



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
May 31, 2018 – 1:30 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

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

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Dalhi Myers

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Tony Edwards, Nathaniel Miller, John Thompson, Trenia Bowers, and Quinton Epps

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. C. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:33 PM
2. **Approval of the Minutes**
 - a. May 10, 2018 – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by M. N. Jackson, to approve the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **Widening Memorandum** – Dr. Thompson stated this item was discussed at the last ad hoc meeting. It is being brought back before you at the request of Councilwoman Myers. She has requested a study of a Shared Use Path for Bluff Road and Pineview Road, as well as repaving the road.

Ms. Myers stated, to the extent, that we are looking at the widening category, and eliminating the widening for Pineview, Bluff Road Phase 2 and a portion of Spears Creek Church Road. Her concern was how we got to the conclusion that was the best way to get to where we needed to be with the Penny. She raised these questions in the meeting, as to who it was that had come up with this as a way forward. Mr. Beaty was good enough to tell her it was him and his team. Her concern was, have we gotten clarity from SCDOT and the CMCOG as to the assumption we have made on the new direction. The answer was, “Yes, but”, so she went and talked to the CMCOG and SCDOT to get an understanding of what they understood. The CMCOG’s analysis is based on all these projects being done, not some of them not being done. They even analyzed the Pineview traffic based on all the roadway projects, as stated being done. That is different from us modifying, and not widening Pineview, and not completing the widening for Bluff Road Phase 2. In the meeting, we discussed rather than widening Bluff Road, on Phase 2, we could resurface and add Shared Use Paths. And, do the same thing on Pineview. Look to the Procurement Department, and discuss, buying in bulk asphalt and concrete, comparable to SCDOT, rather than waiting year to year as the prices go up and up. She now has an answer back on what the SCDOT has in their annual resurfacing budget, which is between \$50 - \$200 million annually. She was concerned with scrapping the projects, in their entirety,

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
May 31, 2018**

without any public input, and without an analysis from SCDOT, as the roads specialist. They have said they would never do an analysis 23 years out. A 23-year analysis that says the traffic on Pineview will be less than what it is today is not an analysis that would come out of SCDOT. Their analysis is e more in the 3 to 5-year category, and would be based exclusively on roadway projects underway and current traffic patterns. She was concerned with some of the underpinning of where we are, as well as the fact that the suggestion came exclusively from a committee of the PDT, rather than any input from the experts. Her concerns were, obviously, that we look at alternative means, and making sure we do fulfill our referendum obligations. Obviously, if you do not need a widening, there is no need to do it, but if the need, or lack thereof, for that widening comes from an analysis that has some flaws in it, we need to look at it too.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he knows when the PDT made the recommendations they took into account the Shop Road Extension to come to the Air Base Road area. Also, he is not sure where it is on the STIP, or where the funding is for that. Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to the level of service of Pineview and the projected traffic level of service. If it is B or C, then they have a good point. He is not sure what was the projected level of service, and when that road would be built. He is not sure where the Highway Transportation Bill is. He has been hearing people in Congress saying they are pushing for it, and it is supposed to be done but he is not sure where it is.

Mr. Beaty stated he does not have the level of service at the tip of his tongue, but the Coates model does include all of the projects being constructed, as Ms. Myers said. Under that scenario, with Pineview widening, Shop Extension built all the way out to Garners Ferry, and all of the Penny projects constructed, Pineview Road, between Shop and Garners Ferry, where there is more traffic, the current traffic is 16,700. If everything were built, 20 years in the future, the traffic would decrease to 16,000. He stated he will defer to Councilman N. Jackson, but 16,000 – 17,000 on a 5-lane road is probably a level service “B”. Even on a 2 and 3-lane road it is probably a “C”. In fairness to Ms. Myers, he just sent her an email with some additional information, which she obviously has not had a chance to look at. He provided some research, and it is not fully complete, but he wants to have a conversation with Ms. Myers and Dr. Thompson. He stated they have looked into buying in bulk, and the pros and cons. As a part of that email, he got, from the SCDOT, when they would resurface Bluff Road. They predicted it would be 5 to 7 years before they resurfaced Bluff Road, and the same thing for Pineview. From Shop Road to Garners Ferry Road would be 5 to 7 years, and from Bluff Road to Shop Road would be 6 to 8 years.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired, in the scope of the overall Penny project prioritization listing, where do these projects fall on that list.

Mr. Beaty stated the prioritization had them in the middle.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if that would be in the next 3 – 5 years, 5 – 7 years...

Mr. Beaty stated the Pineview plans have been developed. It is taking about 2 years of development to get them to the point where we could start buying the right-of-way. That would take about a year/year and a half. If we continue with Pineview, it could not go to construction for a year and a half. Bluff is pretty much in the exact same spot. If Bluff were to continue, we are at the right-of-way stage now where we could begin paying right-of-way. That would also take about a year and a half, maybe 2 years. There are some more permitting requirements.

Mr. Livingston stated he is trying to understand the resurfacing and shared used pathways. What is the projected costs for Pineview and Bluff, as opposed to what is in the referendum?

Mr. Beaty stated he is fairly confident the construction costs of each, Bluff Phase 2 and Pineview, are both

right at \$40 million each. The costs in the referendum was approximately \$17 - \$18 million.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the Bluff Phase 2 was \$16.7 million and Pineview was \$18.2 million.

Mr. Beaty stated the Bluff Road number included Phases 1 and 2.

Mr. Livingston stated we do not have enough money to complete those, based on the referendum. Those are not the only ones. There are other ones too.

Mr. Beaty stated that is correct. That does apply to most of the widenings.

Mr. Livingston stated he actually likes, if he's hearing what Ms. Myers is saying. If you cannot do them all, if we can do some resurfacing and shared use that may be compromise, if we have enough money to do it. Are we looking at what that would cost?

Mr. Beaty stated, at Ms. Myers' suggestion, they did a preliminary cost estimate, and he has asked the On-Calls to back check their number. They can build shared use paths on Bluff Road Phase 2, on both sides, for approximately \$4 million. On Pineview, if we built it on one side, it would be approximately \$2.5 million. To resurface each was less than \$2 million.

Ms. Myers stated when they had their meeting, the piece the community wanted was the shared use paths, and certainly resurfacing, because what you have now with one part of Bluff being done by the stadium and the other half needing resurfacing. So, making the road, an integrated road, so that it has all gotten resurfaced, at the same time, and adding the shared use paths all the way down, that makes the communities more livable, is a good trade off, if we are running out of money. She is not backing away from that. She thinks it is great for the community, and it creates an alternate bath for bikers, and gets them off the road and keeps the traffic moving. We agreed the same thing would be great for Pineview, and the numbers that were brought back were excellent. The only outstanding issue is with the addition of the Jushi plant, which SCDOT is saying is a factor that was not in their earlier analysis, you have on the backside of Shop Road, Longwood Road, which was never in any plan. If you do not widen Pineview, you have forced more traffic onto Longwood, which leads back to Garners Ferry. That road is dead center in the Millcreek Community. They have, even now, gotten more truck traffic, so she was also asking them to look at maybe "CTIP" funding, or other funding, to add some safety measures to Longwood, so that community does not get dumped onto with a bunch of 18-wheeler traffic from Jushi leading out to Garners Ferry. She thinks those compromises would be great. If that is where we are with the funding, she would happy to discuss it with the community.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the reason we delayed this, last Council meeting, was to allow the opportunity to have the conversation Ms. Myers has had with the PDT, as well as, from that conversation a conversation with the community. He thinks it is appropriate to move towards that. Obviously, that will not happen before this coming Tuesday's Council meeting.

Ms. Myers stated she has a scheduled meeting with them on Saturday.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the shared use pathway in the residual area, that's great. He would hate to see a shared use pathway in an industrial area where it is seldom, or not really used. On Bluff Road, when USC has events it is used. Pineview is more of a commercial corridor, and to put a shared use pathway where there are only industries. He has seen sidewalks in some areas that grass grows over it, and it is not used. He wants to make sure when you put shared use pathways or sidewalks, it is there to be used, and not just here because we are doing the widening. As for Longwood Road, we just had a meeting the other night

about trucks going through neighborhoods, and we could prevent no through trucks in that neighborhood also. The condition of the turning is more of a headache for tractor trailers to use.

Ms. Myers stated she thinks they would love it if there were posted signs that made it illegal for those trucks to go through their neighborhood. If that is the fix this committee recommends, and we get it marshalled through, she thinks they would love it and its low cost. As to the shared use path on Pineview, there is some concern with the residents, who are there, with the level of traffic, even now.

Mr. N. Jackson stated back to Bluff he can understand, but not from Shop to Garners Ferry.

Mr. Livingston stated one of the reasons he was okay with Pineview is because Mr. Beaty stated the shared use path would only be on one side.

Ms. Myers stated, even on one side, that makes Pineview a lot safer than it would be. One side is absolutely fine, and the costs is something that could be accommodated within the budget, so long as the communities understand the modifications going forward. And, we make them aware this is not selling them out, but is providing a reasonable fix that gets the program in a space where everybody is moving on the same track, at the same time.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the conversation we had last time, that dealt with the no through trucks signage, also had attached to it enforcement as well. The signs, in and of themselves, would probably not be sufficient. He does not want us to lose that piece of it when we say the signage is good because part of the conversation was to include the enforcement.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to move forward with proposal, to include the shared use pathways for Pineview Road and Bluff Road, and also look at adding safety measures on Longwood Road. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if there is any additional information regarding the STIP. Are we pursuing that?

Mr. Beaty stated he reached out to the CMCOG and has not gotten a response back. At one point, there was an earmark, that Mr. N. Jackson referenced, for Shop Road. He does not know what has happened to that earmark, so he has inquired, with the CMCOG.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, usually, if it is in the STIP, it is supposed to stay there unless there is a recommendation to take it out. As we built Phase 1, it was still in the STIP. That money is supposed to come back to the Penny Tax Program.

Ms. Myers stated we also talked in the meeting about savings from bulk purchases through our Procurement team. She wanted to follow-up to see if the Transportation Department had been supplied with any number on how much actual asphalt and concrete we purchased for the program last year, so they would have some numbers to run to see if that is worth the effort.

Mr. Beaty stated they just got finished compiling all that information, and it was provided to Ms. Myers and Dr. Thompson this morning.

Dr. Thompson stated Clemson Road is a good project to figure out the costs, as we move forward, and to also trend the costs in prior years.

5. **County Letter to SCDOT Regarding the \$52.5 million for the I-20/Broad River Interchange** – Dr. Thompson stated part of the PDT’s recommendation, to save \$143 million to the program, was to defer the \$52.5 million going to the SCDOT for the I-20/Broad River interchange. The recommendation from staff is to broach the subject with SCDOT on whether they are going to pursue those funds versus us doing this waiting game, and them coming and asking us for \$52.5 million when we have encumbered those funds for other projects.

Mr. Livingston stated what he would like to know, when you are talking about Malfunction Junction, is any of that in Lexington County. If they want Richland County to pay for it, then he expects Lexington County to pay for it too. Just because they did not do a penny, and we did, and our taxes are paying it. It is totally unfair for us to give them our money, and Lexington County does not have to pay for it.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he will reiterate again, all funding, for any State road that is in the STIP, if the Penny Tax Program pays for it, when that money is appropriated, we are supposed to be reimbursed. That was his understanding when we did the Penny Tax. If it is in the STIP, and Congress approved those funds, if SCDOT gets it, they are supposed to give it back to us.

Ms. Myers stated it could be a letter to confirm that they are now in charge of the project, and all associated costs, rather than asking.

Dr. Thompson stated, to put the conversation in perspective, because SCDOT and the County has a IGA for Hardscrabble Road, they came for their 3rd installment of over \$9 million. The total project is \$29 million. The commitment from the County is \$2 million – Construction, Engineering and Inspection (PDT); and \$27 million – SCDOT.

Ms. Myers stated then the letter could be alternating language. We understand you have assumed all costs associated with this project, as per your recent funding. If the County is expected to participate, at all, in this this, we further understand that when the STIP reimbursement arrives, that will be remitted to Richland County. And, in that way, you make it clear, no matter where this money starts, we expect it to end up back with our taxpayers.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the other twist is, that with Hardscrabble, it was always a shared cost, out the gate, this one is a total consumption of the costs by SCDOT.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if SCDOT had received the money to move forward with the widening.

Dr. Thompson stated he does not know. He will have to research this.

Mr. Beaty stated the Malfunction Junction Project, which they are rebranding as Carolina Crossroads, has been fully funded by the State Legislature. The State is putting up the majority of the money, and there will be some Federal funds. The point being, through Federal funds and the State Legislature, they have fully funded Carolina Crossroads, which includes the I-20/Broad River Road Interchange. So, they physically cannot only replace where I-20 crosses I-26, without replacing I-20 and Broad River Road. Most of the project is in Richland County, but a portion of it is in Lexington County.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it is his understanding the committee’s request would be to craft a letter that makes a statement regarding our expectations of the project funding, as it is going forward, as opposed to asking SCDOT what they are expecting from us. As well as, Mr. N. Jackson keeps reminding us, to make sure that any Federal dollars that come down we are expecting to be reimbursed.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to have staff draft the letter to the SCDOT. The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Greenway Memorandum:**

- Three Rivers Greenway
- Lincoln Tunnel
- Gills Creek Section A
- Gills Creek Section B
- Gills Creek Section C
- Smith/Rocky Branch Sections A, B, C
- Crane Creek Sections A, B, C
- Columbia Mall Greenway
- Polo/Windsor Lake Connector, Woodberry/Old Leesburg Connector, and Dutchman Boulevard Connector

Dr. Thompson stated the Greenway Memorandum for the PDT to proceed with doing the design.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, that we did not make a decision on Gills Creek Section B. Also, we did not make a decision on the City deciding they want to move from 8' to 14'. He thinks we tried to tell the City they need to live up to what they agreed to, in the beginning. They want it for maintenance.

Mr. Livingston stated his position on the City, if it is \$3 million for a project, and it's within the City, and they want to shorten or widen, they pay for it.

7. **Bluff Road Phase 1 Final Change Order** –Dr. Thompson stated this project has gone beyond the total amount of the project, plus the contingency amount by approximately \$75,000. The PDT would like to move forward with this project, if this change order is approved.

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

8. **Gills Creek Greenway Section A Final Design Approval** – Dr. Thompson stated this item is to give the PDT approval to move forward with the design work on Gills Creek Greenway Section A.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if that included additional widening by the City of Columbia.

Mr. Beaty stated the City staff, which he talked with yesterday, are strongly sticking with their recommendation, and their City Council has approved, that if they are to maintain and provide security for greenways, within the City, they shall be 14' wide. He has expressed concern that it could be less than 14', and the City staff are digging in with 14', within the City for greenway widths. What we are proposing to move forward with is, on Gills Creek Greenway A, and all of the greenways are going to be capped to the referendum amount, so Gills Creek A had \$2.246 million in the referendum, and that is all that is going to be spent on the greenway. If it gets wider, it just gets shorter.

Mr. N. Jackson stated if they want to it to go to the original length, then the City will find the money to do it, not them come back to us and say can you use money from this to lengthen it.

Mr. Beaty stated about half of the greenways are outside of the City. And, as we develop those, we will recommend they be more narrow to get a greater length, but at least County Council will have that prerogative for greenways that are located outside of the City. This service order would take Gills Creek through final construction plans, and allow the On-Call to do the final design.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if the construction reflects the 14' widening.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if it will also reflect the shorter distance, based upon the funding available.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, that a shared use pathway is 10' wide, right?

Mr. Beaty stated it depends on who you ask, and the City says, in an urban area, it should be 14'.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about what the SCDOT says.

Mr. Beaty stated with SCDOT it varies. What we are designing is for 2-way pedestrian traffic. On a shared use path, it must be 10'. Now you can build them 8' wide, but then you must build them on both sides of the road because 8' is only one-way.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he just wanted to clarify that, and the City's justification, and it can be narrower in the rural area. He just wanted to see the standard to make sure everyone is treated, at least to the standard.

Mr. Beaty stated he would recommend, in the County, that it be between 10' - 12', but we are a long way from there.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, we are a long way from getting there, but the City is moving forward in the unincorporated area. It seems like everything has progressed in the City, and people in the unincorporated area are asking when we are going to get to them.

Mr. Beaty stated Dr. Thompson has a great idea that should be shared with the committee. He stated Council previously approved them engaging the OETs to begin the other designs. They are going to begin the design process for about 9 or 10 of the greenways in the next few weeks. Then, they will have public meetings, and come back with recommendations in approximately 6 - 9 months about which projects move forward, with what particular width, etc.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if these recommendations will be a part of the budget, or is it separate.

Mr. Beaty inquired if Mr. N. Jackson was asking about the budget for each individual project.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the County's budget. He inquired if the recommendations will be a part of the County's annual budget.

Mr. Beaty stated he believes these are what they provided to staff to include in the budget.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, the reason why is, because we have made decisions on Gills Creek B. He would encourage his colleagues to get some recommendations and proposals to see what we can do with the funding.

Dr. Thompson stated we are around \$117 - \$118 million for funding to the PDT for the next fiscal year. That will help to cover their design costs, as well as construction, for all of the projects they identified for FY19.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is talking about the unused funding from Gills Creek Section B, which is approximately \$2 million.

Dr. Thompson stated they will not touch the funding, based on Council's recommendation.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, if we can come up with ideas before the budget, or if the funding is in the budget, so we do not have to do a budget amendment to move forward.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the Conservation Commission, Mr. Malinowski, etc. have some ideas to spread it around, with the remaining projects. He stated Mr. N. Jackson is correct, we need to come up with some of our own, as a committee.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to move forward with the final design of Gills Creek Greenway Section A. The vote in favor was unanimous.

9. **2018 BUILD Grant Application for Shop Road Extension Phase 2** – Dr. Thompson stated staff is proposing to pursue the BUILD funding to better utilize investments to leverage development transportation grant dollars from the US Department of Transportation. They plan to pursue the dollars in the amount of \$25 million for the Shop Road Extension Phase 2 Project. This is also a recommendation from the PDT.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the County would be carrying the proposal to complete Phase 2.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it started as a SCDOT project, and it is in the STIP. He is not sure where SCDOT is with getting the funding in the STIP. He stated he knows it is a SCDOT project, it's a State road, and we were doing part with the Penny, and were to be reimbursed. If we can move it forward, as long as there is an understanding that it is really their project.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to move forward with the grant application. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers inquired if there are any other road projects that would fit within the BUILD guidelines. If there is Federal money available, and we have a need, and our projects fit within these guidelines, why would we not apply for all that fit within the guidelines.

Dr. Thompson stated he does not see why we could not apply it to another project, but he is going to ask Mr. Beaty to address your questions.

Mr. Beaty stated the Trump Administration has changed the TIGER Grant to the BUILD Grant, and they have changed some of the rules. They have put more emphasis on rural projects, so they recommended, that of the widenings, most of them, if not all of them, could be considered urban. Shop Extension could be considered the most rural of any of them. That is why we identified Shop Road because it would better meet the requirements of the grant.

Ms. Myers stated, if this is the case, and we certainly have constriction in several areas with the farm to

market roads, the old dirt roads the County owns, would any of those fit within the BUILD guidelines. We have about 900 roads on that list. If we could look at analyzing those roads, because some of those are pretty heavily used.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if there is a maximum amount in the grant.

Dr. Thompson stated \$25 million per grantee.

10. **2017 Annual Report** – Mr. C. Jackson stated the County PIO and PDT PIO has reviewed the report. The only question now is to release it so it can be posted on the website, and used to share where things were and are in the past year.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to accept the document as information and forward to Council with a recommendation to release it to the public. The vote in favor was unanimous.

11. **PDT Update** – Mr. Beaty stated they opened the bids on 2 projects. One was the Magnolia/Schoolhouse sidewalk projects. There were 2 bidders, one of which was very close to the engineer's estimate. The low bidder was very much below our engineer's estimate. They are evaluating the bids. They also took bids on the pedestrian intersections, which were about 18 intersections where we were providing handicap ramps, and push buttons for crossing. Both of those bids came in higher than the engineer's estimate, so they are going to have to evaluate that very hard before they make a recommendation. They are receiving bids, in about another week, on 2 packages of dirt roads (Package G and H). Those are due June 6th. Then, June 27th they are receiving bids on 2 more small sidewalks, Pelham and Tryon, and Resurfacing Package O. They are going to work on advertising Clemson Widening. The Southeast Richland Neighborhood project is still a few months away. They are still trying to get the CLOMR from FEMA. The Broad River Neighborhood Project is very close to advertising. They have received right-of-way authorization from the SCDOT to start buying the right-of-way on another intersection, Garners Ferry and Harmon. The referendum included 15 intersections; 7 have been completed; 3 are in construction; and 5 are at the right-of-way acquisition stage. They hope to be able to go to construction with 3 of the 5 in early 2019. The resurfacing program had \$40 million in the referendum, and thanks to the CTC, they have been able to bring in another \$1.4 million. Of the \$41.4 million in resurfacing, staff and the PDT have committed \$30 million through design or construction. They hope to be able to commit the other \$10 million in 2019 – 2020. They will likely come back to you at the next ad hoc committee meeting with the Crane Creek Neighborhood Summary from the public meeting, and recommendations to move forward with the design. The SCDOT approved the Shared Use Path Agreements for Clemson Road, Southeast Richland Neighborhood Project, and Polo Road. The 5 On-Calls, he mentioned earlier, they are engaging them with approximately 2 design projects each. By doing that, they will have most of the program in some level of development. Lastly a construction overview:

- 3 Rivers Greenway – Moving along very well
- Shop Road Extension Phase 1 – The rain has slowed things down, but it is moving. There has been some concrete and asphalt paving done on it. Mr. Beaty asked the Construction Manager to talk to the contractor, and China Jushi's contractor, to request the trucks leaving the construction site, and turning right onto Longwood, to come to a complete stop. They have also requested some additional rock, so they run over the rock, and leave some of the dirt, so they do not carry all of that dirt onto Longwood.
- Farrow/Pisgah Intersection is under construction.
- Resurfacing Packages – The contractors plan on getting started in June when paving season begins.

Ms. Myers stated in looking at this, if you look at the resurfacing notes in your update, since the inception of

the Penny Program we have resurfaced 200 roads. Dirt roads, from last year to this year, we have paved 2. Before the Penny, the County had paved 28. Then Penny paved 5, and the total is 38. She knows Mr. N. Jackson shared this sentiment, but they are getting clobbered by people in the areas where their only output from the Penny is the dirt road paving project. She inquired if that project is too small to be under the PDT's purview. Meaning, because dirt roads are labor intensive on the front end, but not the back end. You got to go knock on a bunch of doors. You got to have the manpower to do that. Does it make more sense for the County itself to be handling that internally, so we can get some movement? Surely if we can resurface 50 paved roads a year, but to only be able to pave 2 dirt roads, which are much shorter, and less complicated, she does not understand.

Dr. Thompson stated that is a great point that Ms. Myers brought up. Probably because of the lack of effort because the PDT does not manage that program.

Ms. Myers inquired as to who does.

Dr. Thompson stated the County does, and you can imagine with a small shop. He stated their team is what you see in here. PDT's team is larger. He would make a recommendation, if PDT is able to manage the program, it would be in the best interest of the County for them to manage it, just like they are managing resurfacing projects, greenways, bikeways, and road widening projects. Why do we discriminate against this program, to the tune of \$45 million? Also, keep in mind we hit a major roadblock at the beginning of this program, with one of the vendors. He does not think we have time now to hit this 2nd roadblock that is coming upon us. He said publicly, that Mr. Beaty has been more than cooperative in extending the olive branch, and saying what came I and my team do to help you out.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification that means the OETs will not get involved in it.

Mr. Beaty stated, right now, the way the contract has been set up, the PDTs role is very limited, and their role was whenever the public involvement, the right-of-way, the design is done by others, managed by staff, and done by the 5 On-Calls. Then, the PDT advertises for construction and does the inspection. They have had a very limited role, up to this point. The current process today is staff is managing the 5 On-Calls who are doing the design work.

Ms. Myers inquired as to what that means. Do you mean they will take over the doing from beginning to end? What does it mean?

Dr. Thompson stated they would manage the On-Call Engineer Teams.

Ms. Myers stated so somebody would be saying, if you have been given 5 roads to pave, and you have had those 5 roads since 2014, and you have not paved them, we are taking those and giving them to someone else. Somebody would then managing that.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to what schedule Mr. Beaty currently provides an update on all the other projects he manages.

Mr. Beaty stated they provide a monthly progress report, and met weekly with County staff.

Mr. C. Jackson stated this would then be incorporated into that. So, now another element in that report would be the status of those dirt road projects.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to amend the agenda to add the status of Penny invoices,

the summer internship, and the management of the dirt road paving program. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston inquired about the invoices related to the Penny program.

Dr. Thompson stated the only “snag” he has is with Invoices #40 and #41 to the PDT for the administrative costs because the County is waiting for a decision from the Circuit Court, after we receive the decision from the SC Supreme Court. They now know what to do. He stated there was a “hiccup” in Accounts Payable, in terms of paying nearly \$1 million for 2 months’ worth of administrative services. They cut a check, because the money had to come out of 2 different pots, the General Fund and the Transportation Penny Tax funds.

Mr. Livingston stated he got a call from someone at Benedict College, which was one of the places where we had a summer program for persons interested in learning about Transportation. Based on his understanding of DOR, that is probably not an allowable to be funded with the Penny Program. He stated, if the County benefitted, we should look at a way of doing it. We should, at least, have a discussion about whether or not we should continue.

Dr. Thompson stated he has been in conversation with Mr. Beaty. He has already had a conversation with Dr. Yudice, as well as, the County PIO Office. We are moving forward. We are not going to circumvent what the Circuit Court or the SC Supreme Court has said. What we are going to do is, the County is going to be lead, so we are not worried about using the Penny funds. Tony, on our team, will conduct the construction project tours. We will coordinate with COMET, in terms of getting transportation for about 35 students. Mr. Beaty has emailed his contact at Benedict, and asked her to reach out to him.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to forward to Council a recommendation to transfer the management of the dirt road paving program to the PDT. The vote in favor was unanimous.

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