

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL SOUTH CAROLINA



Council Members Present

Paul Livingston, Chair
District Four

Bill Malinowski
District One

Seth Rose
District Five

Jim Manning
District Eight

Others Present:

Torrey Rush
Norman Jackson
Rob Perry
Chris Gossett
Shawn Salley
Tony Edwards
Tony McDonald
Roxanne Ancheta
Larry Smith
Kristen Hutto
Tracy Hegler
Ashley Powell
Quinton Epps
Michelle Onley

TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE

March 10, 2016
12:00 PM
Admin Conference Room

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 12:03 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 23, 2016 – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Perry stated Item 5(d): “North Main Widening Project – Right of Way acquisition” is eligible for Executive Session and outside counsel is here for the item.

The agenda was adopted unanimously.

The Committee went into Executive Session at approximately 12:04 p.m. and came out at approximately 12:08 p.m.

BLUFF ROAD WIDENING PHASE I: SUPPLEMENTAL IGA WITH SCDOT

Mr. Perry stated on any SCDOT road where funding is being provided to the County there has to be a supplemental agreement. This project has \$1 million in federal funding and the agreement sets forth the process of how the funding is accessed.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

NORTH MAIN STREET WIDENING PROJECT

Mr. Perry stated there are three (3) agreements the County needs to enter into before this project can be bid. This project has \$11.3 million in federal funding.

- a. **Four Party Railroad Agreement** – The parties to the agreement are: the County, the City of Columbia, SCDOT, and CSX Railroad. The agreement allows the County to access the railroad property to make improvements to North Main Street under

the overhead railroad trestle, to pay for the review of plans and flagmen during construction.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Malinowski requested that a pre-assessment be completed on the project.

- b. Supplemental IGA with SCDOT** – There is \$11.3 million in federal funds available (\$10 million – TIGER Grants; \$1.3 million – outstanding federal earmarks). The agreement sets forth how the funds are accessed.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. IGA with City of Columbia** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.
- d. Right of Way Acquisition** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve as discussed in Executive Session. The vote in favor was unanimous.

PUBLIC INPUT AND RECOMMENDED FUTURE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

- a. 2016 Bikeway Projects: Recommendation** – Mr. Perry stated a public information meeting was held to receive input on the 17 proposed bikeways. The SCDOT is not amenable to having bike lanes on Gervais Street because of the high traffic volumes. The recommendation is to determine an alternate route.

Staff's recommendation is to forward this recommendation to TPAC for review. If they are in agreement the recommendation will be forwarded to Council.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve staff's recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about what happens to the public input from the public outreach meetings. He further inquired why there was only one meeting held for all of the projects.

Mr. Perry stated this is the way the public input had been handled in the past. He further stated that typically there is not a public meeting held at this stage with regards to bikeways and/or sidewalk projects. In the future, if Council desires they could conduct cluster meetings.

The plan for Ott Rd. is to place signage and pavement markings to "Share the Lane."

Mr. Perry stated he would love to see the County partner with the CTC or SCDOT to do more bikeways.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to support staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. 2016 Sidewalk Projects: Recommendation** – Mr. Perry stated a public information meeting was held to receive input on the 11 proposed sidewalks. The recommendation is to revise/remove seven (7) of the proposed sidewalks.

Staff's recommendation is to forward this recommendation to TPAC for review.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Gills Creek Greenway Section A Project: Status** – Mr. Perry stated a public hearing was held for the Gills Creek Greenway and had an overwhelming turnout.

Mr. David Beatty stated the public meeting was held February 11th. There were 321 attendees at the meeting and about 225 comments were been received. Approximately ½ of the citizens support moving forward with the project. Most of the opposition came from the Hampton neighborhoods to the east of Gills Creek.

The plan is to reach out to the west side of the Gills Creek by conducting informal public outreach and contact community leaders. At that time, the input will be summarized and request Mr. Pearce's advice. The recommendation regarding this project will then be brought back to the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee.

COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CTIP)

Mr. Perry stated approximately a year ago County Council approved the County Transportation Improvement Program (CTIP), which ran through 2019. Each year the CTIP will be updated to add an additional year.

If a project is proposed to be amended/alterd/changed prior to the CTIP being updated, those proposals would come back to Council.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

FY2016 TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAM: POTENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. Perry stated the County applied for two (2) projects: Clemson Road and Bluff Road. No one in South Carolina was awarded any of the 2015 TIGER Grant funds.

Staff recommends applying for 2016 TIGER Grant funds for two (2) neighborhood improvement projects.

Ms. Hegler stated the Decker Boulevard and Broad River Road Master Plans have transportation related recommendations. For both of the projects there is a penny allocation, but the allocation does not include the complete corridor or all of the recommendations of the master plans.

The deadline for application is April 29th and staff is requesting to place these two (2) projects on the Council agenda for approval to move forward with submitting the applications.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

MOTION FORWARDED TO COMMITTEE FROM COUNCIL: JACKSON

- a. **I move that Richland County Council do an immediate assessment of the PDT contract, the role and placement of the SLBE office, the role and placement of the OSBO office, and the role of the TPAC, as well as, a thirty day hold on any transaction/payment to the Transportation Penny Program. Note: I have concerns and have no idea how the taxpayer dollars are being spent. Staff is not giving adequate information and jobs performed were to be done by the OSBO/SLBE department. That department was to be fully staffed and is totally ignored by Council's directive.**

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to divide the question.

(1) I move that Richland County Council do an immediate assessment of the PDT contract, the role and placement of the SLBE office, the role and placement of the OSBO office, and the role of the TPAC.

(2) A thirty-day hold on any transaction/payment to the Transportation Penny Program.

Mr. Jackson stated this motion was in response to the DOR assessment. He is requesting confirmation on the role of the SLBE/OSBO Office. It was his understanding the SLBE/OSBO was to serve as a "watchdog" for Administration. It his belief that if the SLBE/OSBO Office had been properly staffed the "frivolous" spending reported by the media would not have happened.

The vote in favor was unanimous to divide the question.

Mr. Malinowski stated the first part of the question has been forwarded to TPAC for consideration.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to accept the first part of the question as information.

Mr. Jackson stated the motion was to assess the TPAC and the SLBE/OSBO Office. The TPAC Committee cannot provide an assessment of the SLBE/OSBO Office. The assessment of the SLBE/Office would have to come from the County Administrator.

Mr. Malinowski inquired of Mr. Perry if there is a place where the Transportation Penny funding that has been spent is listed.

Mr. McDonald stated the role of the SLBE/OSBO Program was to be a "watchdog" with respect to businesses that are entering or applying to the program to determine (1) their eligibility to participate as a SLBE and (2) to monitor that function as they continue through the program. Once the business has reached a certain level of activity they will graduate out of the SLBE program.

It was not staff's understanding that the SLBE/OSBO Office would be a "watchdog" for the entire Transportation Penny Program.

Mr. Perry stated the SLBE/OSBO Office sets the goals on the individual projects.

Mr. Jackson stated the Mentor Protégé Program was supposed to be conducted by the SLBE/OSBO Office and not the PDT.

Mr. Perry stated he could not speak to what is contained in the PDT's subcontract(s), but whatever is contained in the subcontract(s) does not back into whether the SLBE/OBSO Office is doing a Mentor Protégé Program.

Mr. Perry stated there is no County mentor protégé program. Any training that was approved for the PDT to educate the subs so they are able to provide their services was not a part of the County's proposed mentor protégé program.

Mr. Malinowski withdrew his motion.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to direct staff to provide a response to Council regarding the first part of the question.

Mr. Manning inquired if a financial and program audits were conducted would it cover the first part of Mr. Jackson's motion.

Mr. McDonald stated it is his belief that the audits would cover the assessments of the TPAC, the SLBE/OSBO Office and the PDT.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Rose inquired about what the impact of the second part of Mr. Jackson's motion would be to the Transportation Penny Program.

Mr. Perry stated payments to contractors are reimbursements; therefore, it is for work that has been completed. It would likely effect the prompt payment of the SLBE subs. There could also be legal ramifications if the contractors are not paid for the work they have done on behalf of the County.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to deny the second part of the motion. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. McDonald stated for the record a report is sent out bi-weekly to Council that includes Transportation Penny Program activity, as well as, SLBE/OSBO activity with respect to the certifications of the businesses. In addition, the PDT and Transportation Department send out a monthly comprehensive report of the program.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:59 PM

The Minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley, Deputy Clerk of Council