 5-lane section (4 travel lanes and a center turn lane) between Rabbit Run and Garners Ferry Road and will include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Bike lanes and a shared use path are also proposed along both sides of Lower Richland Boulevard.

Referendum Funding: \$6,100,000 **Current Cost Estimate:** \$6,708,092

Traffic Analysis And Results

The intersection of Garners Ferry Rd and Lower Richland Blvd will perform at a LOS of E/D (AM/PM peak hours) in 2042 with no-build scenario. The completed project will bring the LOS up to a C.

The intersection of Lower Richland Blvd and Rabbit Run is currently functioning at an LOS of B and will continue to function at this LOS in year 2042 even with the no-build scenario.

Crash Data between 1/1/15 and 6/30/18 (3.5 years) shows that there were 17 reported crashes with rear-end collisions being the most common.

Public Input Results

- Only 5 comments were received from the public meeting held for this project. 2 were supportive of the project, 1 was concerned with drainage, 1 was concerned with the intersection of Lower Richland and 378, and 1 was a complaint not specifically pertaining to this project.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 0 Expended To Date - \$0

Possible Design Modifications To Lower Cost

1. Do not widen the road or perform any intersection work at Rabbit Run. Perform intersection improvements by installing dedicated left-turn lanes at Garners Ferry and install 5' sidewalks on both sides of the road from Rabbit Run to Garners Ferry. **New Approx. Estimate: \$5M (Approx. Savings \$1.7M)**
Note: This option addresses the inadequate LOS and provides pedestrian safety.
2. Instead of building sidewalk on both sides of Lower Richland, limit sidewalk to the east side and limit it to 5' in width. There will be an existing 10' wide share-use path running along the east side of Lower Richland from Rabbit Run approximately 1800 feet south to Lower Richland stadium entrance. (See SERN plans). **New Approx. Estimate: \$6.6M (Approx. Savings \$0.1M)**
3. If sidewalk on west side of road is kept, reduce the proposed width from 8' down to 5'.
New Approx. Estimate: \$6.6M (Approx. Savings \$40,000)

POLO RD. WIDENING

Original Project Scope – Widen Polo Rd. from a 2-lane road to a 3-lane road from Two Notch Rd. to Mallet Hill Rd. and install sidewalks and bikeways from Two Notch Rd. to just south of Mallet Hill Rd.

Referendum Funding: Widening - \$12,800,000 Bikeway – \$1,075,853 **TOTAL:** \$13,875,853

Current Cost Estimate: \$15,865,240.98

Traffic Analysis And Results – The traffic analysis performed mainly looked at the LOS at the intersection of Polo Rd. with Two Notch Rd., Running Fox Rd., Miles Rd., and Mallet Hill Rd.

Because only a median, or third lane is proposed as part of this widening, the LOS of the corridor will not improve because the median will not provide any extra traffic capacity to the overall road.

The proposed median has the potential to improve the LOS at some of the intersections over the next couple of years, but not all intersections. In looking at the 20-year traffic projection, even with the proposed median, most of the intersections will have an LOS of D, E or F.

Crash Data between 1/15 and 9/18 (3.7 years) shows that there were 74 crashes reported with the most common being angle and rear-end collisions.

Public Input Results – After reviewing the public comments received through mail, email and public meeting attendance, 66% of these comments were either neutral or opposed the widening of this road. Only 34% supported the widening of the road.

A few of the neutral\opposed were against the widening but okay with SUPs, bikeways and\or sidewalks.

The biggest concern from the comments are that there will be an increase in traffic and also speeding along Polo Road and that the project will damage the wetlands and cause flooding.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 0 Expended To Date - \$0

Possible Design Modifications To Lower Cost

1. Do not widen the entire road but rather provide intersection improvements (turning lanes) at the locations of the four intersections (Polo Rd. with Two Notch Rd., Running Fox Rd., Miles Rd., and Mallet Hill Rd), and then include bikeways and 5' sidewalks.

New Approx. Estimate: \$10.6 (Approx. savings is \$5.2)

Note: This is the most economical solution to address LOS issues and provide pedestrian\bicyclist safety.

2. Do not widen or complete intersection improvements but do install bikeways and 5' sidewalks.
New Approx. Estimate: \$8.6M (Approx. savings is \$7.2M)

SHOP ROAD WIDENING

Original Project Scope:

The proposed scope recommends a 5-lane (4 travel lanes with a center turn lane) widened roadway with offset, shared use paths along both sides of the road (for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations) on Shop Road from George Rogers Blvd. to Mauney Drive.

Referendum Funding: \$33,100,000 **Current Cost Estimate:** \$46,461,612

Traffic Analysis And Results

- For opening year (2022) and design year (2042) “no-build” conditions, most of the intersections within the project limits function at an adequate Level of Service but some are inadequate.
- The analysis shows that the widening project will significantly improve the Levels of Service once the project is completed; however, a few intersections will still function at an inadequate level and in year 2042 more of the intersections will function at an inadequate level.
- Crash Data between 1/1/11 and 10/31/14 (3.9 years) shows that there were 82 reported crashes with rear-end collisions being the most common.
 - 2 fatalities

Public Input Results

- General support of the project widening and the plans for the addition of bike / pedestrian accommodations.
- Relocations (Residential & Commercial) & R/W issues – many questions relative to the process for relocations and ultimately, compensation.
- Parking / vehicular circulation impacts adjacent to Shop Road (by a few business owners)
- Traffic Signals at Side Roads / Safety –comments relative to adding traffic signals at side roads within Little Camden / Washington Park. The comments received were concerned with safety of crossing the road due to speeding traffic and increased volumes.
- Walcott Drainage - planned improvements to the drainage outfall along Walcott Street; specifically that the outfall needed improvements.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 5 Expended To Date - \$104,265.00

Possible Design Modifications To Lower Cost

1. Remove SUPs and buffers from both sides of the road and install 4’ bike lanes with 5’ sidewalks.
New Approx. Estimate: \$46M (Approx. savings is \$0.6M)
2. Currently, a significant portion of this road is 2 lanes with turning lanes at a few intersections. Option 2 would be uniformly widen the road to a 3-lane (2 travel lanes and one median) and include the bike lanes and sidewalks. The median would allow for and improve turning movements in and out of the various roads and driveways. **New Approx. Estimate: \$32M (Approx. savings is \$14.4M)**
Note: This option would improve the driver safety along the road since most collisions were rear end. This would also set up to widen the road to a 5-lane road in the future.

SPEARS CREEK CHURCH RD. WIDENING

Original Project Scope – Widen Spears Creek Church Rd. from a 2-lane road to a 5-lane road starting at Two Notch Rd. and ending at Percival Rd.

Referendum Funding - \$26,600,000 **Current Cost Estimate** - \$49,492,027.07

Traffic Analysis And Results

- A traffic analysis has not been completed for this project.
- Crash Data between 1/1/15 and 12/31/17 (3 years) shows that there were 129 reported crashes with rear-end collisions being the most common.

Public Input Results – To date, no public meetings have been held. The project never progressed to the point of a public meeting.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 0 Expended To Date - \$0

Possible Design Modifications To Lower Cost

1. The average daily traffic on this road is similar in quantity to other two-lane roads in this vicinity of the County such as Bookman Rd., N. Brickyard Rd., Sparkleberry Ln., and Percival Rd. These other roads are not currently scheduled for widening. Widen the road to a 3-lane in order to provide a median from Two Notch Rd. to Jacobs Mill Pond Rd.

New Approx. Estimate: \$20M (Approx. Savings is \$29.4M)

Note: This option would improve the driver safety along the road since most collisions were rear end. This would also set up to widen the road to a 5-lane road in the future Penny 2.0.

PINEVIEW ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Original Project Scope - Widen Pineview Rd. to three lanes between Bluff Rd. and Shop Rd., widen Pineview Rd to 5 lanes between Shop Rd. and Garners Ferry Rd., pedestrian\bicycle accommodations, and intersection improvements at Shop Rd. This project has economic development tie-ins to the surrounding industrial areas.

Referendum Funding - \$18,200,000 **Current Cost Estimate** - \$39,927,056.67
(Est. based on PDT's last estimate for full project)

Traffic Analysis And Results

Pineview between Bluff Rd. and Shop Rd.

- Existing conditions is a LOS B both for the current year and year 2041 in the AM. Existing conditions LOS is a C\B (northbound\southbound) in the PM. These LOSs for 2041 are all adequate even if this section of road is not widened. The analysis recommends the third lane in order to remove turning traffic from through lanes.
- Crash Data between 1/1/12 and 2/28/15 (3.2 years) for Pineview between Bluff and Shop shows that there were 7 reported crashes with run-off-road collisions being the most common.

Pineview between Shop Rd. and Garners Ferry Rd.

- Existing conditions is a LOS D\E for AM\PM both for the current year and year 2041. Widening this section to 5 lanes will bring the LOS to A\B in the AM\PM for year 2041.
- Crash Data between 1/1/12 and 2/28/15 (3.2 years) for Pineview between Shop and Garners Ferry shows that there were 54 reported crashes with rear-end collisions being the most common.

Public Input Results

- The majority of the public comments from the first public meeting were against widening Pineview between Bluff and Shop Roads. This widening would eliminate all of the parking for the Pine Bluff Baptist Church; however, the majority of these parking spaces are in the current road ROW. The comments for and against bike lanes\sidewalks were evenly split.
- The majority of the comments received at the second public meeting did not specifically mention the widening but were supportive of bike lanes. There were also several requests to include a traffic light at the intersection of Pineview and American Italian Way.

Right-Of-Way ROW Obtained To Date – 0 Expended To Date - \$0

Possible Design Modifications To Lower Cost

1. According to SCDOT, Pineview between Bluff and Shop was resurfaced in 2015 so it would not need resurfacing at this time. Due to the construction of the Shop Road Extension, it is anticipated that traffic along Pineview between Shop and Garners Ferry will most likely decrease, which would improve the future LOS. This section of road was resurfaced over 10 years ago. Most of the development along this road is light industrial\commercial so pedestrian and bicycle accommodations are not recommended. It is recommended to widen Pineview between Shop and Garners Ferry to a 3 lane, which would improve safety and address rear-end collisions.

New Approx. Estimate: \$8M (Approx. Savings is \$31.9M)

BULL\ELMWOOD INTERSECTION

Original Project Scope – Construct an additional lane on the southside of Elmwood Avenue beginning at Marion Street and ending at the Bull Street Intersection to provide eight lanes and a raised concrete median. The existing southbound right-turn lane from Bull Street to Elmwood Avenue is proposed to be converted to a channelized free-flow movement. Bull Street is proposed to be restriped to add an additional northbound through lane and remove the southbound dedicated right turn onto Calhoun Street. The leg of Elmwood Avenue that is used as the entrance to the old Department of Mental Health Facility will retain the existing lane configurations.

Referendum Funding: \$2,000,000 **Current Cost Estimate:** \$3,798,911.02

Traffic Analysis And Results – The traffic study performed at this intersection was part of an overall study to evaluate traffic related to the BullStreet mixed-use development.

At the time of the traffic analysis in 2016, this intersection functioned at a LOS of D in the AM peak and LOS of F in the PM peak.

Once the development is completed, the intersection is expected to function at LOS of E in the AM and F in the PM. The proposed scope of work will improve these levels back to a D in the AM and a D in the PM.

Crash Data between 2015 and 2017 (3 years) shows that there were 73 reported crashes at this intersection with sideswipe collisions being the most common.

Public Input Results - No public input information was found for this project.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 5 permissions, 3 parcels Expended To Date - \$222,535 (Est.)

Possible Design Modifications To Lower Cost

There does not appear to be another cost-saving option for this project that would address capacity or safety issues.

CLEMSON\SPARKLEBERRY INTERSECTION

Original Project Scope – Improvements to the intersection of Clemson Rd. and Sparkleberry Ln. and surrounding area to increase intersection capacity. The initial design also included 10' SUPs on both sides of the roads leading up to the intersection.

Referendum Funding: \$5,100,000

Current Cost Estimate (Alt. 3): \$15,751,126.37 **Current Cost Estimate (Alt. 4):** \$12,780,946.12

Traffic Analysis And Results – The traffic analysis performed mainly looked at the LOS at the intersection of Clemson Rd. and Sparkleberry Ln., although any improvements made to this intersection will also affect the surrounding intersections. The existing LOS for the AM and PM peak hours is D/E, and the proposed 20-year LOS is F in the AM and the PM.

Based on the traffic analysis, the OET presented three intersection improvement alternates. The first two alternatives offered no real improvement to the capacity of the intersection. The third alternate keeps the 20-year LOS at a C. The cost estimate for this alternative, called a double crossover or diverging intersection, is roughly 3 times the referendum amount.

In 2019 the PDT performed an independent study to evaluate a fourth alternate called a modified quadrant. This alternative will provide a LOS of C\B for the AM\PM peak hour, and it brings the cost estimate of the project down to roughly 2.5 times the referendum amount.

Crash Data between 1/2011 and 12/2014 (4 years) shows that there were 69 reported crashes at this intersection with angle collisions being the most common.

Public Input Results – A public meeting was held in December 2015, and citizens were given the option to vote on Alternates 1, 2, or 3. Out of the 26 comments received, 20 selected alternate 3. A second public meeting was held in April 2018 to review updated plans for alternate 3.

There has not yet been a public meeting to unveil alternate 4 that was completed by the PDT in 2019.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 1 Expended To Date - \$3,229,910.40

Possible Design Modifications To Lower Cost

1. Remove SUPs and/or sidewalks along Sparkleberry Ln. and Sparkleberry Crossing from the design. There are no current sidewalks or SUPs along Sparkleberry in this area to tie any of these new features into. Proceed with the Alternate 4 design. **New Approx. Estimate: \$12.5M (Approx. savings is \$0.2M)**

Note: There does not appear to be another cost-saving option for this project that would address capacity or safety issues.

SCREAMING EAGLE/PERCIVAL INTERSECTION PROJECT

Original Project Scope

The proposed scope recommends realigning Screaming Eagle Road to bring the angle of the intersection closer to a right angle as well as widening Screaming Eagle Road to provide left and right turn lanes, which will improve capacity. Percival Road is also proposed be widened to provide a left turn lane onto Screaming Eagle Road. The project also includes installing a new traffic signal at the intersection.

Referendum Funding: \$1,000,000.00 **Current Cost Estimate:** \$3,105,147.46

Traffic Analysis & Results

The traffic results show that at the time of the study in 2016, 3 out of the 4 legs of this intersection were functioning at a Level of Service A and even if no work is performed at the intersection, these same 3 legs will continue to function at an A in year 2040. In 2016, the 4th leg was functioning at an LOS of D. This leg, is proposed to function at a C if the improvements are made in 2020, and will function at a D in year 2040.

Crash Data between 1/2013 and 3/31/16 (3.2 years) shows that there were 5 reported crashes at this intersection with run-off-road being the most common.

Public Input Result: No public meetings held for this intersection

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 2 parcels, 4 permissions Expended To Date - \$22,525.00

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. Instead of shifting this intersection and providing turning lanes in all directions, leave it in its current location and improve the current intersection by adding a turning lane to address the LOS at the 4th leg, which is the only one with capacity issues. Install the traffic signal as planned.

New Approx. Estimate: \$1.6M (Approx. savings is \$1.5M)

Note: This option will address the capacity issue now at the 4th leg of the intersection.

BLYTHEWOOD RD. AREA IMPROVEMENTS

Original Project Scope

- The project scope is for roadway improvements in the area of Blythewood Rd. specific to a prioritized listing provided by the Town of Blythewood. The referendum funding is only sufficient to cover the first two priorities.
 - Priority 1 – Widen\improve McNulty St. from Main St. to Blythewood Rd.
 - Priority 2 – Widen\extend\improve Creech Rd. from Blythewood Rd. to Main St.
 - Priority 3 – Widen\improve Blythewood Rd. from I-77 to Main St.
 - Priority 4 – Widen\improve Blythewood Rd. from Syrup Mill Rd. to Fulmer Rd.

Referendum Funding - \$21,000,000.00

Current Cost Estimate (for 1 and 2) - \$13,000,000

Traffic Analysis and Results

- McNulty St. – The intersections with Blythewood Rd, US 21, and Boney St. currently all have adequate LOSs (A\C). In the year 2040, the intersections with US 21 and Boney Rd will still be adequate (A\C), however, the intersection with Blythewood Rd. will have an LOS of F. It is proposed to install a traffic circle at McNulty\Boney to improve traffic flow.
- Crash Data between 1/1/14 – 12/31/17 (4 years)
 - **Intersections:** US 21\McNulty – 1 Blythewood\McNulty – 14 McNulty\Boney Rd - 1
 - **Road Section:** Blythewood to US 21 – 7
- Since Creech Rd. is currently a dead-end road that is proposed to be extended to US 21, there is no traffic data for it.

Public Input Results

- McNulty St - The public supports improvements to McNulty to update the existing varied road width to a standard width and to install sidewalks on both sides of the road. A significant number of citizens did not support a traffic circle at McNulty\Boney.
- Creech Rd – No public meeting held yet

Right-Of-Way

- To date, no new ROW has been obtained

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

- The Blythewood Area Improvements project includes 4 projects, ranked in priority by the Town of Blythewood. There will not be enough referendum funding to complete all 4 projects so only the first two projects are being moved forward. After completing the first two projects, there will be approximately \$8,000,000 remaining that would not be sufficient to fund either of the last two projects. If this funding were transferred to the Blythewood Rd. Widening project, it would be sufficient to cover the difference in the referendum and cost estimate amounts.
- The crash data indicates that the number of crashes in a 4-year period is low. This widening project would address **Capacity** issues.

Note: This option was discussed with the Town of Blythewood. It is not yet in writing.

HARDSCRABBLE RD. WIDENING

- SCDOT has managed the design and is currently managing the construction of this project. County funding is capped at \$29,860,800 in either a monetary amount to be paid to SCDOT or in-kind inspection services. To date, the County has provided \$28,117,086.

LEESBURG RD. WIDENING

- SCDOT is currently managing the design of this project and will manage the construction. County funding is capped at \$4,000,000 in a monetary amount to be paid to SCDOT. To date, SCDOT has not invoiced the County.

I-20\BROAD RIVER RD. INTERCHANGE

- SCDOT will manage the design and construction of this project. County funding is capped at \$52,500,000 in a monetary amount to be paid to SCDOT. To date, SCDOT has not invoiced the County.

DIRT ROAD PAVING PROGRAM

- \$45M was assigned to this program, and to date approximately \$17.4M has been expended.
- It is recommended that when this funding runs out, C Funds are requested to continue with the program.

RESURFACING PROGRAM

- \$40M was assigned to this program, and to date approximately \$26.6M has been expended.
- It is recommended that when this funding runs out, C Funds are requested to continue with the program.

GARNERS FERRY RD\HARMON RD. INTERSECTION PROJECT

Original Project Scope

The proposed scope is to install a dedicated right turn lane from Garners Ferry Rd. onto Harmon Rd. and to install dedicated left and right turning lanes from Harmon Rd. onto Garners Ferry Rd. A new traffic signal will also be installed as part of the project.

Referendum Funding - \$2,600,000

Current Cost Estimate - \$1,583,877.81

Traffic Analysis and Results

- Garners Ferry Rd. – The existing LOS for both eastbound and westbound are C in the AM and B in the PM.
 - If no work is performed, the 2040 AM LOS will be C eastbound and E westbound and 2040 PM LOS will be C for eastbound and westbound.
 - After completing this project, the anticipated 2040 AM LOS will be C eastbound and D westbound; the anticipated 2040 PM LOS will be B in both directions.
- Harmon Rd. – The existing AM LOS northbound is D and southbound is F; the existing PM LOS northbound is D and southbound is E.
 - If no work is performed, the 2040 AM LOS will be E northbound and F southbound, and the 2040 PM LOS will be D northbound and F southbound.
 - After completing this project, the anticipated 2040 AM LOS will be E northbound and F southbound; the anticipated 2040 PM LOS will be E in both directions.
- Crash Data between 1/1/13 – 3/31/16 (3 years) shows that there have been 41 crashes in this timeframe at this intersection with the majority being rear-end collisions. None of these crashes occurred on Harmon Rd. and only two appear to be related to traffic turning right from Garners Ferry to Harmon.

Public Input Results - No public meetings held to date for this project.

Right-Of-Way

- ROW Obtained To Date – 4 parcels
- Expended To Date - \$69,663

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. Overall, the proposed scope does not drastically improve safety or capacity at this intersection.
 - a. Option 1 – Only install the Garners Ferry Rd. right turn lane **New Est. \$1.04M (Approx. Savings \$0.54M)**
 - b. Option 2 – Only install the Harmon Rd. turning lanes **New Est. \$1.31M (Approx. Savings \$0.27M)**
 - c. Option 3 – Do not complete the project at this time but proceed with a more detailed traffic study in order to come up with better solutions. One possible future solution could be to widen a portion of Harmon Rd. It is recommended to only perform a detailed traffic study at this time. **Study Estimate \$50,000 (Approx. Savings \$1.53M)**
 - d. Option 4 – Complete the entire project **No Savings**

SHOP RD. EXTENSION PH. 2 PROJECT

Original Project Scope

The proposed scope recommends extending Shop Road from its Phase 1 terminus at Longwood Rd., east and northeasterly to its future terminus at the intersection of Garners Ferry Road\Trotter Rd\Old Hopkins Rd. This new road will consist of a two-lane road with four-foot shoulder and ditch section. Four alternates for the new road have been presented, and Council approved to proceed with Alternate 4.

Referendum Funding - \$71,800,000 for Phases 1 and 2

Current Cost Estimate - \$40,112,787.51

Approximately \$33M has been spent to date, leaving approximately \$38.8M for Phase 2. The Economic Development Department will reimburse \$3.5M for Phase 1, which will bring the total for Phase 2 up to \$42.3M.

Traffic Analysis and Results

- Traffic analysis was performed along existing Montgomery Lane, which intersects with Lykesland Trail and Pinchusion Rd and then terminates at Old Hopkins Rd. Old Hopkins, which intersects Air Base Rd., Lykesland Trail, and Old Garners Ferry Rd., then conveys traffic to Garners Ferry Rd.
 - Currently all of these intersections function at an LOS of A, B or C except for the intersection of Old Hopkins and Garners Ferry, which functions at levels B, C, D, E and F.
- The design year 2043 was only evaluated for the proposed alternates 1 and 2, which do not have the same intersections that were evaluated for existing conditions; therefore, comparing existing to future is not possible.
- Crash Data between 1/2015 – 12/2017 (3 years) along Old Hopkins Rd. shows that there have been 75 crashes, most being listed as Rear-End Collisions and Not Collision With Motor Vehicle. The intersection of Old Hopkins and Garners Ferry\Old Garners Ferry had the highest number of collisions, accounting for 42 of the 75.

Public Input Results

Public comments from the December 6th, 2018 reflect that Alternate 2 is the least favored. Alternates 3 and 4 seemed to have the most support.

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. Proceed with Alternate 4 with no cost savings.
2. Proceed with Alternate 4 from Shop Rd. Ext. Ph. 1 to Montgomery Ln. and then allow traffic to continue on Montgomery. Also, perform any needed intersection improvements along Montgomery\Old Hopkins, and add improve safety at existing railroad crossing. This will eliminate the need for a new railroad crossing, extra wetlands disturbance, and extra ROW acquisition. **New Approx. Estimate: \$27M (Approx. Savings \$13.1M)**

INNOVISTA PH. 3 PROJECT

Original Project Scope

This project, also known as the Williams Street Extension, consists of constructing a new roadway from Blossom Street to Gervais Street, approximately (2,650') and also completing a section of Senate Street from the new roadway to the west.

Referendum Funding - \$50,000,000 for 3 phases **Current Cost Estimate** – \$23,907,450

This cost estimate was provided by the City of Columbia in 2014. There is no record of an estimate from the former PDT. Greene St. phases 1 and 2 accounts for approximately \$17.9M and \$26.4M leaving only \$5.7M to complete phase 3.

Traffic Analysis and Results – None performed

Public Input Results - No public meetings held to date for this project

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. Because the cost estimate is approximately four times the amount remaining for this phase, and because this project does not address safety or capacity issues, it is recommended to not proceed with phase 3. **Savings \$5.7M**

KELLY MILL ROAD PROJECT

Original Project Scope

This project falls within the Special category and is listed as starting at the intersection of Hardscrabble Rd. and ending just past the entrance to Lake Carolina Elementary School. There are no further details on the exact scope of this project.

Referendum Funding - \$4,500,000

Current Cost Estimate – None – Assume referendum amount

Traffic Analysis and Results – None performed. A traffic analysis would provide the means to define a scope of work for this project.

Public Input Results - No public meetings held to date for this project

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. It is recommended to proceed with a traffic study to determine what, if any, work should be performed at this location and to create an Engineer's cost estimate for construction.

COMMERCE DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Original Project Scope

This project consists of relocating a portion of the Commerce Drive alignment to allow for a future extension of Runway 13 at the Owens Field Airport. It is also the intent to have this road be a gateway road leading from the airport to Rosewood Drive, with curb, gutter, planted median, sidewalks and lighting. There are potential economic development impacts related to airport expansion.

Referendum Funding - \$5,000,000

Current Cost Estimate – None – Assume referendum amount.

Traffic Analysis and Results – None performed

Public Input Results - No public meetings held to date for this project

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. This project does not address safety or capacity but has the potential to assist with economic growth in the area with the runway extension allowing for larger aircraft to land at the airport. Because Council approved in 2019 to remove landscaped medians and lighting from projects, these items will be removed from this project.

BROAD RIVER ROAD CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Original Project Scope

The concept phase of this project has been completed, and the recommended scope of work has been approved by Council. The scope includes making intersection improvements at Broad River\St Andrews, Broad River\Bush River, and Broad Rive\Greystone. The original scope also recommended landscaped medians, street lighting, and mast arms, all of which Council has since approved to remove from further projects. The final recommendation was to underground utilities; however, this option is being removed because it does not qualify for funding under DOR guidelines.

Referendum Funding - \$63,000,000 for all NIPs

Current Cost Estimate – \$21,818,057

Traffic Analysis and Results – None performed to date

Public Input Results

- The biggest concern voiced was over the possibility of raised concrete medians. Most citizens who provided comments supported flush medians.
- Some citizens requested bike lanes and new signalization at different intersections.
- A few comments requested resurfacing to be performed.

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. The removal of the landscaped medians, street lighting, mast arms, and the undergrounding of utilities will reduce the cost of this project. It is recommended to move forward with a traffic study to determine a detailed scope of work that needs to be included at each intersection. **New Approx. Estimate: \$14.2M (Approx. Savings \$7.6M)**

CRANE CREEK IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Original Project Scope

The original scope of this project includes new sidewalk along Blue Ridge Terrace, Heyward Brockington Rd., Crane Church Rd., Dakota Dr., Seagull Ln., Roberson St., and Lincolnshire North Drive. It also includes landscaped medians and streetscaping along Blue Ridge Terrace, Heyward Brockington, Crane Church and portions Monticello Rd. Because Council approved in 2019 to remove landscaping from future projects, landscaping and streetscaping will not be completed for this project.

Referendum Funding - \$63,000,000 for all NIPs **Current Cost Estimate** – \$14,385,000

Traffic Analysis and Results – None performed to date

Public Input Results

- There was general support for the sidewalks
- Some citizens requested lighting and sidewalks along additional roads in the community

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. The removal of the landscaping and streetscaping will reduce the cost of this project. It is recommended to move forward with only the sidewalk work. **New Approx. Estimate: \$8M (Approx. Savings \$6.3M)**

DECKER\WOODFIELD PARK IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Original Project Scope

This project consists of two phases. Phase 1 proposes sidewalks along Brookfield Rd., Faraway Dr., and the Chatsworth Pedestrian Connector. Phase 2 proposes streetscaping and intersection improvements along a portion of Decker Blvd. Because Council approved in 2019 to remove landscaping from future projects, streetscaping will not be completed for this project.

Referendum Funding - \$63,000,000 for all NIPs **Current Cost Estimate** – \$13,156,740.93

Traffic Analysis and Results

- A traffic study was performed at the intersections of Decker Blvd. with Trenholm Rd., Dent Middle School, Oneil Ct, Joye Cir., Decker Park Rd., and Brookfield Rd.
- The only intersections that are not currently and will not in the design year 2028, function at an adequate LOS are Oneil Ct. and Joye Cir.
- Crash Data between 1/2015 – 3/2018 (3.25 years) shows that there were 175 crashes along Decker Blvd. between Trenholm Rd. and Brookfield Rd. with the majority being angle and rear-end collisions.
- 1 fatality

Public Input Results (2 meetings held)

- The comments showed about the same support and non-support of landscaped medians and burying power lines.
- Some comments requested additional sidewalks on other roads, especially Percival Rd. Percival Rd. will have sidewalks installed on it under a separate project.
- Some comments requested additional street lighting.
- Some comments received at one of the meetings were against the proposed Columbia Mall Greenway.

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. The removal of the landscaping and streetscaping will reduce the cost of this project. It is recommended to move forward with only the sidewalk and intersection improvement work. **New Approx. Estimate: \$8M (Approx. Savings \$6.3M)**

TRENHOLM ACRES/NEWCASTLE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Original Project Scope

The scope of this project includes new sidewalks along Claudia Dr., Humphrey Dr., Nancy Ave., Shakespeare Rd., Sprott St., Warner Dr., and Westmore Dr. It also includes streetscaping along Fontaine Rd., Parklane Rd., and Two Notch Rd. Because Council approved in 2019 to remove landscaping from future projects, streetscaping will not be completed for this project.

Referendum Funding - \$63,000,000 for all NIPs

Current Cost Estimate – \$5,390,658.00

Traffic Analysis and Results – None performed to date

Public Input Results

- There was general support for the new sidewalks; however, a lot of comments requested even more sidewalks on additional roads.
- There was not a lot of support for the landscaped medians/streetscaping.

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. The removal of the landscaping and streetscaping will reduce the cost of this project. It is recommended to move forward with the sidewalk work. **New Approx. Estimate: \$4.9M (Approx. Savings \$0.4M)**

BIKEWAYS

Original Project Scope

The scope of this project includes 87 bikeway projects along various sections of roadways throughout the County. These projects were broken down into categories of Restriping, Road Diets, Sharrows, and Shared Use Paths. Because Council approved in 2019 to remove SUPs from future projects, SUPs will not be completed for this project.

Referendum Funding - \$22,008,773 **Current Cost Estimate** – none – assume referendum amount

Traffic Analysis and Results – None performed to date

Public Input Results - No public meetings held to date for this project

Right-Of-Way - No ROW has been obtained at this time.

Possible Design Modifications to Lower Cost

1. Remove any SUP projects.
2. The Columbiana Dr. road diet was denied by SCDOT.
3. Twelve restriping projects were denied by SCDOT due to design restrictions.

The removal of these items will greatly reduce the cost estimate for the bikeway program. Because a cost estimate has not yet been performed on this category, it is unknown at this time how much the estimate will be reduced.

LEVELS OF SERVICE

for Multi-Lane Highways

Level of Service	Flow Conditions	Operating Speed (mph)	Technical Descriptions
A		60	Highest level of service. Traffic flows freely with little or no restrictions on maneuverability. No delays
B		60	Traffic flows freely, but drivers have slightly less freedom to maneuver. No delays
C		60	Density becomes noticeable with ability to maneuver limited by other vehicles. Minimal delays
D		57	Speed and ability to maneuver is severely restricted by increasing density of vehicles. Minimal delays
E		55	Unstable traffic flow. Speeds vary greatly and are unpredictable. Minimal delays
F		<55	Traffic flow is unstable, with brief periods of movement followed by forced stops. Significant delays



Agenda Briefing

To: Chair of the Committee and the Honorable Members of the Committee
Prepared by: Michael A. Niermeier, Director
Department: Richland County Transportation
Date Prepared: April 3, 2020 **Meeting Date:** April 28, 2020

Legal Review	N/A	Date:	
Budget Review	N/A	Date:	
Finance Review	N/A	Date:	
Other Review:	N/A	Date:	
Approved for Council consideration:		Assistant County Administrator	John Thompson, Ph. D

Committee

Subject: Greene Street Phase II Geotech-Material Testing Contract

Background Information:

Richland County currently has three vendors on its On-Call Geotech-Materials Testing list. Solicitation RC-331-P-2020 was advertised specifically to these three vendors in order to procure geotechnical and material testing services for the Innovista Phase II/Greene Street Phase II project. Two out of the three vendors responded to the solicitation. The ranking of the two vendors is listed below.

1. S&ME
2. F&ME

Recommended Action:

Recommend award to the highest ranked offeror, S&ME for \$222,072.00 and a 10% contingency of \$22,072 to provide for potential, unexpected costs.

Motion Requested:

Move to approve the Recommended Action.

Request for Council Reconsideration: No

Fiscal Impact: None

Motion of Origin: This request did not result from a Council motion.

Council Member	N/A
Meeting	N/A
Date	N/A

Discussion:

Attachments:



Agenda Briefing

To: Chair of the Committee and the Honorable Members of the Committee
Prepared by: Michael A. Niermeier, Director
Department: Richland County Transportation
Date Prepared: April 3, 2020 **Meeting Date:** April 28, 2020

Legal Review	N/A	Date:	
Budget Review	N/A	Date:	
Finance Review	N/A	Date:	
Other Review:	N/A	Date:	
Approved for Council consideration:	Assistant County Administrator	John Thompson, Ph. D	

Committee Subject: Innovista – Greene St. Ph. II CEI Services Contract Approval

Background Information:

Richland County currently has eight (8) vendors on its On-Call Construction, Engineering & Inspection (CE&I) list. Solicitation RC-314-P-2020, CE&I for the Innovista – Greene St. Ph. II Project was advertised on Bid Express to these eight vendors. There were six (6) respondents that are listed alphabetically below.

1. Brownstone
2. Civil Engineering Consulting Services
3. Mead & Hunt
4. Neel-Shaffer, Inc.
5. Michael Baker Intl.
6. Parrish & Partners

Recommended Action:

At the April 21, 2020 Council Meeting, Council expressed its wishes to not award contracts to qualified vendors who are in current litigation with Richland County.

Subsequent to this decision by Council, the recommendation is to award the Innovista – Greene St. Ph. II Project, CE&I services to, Parish and Partners, LLC in the amount, not to exceed \$1,034,902.71. Additionally, recommend to approve a contingency amount of \$98,828.68 for authorized overtime.

Motion Requested:

Move to approve the Recommended Action.

Request for Council Reconsideration: Yes

Fiscal Impact: None

Motion of Origin:

Council Member	N/A
Meeting	N/A
Date	N/A

Discussion:

Attachments:

Motion of Origin:

This request did not result from a Council motion.

Council Member	N/A
Meeting	N/A
Date	N/A

Discussion:

Attachments: