



Richland County Council  
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
**MINUTES**  
June 18, 2024 – 4:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

---

COMMITTEE COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Yvonne McBride, Don Weaver, and Jesica Mackey.

Not Present: Overture Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio, Chakisse Newton (online), Derrek Pugh, Gretchen Barron, Michelle Onley, Michael Maloney, Angela Weathersby, Anette Kirylo, Patrick Wright, Ashiya Myers, Susan O’Cain, Lori Thomas, Leonardo Brown, Jackie Hancock, Dale Welch, and Stacey Hamm

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Councilman Paul Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. May 21, 2024 – Ms. Mackey moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Mr. Weaver.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. McBride moved to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEM FOR DISCUSSION/ACTION**

a. Review of Transportation Penny Advisory Committee (TPAC) Recommendations – Mr. Ray Jones Parker Poe noted that the public has had several opportunities to attend meetings and provide feedback.

- ***Highlights of TPAC Principles Document***

- 2012 Needs Prioritized: A guiding principle of the New Penny shall be that the 2012 Needs will be addressed first. The 2012 Needs shall be prioritized in accordance with any applicable ordinance of the County. In the absence of an applicable ordinance, the 2012 Needs will be addressed in order (from highest to lowest) based on the respective Project Score assigned to each by the Transportation Department.
- Isolated Communities: If a road serves as the sole means of ingress and egress for a community, it has been addressed in the Overall Impact and Cost Ratio and the Safety principles.
- Updated Community Investment Project Description: These projects address the integrity, safety, reliability, and sustainability of the transportation infrastructure in local communities and impact the day-to-day activities of citizens and local businesses. These Projects may include viable and unfunded 2012 penny projects as well as road improvements, widening, resurfacing, paving of dirt roads, intersection improvements, bikeways, greenbelts, sidewalks, and other pedestrian-friendly enhancements.

- **Emerging Needs:** The County Council’s plan for the New Penny anticipates the presence of Emerging Needs. To identify and track Emerging Needs, the Transportation Department shall undertake the following:
  1. Work with TPAC to establish a protocol for identifying, tracking, and addressing Emerging Needs;
  2. The process should occur in regular intervals, at least semi-annually, commencing with the first calendar year occurring after the year in which the New Penny is imposed;
  3. The protocol should solicit input from County Administration, each member of County Council, and other stakeholders, including the entities represented in the Needs Assessment;
  4. TPAC shall review any newly proposed Emerging Needs and make a recommendation to the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee (TAHC) regarding which proposed Emerging Needs should be addressed by the New Penny;
  5. TAHC should review and approve the compiled list of Emerging Needs and then send it to County Council for approval; and
  6. Once the Emerging Needs are established, the Transportation Department shall assign each of them a Project Score and then appropriately prioritize them in their program of work for the New Penny.
- **Stantec revised the original needs list to include the City of Columbia’s submission and needs identified by the public, Department of Transportation, University of South Carolina, and affected municipalities. With input from TPAC, this list has been further refined and grouped by Category.**
- **Summary of Current Needs**
  - Community Investment Needs - \$2.7 Billion (65%)
  - County Advancement Needs - \$1.4 Billion (35%)
  - Total Cost - \$4.1 Billion
  - The total is slightly higher than what is in Stantec’s Needs List:
    1. Additional dollars were put in the programmatic categories highlighted by TPAC
    2. The additional costs, on top of the base costs, are layered over every project.

Mr. Jones stated TPAC encouraged the committee to take a closer look at how the Penny is being allocated, given that 65% of the cost seems to fall into the Community Investment category. They recommend the split between the Community Investment and County Advancement Projects be based on the number in the Categorized Needs List. Currently, 50% of the dollars are allocated to County Advancement, 30% to Community Investment, and 20% to COMET Enhancement.

	<b>Inflation Adjusted Total Cost*</b>	<b>Current Penny Allocation</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>Funding Percentage</b>
All Other Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Advancement</li> <li>• Community Investment</li> </ul>	\$8 billion	\$3.6 billion	\$4.4 billion	45%
COMET	\$1.1 billion	\$900 million	\$200 million	82%

\*Does not include Emerging Needs

- **June 25, 2024 Work Session**
  - Complete Review of the Principles Review Penny Allocations
  - Answer Additional Questions in Advance of July 16, 2024, Third Reading of the Penny Ordinance and Resolution approving the Principles
- **July 9, 2024 – Public Hearing on Penny Ordinance**
- **Provide information for the ballot to Election Commission by August 15, 2024**

Mr. Weaver requested Mr. Jones to define “Special” on the Summary of Current Needs.

Mr. Jones responded “Special” is a category of projects that do not have a good definition but are largely new road construction projects.

Mr. Weaver suggested adding verbiage to more clearly define “Special.”

Ms. Mackey inquired if the adjusted inflation figures include the unfunded projects from the 2012 Penny.

Mr. Jones responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Mackey inquired if the “Categorized Needs List” came from TPAC.

Mr. Jones responded it is a combination of the Stantec Needs List, with additional input from TPAC.

Ms. Mackey noted that the approved percentages are opposite to those reflected in the “Categorized Needs List.” We have allocated 30% to the Community Investment projects, but according to the needs list, 65% would need to be allocated, or we would only get to half of the projects.

Mr. Brown indicated that if the ad hoc committee took action before the work session, it would allow the full Council to make a more informed decision at the July 2<sup>nd</sup> Council meeting.

Ms. Newton stated she supports revisiting the allocation for the Community Investment category.

Ms. Mackey moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to accept TPAC’s recommendation regarding the “Categorized Needs List” and percentages, with 65% allocated to Community Investment and 35% allocated to County Advancement.

Mr. Jones clarified these percentages relate to the non-COMET portion of the Penny.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Mackey moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the “Categorized Needs List” percentages from the TPAC, with 65% allocated to Community Investment and 35% allocated to County Advancement. The percentages pertain to the non-COMET portion of the Penny. Mr. Weaver seconded the motion.

Mr. Jones noted the way the motion has been made makes the most sense since Council has not decided on the COME’s percentage. Saying the split will be 65%/35% of the non-COMET-related funds will allow the amount of funding to automatically adjust, no matter the percentage allocated to the COMET.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Mackey inquired if “Unfunded” is defined in the Principles document so it is clear to the public.

Mr. Jones replied that they used two concepts (“viable” and “unfunded”) to try to capture that. A project is not viable if a certain percentage of residents on the road do not allow it to be done.

Ms. Mackey asked which category a natural disaster or other unknown events would be in.

Mr. Jones indicated there is a suggested process for emerging needs. If a weather-related or catastrophic event occurs, it receives extra points under the “Safety” scoring, so it would be elevated to the top to be addressed immediately.

b. Transportation Penny Projects Update—Mr. Michael Maloney, Interim Transportation Director, stated that the current list of Penny Projects can be found on the County’s website.

#### **PROJECTS IN DESIGN**

- *Bluff Rd. Improvements Phase 2*: Awaiting: SCDOT Right-of-Way review/approval
- *Blythewood Road Area Improvements*: SCDOT requested that the plans be resent; working to annex a section of roadway on McNulty into the Creech project.
- *Broad River Corridor NIP*: Comments submitted to SCDOT.
- *Clemson Road at Sparkleberry*: Boring plans have been submitted; awaiting review.
- *Crane Creek NIP*: Updating Phase 2 & 3 plans for submittal to SCDOT.
- *Decker/Woodfield NIP*: Comment responses submitted to SCDOT.
- *Kelly Mill Road*: Preliminary drawings sent to SCDOT
- *Lower Richland Blvd. Widening*: Responses were submitted on Final Right-of-Way plans.
- *Polo Road Widening*: Preliminary Right-of-Way plans submitted; provided response on pavement design.
- *Shop Rd. Widening*: Submitted Final Right-of-Way plans.
- *SERN 2 NIP*: 100% design completed.
- *Trenholm Acres-New Castle NIP*: The project plans for construction are under review by SCDOT.
- *Crane Creek Greenway*: The OET received comments from the City of Columbia to adjust the plans.
- *Gills Creek Greenway*: The City will be contacting a key property owner; plans have been reviewed and are being completed for final plans and land acquisition.

#### **PROJECTS IN RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION**

- *Pineview Rd. Widening*: All property owners were contacted; right-of-way appraisals and negotiations are underway
- *Broad River Rd. Widening*: All property owners were contacted; over 50 properties were accepted and over 20 paid; City of Columbia Water has approved the easement documents needed for water main relocation.

- *Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway*: All property owners were notified, and appraisals for the easement have been completed.

#### **PROJECTS IN BIDDING**

- *Atlas Rd. Widening*: Council did not approve the award of the contract at the April meeting; the project is currently being advertised as Atlas Road Widening – Utility Relocation.
- *Percival Sidewalk*: The bidding documents are with Procurement; the likely award date is early October 2024

#### **PROJECTS IN CONSTRUCTION**

- *Dirt Road Package O (Howard Coogler Rd. [District 1], Jackson St. [District 10], Nathan Ridge Ln. [District 10], and Sara Mathews Rd. [District 7])*: All projects are being graded with utility adjustments and drainage systems.
- *Alpine Sidewalk and Resurfacing*: Sidewalk construction is complete; restoration is underway; resurfacing – July 2024.
- *Blythewood Rd. Widening*: The south side shared-use path is installed, and drainage systems are being completed on the north side; the projected completion date is July 2025.
- *Sunset Dr. Sidewalk*: Clearing is underway; next will be shoring and water main construction; completion is Spring 2025.

#### **PROJECTS RECENTLY COMPLETED**

- *Screaming Eagle Rd./Percival Rd. Intersection*
- *Garners Ferry Rd./Harmon Rd. Intersection*
- *Bull St./Elmwood Rd. Intersection*

Ms. Mackey noted we submitted Boring Plans in August 2023. She inquired if SDOT is reviewing the plans.

Mr. Maloney responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Mackey inquired what could be done to assist with moving the review along.

Mr. Maloney indicated that SCDOT is short-staffed. For example, our project manager's direct contact has been promoted, so we are currently working with their Program Manager. He stated he would request an update on this project.

Mr. Livingston inquired about the number of projects that have not reached the design phase.

Mr. Maloney replied that one in the Pineview Industrial Park is in concept design. It had been further along, but it would not work with the current conditions. There is one other related to the CUB Airport. If there is a runway extension project, the roads around the end of the runway would need to be relocated.

Mr. Weaver asked what “ATP” stands for.

Mr. Maloney responded, “ATP” is authorization to proceed.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Mackey moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Weaver.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:54 PM.