



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
June 25, 2019 – 1:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Chair; Paul Livingston, Jim Manning, Dalhi Myers and Chakisse Newton

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, John Thompson, Eden Logan, Kimberly Toney, Michael Niermeier, Allison Steele, Quinton Epps, Nathaniel Miller, Christine Keefer, Rasheed Muwwakkil, and Jennifer Wladischkin

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.
2. **Approval of Minutes: April 23, 2019** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Niermeier stated “Crane Creek Greenway Scope of Work for Design Contracts” would need to be added to the agenda.

Mr. Manning stated he was disheartened with another broken promise. After living through another 2-hour work session, one of the things that promised was that the Gills Creek Greenway changes would be on the agenda, and a part of this meeting.

Mr. Jackson stated there was also a discussion about having a work session, with regard to the Greenways, which is why it not here today.

Mr. Niermeier stated back in March/April, when one of the matters came before Council, it was decided to have work session. It was discussed, at the Pre-Ad Hoc meeting, and the matter will be addressed at the next Ad Hoc meeting.

Mr. Jackson accepted full responsibility for making the decision, since we were not prepared to have the discussion today.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to adopt the agenda as amended.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
June 25, 2019**

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:**

- a. **Holt #12 Service Order Modifications for Spears Creek Church Road Design** – Mr. Niermeier stated this item was presented to Council in October 2018, and received 1st Reading. Based on discussions with the County Attorney, it is going to require two more readings and a Public Hearing, in order to pass. Chairman Jackson wanted to bring it back to the committee’s attention, and make sure it is on the next Council agenda.
- b. **12 Dirt Road Contract Extensions** – Mr. Niermeier stated there are 12 dirt road contract extensions required. There is no costs. All 12 contracts are being extended to February 2020, which is before the end of the master contract the OETs are on.
- c. **Pending Approvals** – Mr. Niermeier stated these are the pending approvals with the County, or are in process. The Chatsworth Road Connector goes back to the Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc, when there was a parcel offered by the School District. The Chatsworth Connector runs through the larger of the two parcels that offered. He has been trying to get in touch with the Recreation Commission about that matter. The Shop Road Widening Internal funds transfer is up for signature. There are two engineering agreements the County is trying to reach with railroad, which is just a matter of the County paying the fee.

Mr. Jackson inquired if there are any anticipated problems.

Dr. Thompson responded, “No, sir.”

Mr. Manning requested a clearer understanding of trying to get in touch with the Recreation Commission.

Mr. Niermeier stated they have corresponded with email, tried different phone calls, and when he sees the Director, in person, he mentions it to her that they need to get together to discuss whether the Recreation Commission is interested in the property. Our interest is the Chatsworth Connector between the neighborhood and the main road.

Mr. Manning inquired if the Council member from that district was notified of this problem.

Mr. Niermeier stated the Council member has not been notified.

Mr. Jackson inquired if Mr. Niermeier anticipated being able to make that connection and have the issue resolved by the next Council meeting, committee meeting, etc.

Mr. Niermeier stated he would make that a priority, and, at least, have the conversation. Then, it is just a matter of willingness of the Recreation Commission and the School District.

- d. **Update on Blythewood/Richland County/SCDOT IGA for Blythewood SUP Maintenance** – Mr. Niermeier stated they have started the process of negotiation, and are working with the PDT to link up with the SCDOT and the Town of Blythewood to hand over the agreement.

5. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

a. **Approval of Scope of Work for Design Contracts**

i. **Projects Under the Referendum**

1. **Shop Road Extension**
2. **Blythewood Area Improvement**
3. **Broad River Corridor NIP**
4. **Trenholm Acres/Newcastle NIP**
5. **Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway**
6. **Crane Creek Greenway**

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve Items 5(a)(i)(1-6).

Ms. Myers stated, from her understanding, staff is requesting to go to 70% design.

Mr. Niermeier stated the majority of these are up to 30%, which means all of the concepts were developed, and the public meeting held.

Ms. Myers stated, we were told, with doing this design work, that a subsequent engineer is not likely to use these designs because they did not have input. They will have to go back and check all of the design work, so we would be essentially redoing design work.

Mr. Niermeier stated what they have worked with Procurement on is “substantial progress”, which was determined to be 30%, where the OET that did the work would continue on the project until its logical conclusion. Since all these are at the 30%, we have met the metric of “substantial progress”; therefore, we would not be stopping it and handing it over to another firm.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, these are not the ones we are trying to move to 70% now.

Mr. Niermeier stated they have a list of all the projects, which are below 30%, and the ones that are at 30%. They are working with this metric, now, to determine which ones to move forward with, and which ones to stop.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are looking at the ones that are below 30%. She thought some of them were going to 70%.

Mr. Niermeier stated, he believes, the ones on this list are all at 30%, or greater.

Ms. Myers stated, if we are looking at projects, and taking them to 30%, because we know, at that point, a subsequent engineer could come in and accept that work and move forward, that makes sense to her. We are now looking at those that have gotten to 30%, and we are trying to move them to 70%. Her question is why we would be spending that money, knowing what we were told before, that it is not likely that much of the design is going to be accepted, by a subsequent company coming in. We know this contract will end in November.

Mr. Niermeier stated we are not doing the work again. The base contract, for the design work, ends in March. The intent is to utilize what has been done, and look at not wasting more money and have

someone redo it. If these start moving forward, they will be at the 30% or greater point, and by definition, in Procurement, that is “substantial completion”. The service order, the OETs are working under, would continue. No one would have to go back and redo the work.

Mr. Jackson stated there are others that Ms. Myers’ question is relevant to, but we are not presenting those.

Mr. Niermeier stated there are others that will not make the threshold, and will either be stopped, at a certain point, or bid out differently to continue design.

Mr. Jackson stated, the understanding is, the projects that are before us have already met the threshold that would require reconsideration later on down the line. If we approve them today, and they go from 30% to 70%, that work will continue up until March.

Mr. Niermeier stated the work could continue past March because they will have reached “substantial completion”.

Mr. Beaty stated a couple of these projects would go to 100% design plans. He did not want to mislead anyone.

Ms. Myers inquired if that means, at that point, we would have to bid it out to somebody else, and they would inherit design.

Mr. Beaty stated nothing changes. As Mr. Niermeier explained, we can move forward with the existing OET contracts. Some of them, are scoped to go through 70%, at which point, you may want to make changes in the final design. Some of the others are so clear that the contract is to finish the design.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

ii. Projects Over the Referendum

1. Polo Road Widening

2. Lower Richland Boulevard Widening

Mr. Beaty stated both projects have been designed through 30% complete plans. They are, technically, over the referendum amount, but we are still recommending that you move forward with the design. Each of these would go from 30% to 100%, with the existing OET, and no redesign would be necessary.

Ms. Myers stated, so that means, we have designed it in a way that is over the referendum, and we would be continuing with that design. Alternatively, could the design be re-scoped to be under the referendum.

Mr. Beaty stated Lower Richland Boulevard is a very short section of road, so the only choice would be to go to 3-lanes, instead of 5-lanes. It is either all or nothing, from Garners Ferry to Rabbit Run. He would not think that Lower Richland could be redesigned to a different scope.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, Mr .Beaty presented an alternative to change the scope from 5-

lanes to 3-lanes.

Mr. Beaty stated it was included in the referendum and called out as a 5-lane road. The traffic studies warrant a 5-lane section.

Ms. Myers stated she does not disagree, but given that it is well over budget, it is a decision, and choice, that somebody has to make, to say, "Okay. It is well over the referendum amount, but the referendum called for it to be 5-lanes. To do it for 5-lanes, here is what it cost."

Mr. Livingston inquired if the design is for 3-lanes or 5-lanes.

Mr. Beaty stated Lower Richland is 5-lanes. On Polo, it is 3-lanes.

Mr. Livingston inquired if it would cost us anything, if we decided to go from 5-lanes to 3-lanes, to stay within the budget.

Mr. Beaty stated, today, we have 30% plans for a 5-lane, and there would be a nominal expense to change it to a 3-lane. If you did carry it through 70% - 100%, there would be an expense to change something, but it would not be a complete redesign.

Ms. Newton stated, from her perspective, she would like for us, as body, to say this the standard that we are using for items that are over the referendum. She does not think, without that framework, she could make a decision that it needs to be 5-lanes or 3-lanes. Yes, the referendum said it needed to be 5-lanes, but before we change it, we need to have a framework that we take to the people to say this is why we are making this decision, and this is how we are moving forward. Her preference is that we address what our policy is going to be moving forward, how we are going to address the decisions that we make, and how we are going to deal with any budget shortfalls that may appear.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the referendum called for Polo Road to be 3-lanes, and the design is for 3-lanes.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jackson stated, one of the desired outcomes he had for the work session, was to address the issue that Ms. Newton raised, and identify projects that required exceptions be made. In addition, to make a decision, with regards, to how we would do that systemically, and objectively. He thinks, the "Cash Flow Plan", Mr. Beaty attempted to present at the work session, was an attempt to identify how systemically all the projects identified would be funded. Whether we agree with that plan, or not, is open for discuss, but that is what the intent was. Unfortunately, because many of the issues we are dealing with are now 7 - 8 years old, he still has some challenges separating the mere fact because it is over the referendum it is problematic. He is certain the subject experts in this field would tell him there are some percentage of dollars that have exceeded what was anticipated 8 years ago. Actually, the study, to put it on the referendum, was conducted in 2010 - 2011. For us to singularly hang our hats on, "It is over the referendum", so it is a no-no, he thinks we need to have a much broader discussion about where realistically, and economically, any item that placed on a budget 8 years ago would be, in terms of inflationary costs. He thinks that rather than kick the can down the road for those items that are clearly, and legitimately, over the referendum amount 8 - 9 years later, we need to have a specific conversation, sooner than later, to address the matter. It may require some individualized discussions, project by project. There are some projects, which have exceeded the referendum, for a host of different reasons, so to come up with a cookie-cutter approach, he is not sure

how realistic that may be.

Ms. Newton stated the one item that she would like to see added, as part of this decision, is the people. We decide, as a body, but when we talked about the Penny, we made a promise to people. If one project is \$30M over the referendum that could potentially impact another promise that we cannot keep. She thinks the right thing to do is to figure out a framework, so when we tell one person your project was changed, deferred, or denied, and someone else, your project could go \$30M over budget, we have a good reason, we can justify, and the people accept.

Ms. Terracio requested an estimate of how much these projects are expected to be over the referendum.

Mr. Beaty stated Lower Richland is almost within the range of their ability to estimate. The referendum amount was \$6.1M, and the estimate is \$6.7M. The referendum amount for Polo Road is \$12.8M, and \$15.3 is the estimate.

Mr. Livingston stated the decision for him, right now, is not voting on this because he is committed to going beyond the referendum. It is simply to be prepared to move forward, whichever way we decide to move forward. It may mean that a vote on Lower Richland, at this particular point, someone may find a way to fund it at \$6.7M, or not, but when he gets ready to make that decision, he knows it is still moving forward. There is no decision being made about what it is going to cost, at this point.

Mr. Beaty stated it takes 2 – 3 months to negotiate with the OETs, to get to their contract value. If you chose, you could authorize staff, and the PDT, to enter into negotiations. Nothing is final until Council approves the contract. If you would allow that, then all that is happening is negotiations with the OET. Council would still approve the final contract in September. If you wait until September, to begin negotiations, it may be December.

Ms. Myers inquired if you would be negotiating, based on the current status (i.e. over the referendum amount).

Mr. Beaty responded they could, or another opinion would be, to limit any potential risk, not to take the projects to 100%, but 70%. It keeps activities moving, but it minimizes any opportunity for rework in the future.

Ms. Myers stated she wants the projects to keep moving, but she shares Ms. Newton's concern that we may be just making busy work. We are keeping it moving, but we have not made a decision as to where we should be moving. Until we make some decisions, go back to the people about those proposals, and get an ultimate answer, she does not know that it is prudent to spend the money to get into negotiating something that may never be where we are going. She would say, within the next couple weeks, we need to make a decision, as to what the guiding philosophy is on these projects. She inquired, where are our financial advisors, in terms of the recommendations they were going to bring back to us, so we could drive this decision.

Dr. Thompson stated the financial advisor would be meeting with Mr. Niermeier tomorrow morning. He stated he met with them today. They will be sharing the models with them. They have built those models, based on the PDT's cash flow information.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the financial advisors have developed some proposed recommendations that staff is vetting.

Dr. Thompson stated they would be sharing the models with Mr. Niermeier at the meeting tomorrow.

Ms. Myers inquired when those models would be brought to committee or Council.

Dr. Thompson stated he anticipates the model will come to the ad hoc committee next month.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the financial advisors used the cash flow model, presented at our work session, as the assumption.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated the model, presumed, going over some places, and under some places. To understand the assumptions, did the assumptions say, "This is the math, how can we make these recommendations work financially", or did the advisor say, "These are the numbers of what we have spent, and what we have left, this is how we recommend making it."

Dr. Thompson stated the only thing they are going to give you is information about how to proceed, if we need debt financing.

Ms. Myers stated, basically, we are saying to them, now that we are standing in the shoes of the PDT; tell us how to execute their plan within our budget.

Dr. Thompson stated the financial advisors will be bringing the models to Council. The models are not etched in stone, so it is very interactive. You will have an opportunity to say how we proceed with debt financing, and how we prioritize the projects.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the financial advisors are not starting from a clean slate. They are starting from the recommendations the PDT has made, as to how this program should go forward.

Dr. Thompson stated you cannot start from a clean slate when you are looking at Clemson Road or North Main Street, for example.

Ms. Myers stated those are projects underway. There are also projects that are not underway that could be started in a different way, and this County does not have to do in the same way. We are not the PDT. We are not going to have the number of employees they have. Presuming that, boxes us in, in her opinion. Her question is have we considered there may be another, or better way.

Dr. Thompson stated, again, the financial advisor is going to show you this model next month. You will have the opportunity to be able to modify the projects, as we move forward. Based on the policy that you set forth, you will be able to determine the path forward on all projects.

Ms. Myers stated, under that analysis, we do not need to wait for the financial advisors to give us their run rate to make the policy decision, as to what we do when we are in the position of a cost overrun. We need them to tell us what is possible, but, as far as, do we decide to re-scope when there is an overrun, or do we go forward, we do not need to wait on that.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to move forward with 70% design.

Mr. Livingston stated the votes voted for these two projects. The probability of him voting to delete those is slim, which is why he is willing to move forward with the design instead of delaying them. It is

not going to cost much, and it could be to our benefit to move forward. One of the issues we have, now, with costs, is because it has taken us so long, and those estimates are going to continue to increase. He thinks we are better off moving forward with design, and not have projects done 8 – 10 years from now, when the costs may be significant.

Mr. Jackson stated the only hesitation he would have is, if a project could potentially be deleted, which is not the case with these two. The question on the table, today, is not to fund the completed project, but to fund the design portion. He is certainly willing to move forward with the design, and get the information from Council on whether or not we continue with the projects, as they stand. He would like us to be able to talk, specifically, and not hypothetically, because he thinks the public gets the impression, based upon comments that have been made, there are up to a dozen projects that are over the referendum amount. There is one project, that is out there, but for the most part, with the numbers he has seen, there is less than half a dozen projects that fall in this category.

Ms. Myers stated Mr. Livingston and Mr. Jackson's points stand for all the projects. Until we get a policy decision, all of these are projects that have been voted on, and nobody has said that we are scrapping anyone of them. Making the decision, based on that premise, is a little off. She would suggest, we need to have the conversation about all of the projects that have this problem, because none of them is slated for the chopping block. If there are only six, or so, that are over the referendum amount, it strengthens, in her mind, the need to look at the why. Either costs have gone up for all them, or they have not. If costs have skyrocketed for six projects, but we have 10 that somehow do not have skyrocketing cost, that is more of a reason that we look at it, and establish a protocol to move forward.

Mr. Livingston stated doing the design to 70% does not prohibit the discussion. He wants the discussion too, but the 70% design allows him to move forward with the project, and not put the project off.

Ms. Newton stated we are anchoring time, in a way that she is not sure is accurate, when we talk about delaying the conversation 6 months, or delaying things until September. She thinks it is perfectly reasonable to expect that these are conversations that we need to have in the next several weeks, and not months, to determine how we move forward.

Mr. Jackson stated, he thinks it is important to understand, that the conversation we are having now is not a new revelation. This conversation was being had when he arrived 3 years ago, so to suggest that we are going to address in 30 – 60 days what this Council has failed to address, in 3 years, is unrealistic. The issue regarding the projects, and where they stand, is absolutely a discussion we need to have, and go back to voters to make them aware that we are shortening a term here, or changing a project there. In the meantime, while we are doing that, not to design the project, seems fool hearted. Waiting to have a conversation, and then having to do the design anyway, in September or October. Why not let the design begin now, and let it run simultaneously. Once the end results of that conversation come out, it then impacts and modifies the design. As he understands it, it has not been a waste of money; it has only been a waste of time, if we do not start the design now.

In Favor: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

Opposed: Myers and Newton

The vote was in favor.

b. Approval of Projects to be Advertised

i. Projects Under the Referendum

- 1. Greene Street Phase 2 – Available to advertise**
- 2. Resurfacing Package R – Available to advertise**
- 3. Dirt Road Package K – July**

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve Items 5(b)(i)(1-3).

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

ii. Projects Over the Referendum

- 1. Atlas Road Widening – July** – Mr. Beaty stated Atlas Road, in the referendum, was \$17.6M. The current estimate is approximately \$42M. He stated he would recommend looking at the Widening category, as a whole. If you infuse the potential savings from the I-20 Broad River Road Interchange, you could move forward with 10 of the 14, with no changes, and then modifications to the other four. If you look at one widening, without looking at the global discussion, you are not seeing the total picture.

Ms. Myers stated the current projection for Atlas Road is a little over 2 times the referendum. We have had other roads that have come in below the referendum.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council without a recommendation.

In Favor: Newton, Myers and Livingston

Opposed: Manning

Abstain: Jackson

The vote was in favor.

- 2. Polo SUP, Harrison Sidewalk – July** – Mr. Beaty stated the Polo Shared-Use Path is separate from the Polo Widening Project. It is referred to as the Polo Road Sidewalk in the monthly report. It is a combination of both bikeway and sidewalk funding because the Shared-Use Path serves both purposes. The cost estimate is approximately \$3M for the Polo Road SUP. The Harrison Sidewalk is estimated to be \$2M.

Mr. Livingston inquired about the amount over the referendum.

Mr. Jackson stated the Polo Road Sidewalk referendum amount was \$400,000, and the Harrison Road referendum amount was \$600,000. Basically, it has gone from \$1M to approximately \$5M.

Mr. Beaty stated, with the sidewalk category, there were a number of sidewalks completed outside of the program. If you kept the sidewalk category together, you could take the underruns and apply them to other sidewalks, within that category, to make

them whole. That is how the Polo Road and Harrison Road sidewalks have been designed, to date.

Mr. Jackson inquired, as a result of that, will any sidewalk projects be adversely affected by making those transfers.

Mr. Beaty stated no higher ranked, is how he has to answer that. They have developed the 56, in order. We could complete 50, of the 56. The last six could be negatively affected, even so, there is not enough to do all of them, so they are going to be affected. Whether this is right, wrong or indifferent, we have gone down the ranking, developed the projects. If there were savings from other sidewalks, we have applied those funds, moving down the line.

Mr. Jackson inquired if there are any that would have been done, but as a result of what Mr. Beaty described, would not be done now.

Mr. Beaty stated he does not think so. The sidewalk category had about \$27M. The PDT Cash Flow Plan had proposed reducing the sidewalk program, and the bikeway program, by approximately \$5M each to make the program \$0, at the end of the day. We had talked about Kelly Mill and Commerce being approximately \$9.5M so together that is \$19.5 M. He thinks the interest rate should be closer to 2.5%, instead of the 4%. If we recognize North Main, which is constrained per an agreement with the City, then we think we can change the workflow plan to easily \$20M. We could make the sidewalk category whole to the referendum, but even if we brought it back to the whole of the referendum for the sidewalk category, \$27M will not build 56 sidewalks.

Mr. Jackson stated even from the onset there was not enough money to build all of the sidewalks that have been identified.

Mr. Beaty stated that is correct, and it goes beyond the sidewalks. It goes to most projects.

Mr. Jackson stated, when we have our constructive debates about what to do next, is what to do next based upon some flawed data from, at the beginning. As a result of the flawed data, now we are trying to figure out how to make it whole when it was never sufficient funding, even when the referendum was passed. That is very troubling to him. He referenced the Parsons-Brinckeroff study, as his evidence, when he went back to review that. When he reviewed that document, and looked at what was available, as a result, it is clear to him that we started out of the gate in a deficit, if we were going to try to do everything that was passed on the referendum.

Ms. Myers stated there are some things that are critically important to this discussion that she thinks we are overlooking. She stated that she appreciated the work of the PDT, and them getting the County as far down the road as they have, but there is several things that were said that trouble her. She stated it is not the PDT's role, or right, to be shuffling money around in Penny to make anything whole or to figure out where you bring money from to get this project or that done. That is a policy decision. To the extent, that looking at these projects, you have said we could realize savings here and put it there; that too is a policy decision. This body should decide all those things. The reason that moving forward with design, and pushing this in a way that we do not make these hard decisions is a hard problem, is because it is a de facto decision. When we get the point where we

have said design it, and construct it...well we cannot do these 6 on the bottom. They were not high priorities anyway. We were never going to be able to do them all, so we will just kick them down the road. Her concern with that is that is not what we are telling the public. What we are telling the public is that we are working to rationalize the program, but all the while, we are just moving along the list. We have de facto given the PDT the right to be the policy maker because they are coming to use and saying this is what we have done to rationalize it. That is what Council is supposed to be doing, with public involvement. There are six sidewalks on the bottom of a 56-sidewalk list, which we knew from day one we did not have enough money to do. There is 600 roads on the dirt road paving list, which cost \$500,000 each to pave. We have \$45M; therefore, you can pave 90 roads, so pick your 90. Her issue with that is who is picking the 90. Now that we have told the public that their sidewalks are going to be paved over in this area, and theirs in this area too, but they are all on lists. The public is not watching the list. They just know what the promise was. Before we lop off the end of it, we have to make a decision and present that decision to the public, and take the heat. We have to have a honest discussion about it, and not just move the needle and keep going along for the sake of keeping the project moving. What projects are moving? And, who has decided on the priority? Who has decided, if we realize savings over here, we should put them there? Council has not, and that is the core of their responsibility. She is concerned that because it is easier to do it the other way, that we are de facto doing it that way, and there is going to come a day of reckoning and we are all going to be responsible for not having not done exactly what is the harder thing. She wants these projects to keep going too. We need, as a group, to be saying the same thing. We do not need to be falling into doing something de facto to keep the program moving.

Mr. Manning stated, with all due respect, in his years here, before 2012, and with the PDT coming on, he has been on and off this committee, but consistently on Council, and his impression is that the PDT has never been making any policy decisions. They have come to this committee, Council Retreats, and Council meetings. Many times with thoughts, opinions, options, suggestions, and recommendations. Between this committee, work sessions, Council meetings, and Council Retreats, that decision have been made and continue, even today, with what is being brought before us in the agenda and support materials. Ultimately, Council has been the one to make the decisions.

Mr. Livingston stated his comments are similar to Mr. Manning's comments. He thanked Mr. Beaty for his recommendations and professional opinion regarding this matter. It helps him to make decision, as a Council member, no matter who he gets the information from. He does not see it as making decisions for Council. He sees it as making recommendations for us to consider, and that is what he expects. He thinks Mr. Beaty makes those recommendations as consistent, as possible, with the referendum. That helps him to engage in an honest discussion. He wants the same thing from staff, or anybody else.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to proceed with advertising the project.

Ms. Myers stated, for the record, we are going \$4M over the referendum amount advertising for sidewalks, without a discussion of whether or not we ought to be looking at this a different way. All that we ask is that we postpone this because it is over the referendum amount. A \$400,000 sidewalk, at the referendum, that is now a \$2.9M sidewalk, in her opinion, Council should be asking a lot of questions, as to why it is that

far over. Are all the other ones that far over? If there are some that have come in under, as Mr. Beaty said, how did they come in well under, and we cannot re-scope this one to get it well under. She thinks moving forward this way, advertising for construction, does not make a lot of sense.

Ms. Newton commended the great work, with the Penny Program, thus far. The work has been so great, and so well done, that the people in her district have a lot of questions about it when it comes to what is being done in their areas. What remains to be spent, and how we are going to move forward. She wants us to fulfill our promise to the taxpayers of Richland County. She wants us to move forward and not have undue delay. Again, what she is asking for to take an account, and have us, as a body, make decisions, in terms of this is how we are going to move forward, when things are above the referendum. The fact of the matter is, she has gotten more calls and complaints about proposed cutting of \$5M. It is really hard for her to move forward, saying it is okay to go \$40M, \$30M, etc. over. She is not advocating for undue delay. She is advocating for us to put all our cards on the table, take a look at these numbers and say this is how it makes sense to move forward. Advertising for projects that are far over budget, sounds and feels, the same way as saying, "We approve this going that far over budget." That is where we need to have a conversation. Not just as body, from a policy making prospective, but with the constituents. The fact is the roads we build will need to be maintained. There will come a time when we will have to go before our constituents again, and potentially ask for another penny. When that time comes, she wants to be able to say that she duties. She did the best she could to make sure that we came to you and kept you informed.

Ms. Terracio stated, looking at this project, it seems they are pretty long projects. We are calling them sidewalks, but it looks like the Polo Road one is a Shared-Use Path. She requested additional information about that project.

Mr. Beaty stated a lot of the bikeways and sidewalks had the same road included in both categories. This piece of Polo, from Alpine to Mallet Hill, was identified as both a bikeway and a sidewalk. By constructing a 10-ft. Shared-Use Path you accommodate both.

Mr. Livingston withdrew his motion.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward this to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Jackson stated he thinks this process has been painful, and has been difficult for him, as a Council member, and as a citizen. He was almost late to the meeting today because of the Clemson Road one-lane traffic. It has been painful for Administration, PDT, and the public. He wished there was an easy way to resolve it. Charleston County, unlike Richland County, recognized that they were not going to be able to get it all done, so they did not go for a 5-year referendum, they did a 3-year referendum and came back for a 2nd one. Now that he thinks about it, he sees the logic in that. They got a lot of work done, and told the public, "If you want to get the rest of this done, you are going to pass another referendum." As opposed, to going over the referendum, to try to get it done.

Mr. Manning stated he will be voting "No" out of principle and frustration. He thinks part of the responsibility committees have is to do the work.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- c. **Penny Projects Inside SCDOT Rights-of-Way Maintenance Cost Impacts** – Ms. Steele stated the street lighting cost estimate was updated, and added additional attachments. Staff is requesting guidance from Council on whether to proceed with this. If we proceed, and take on this responsibility, Public Works will likely have to request additional funding for the maintenance. On pp. 63 – 64 of the agenda, is a breakdown of the items that will require maintenance; p. 65 is the updated cost estimates for lighting. Bear in mind, the estimates are based on a cost estimate that was received for the Decker/Woodfield project. This is being broadly applied to the countywide look at lighting. The two scenarios are for a 15-year period. The first scenario is if you were to pay a lump sum amount down for the installation and maintenance fees, with a monthly energy fee. Over a 15-year timeframe, for a 4 or 5-lane roadway, it would be \$578,600. The second scenario is if you do not pay any money up front. The monthly fee would include the installation, maintenance and energy fees, which would equate to \$738,000 over a 15-year period.

Ms. Myers inquired if there is a theory under which we would do the lighting we are all contemplating that needs to be done and get a volume discount, or is this going to be a multiplier on every road.

Ms. Steele stated it is hard to get a good figure for this, if the lighting was done countywide. We took the cost estimate and assumed that most of the County's roads are 2-laned, not 4-laned, so we cut the estimate in half. If you broadly assume we install lighting on every County-maintained road, which is where the figure of \$232,837,319 (Scenario 1) or \$296,982,270 (Scenario 2) come from. Many subdivisions already have lighting installed and maintained by HOAs. The installation costs could decrease, but you could have the HOAs that have lighting to come to the County and say, "You installing and maintaining over here. We want you to take over our costs."

Ms. Myers stated that is over \$200M, over 15 years, so the taxpayers may not be able to sustain a universally lit county.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we could pay for the installation of lighting on Penny-funded roads.

Ms. Steele stated, she believes, that is a question they plan to ask SCDOR, when they have their audit meeting with them.

Ms. Myers inquired if we have investigated solar lighting.

Ms. Steele stated she does not believe so.

Ms. Myers suggested, if that is an option, that might get us to a more energy efficient, and achieve the goal across the county.

Mr. Manning inquired if Mr. Jackson has a list of things that are going to be brought to SCDOR.

Mr. Jackson stated he does not.

Mr. Manning stated, as a member of this committee, he thinks Mr. Jackson should have a current list of what will be brought up in the SCDOR meeting, ahead of time, so he is aware of what the items will be, and if there are ones he has heard brought up during the meeting process, that are not on the list, they can be added. Secondly, on p. 67, it talks about animals and the effects of lighting. If we are going to move forward with lighting, and it is going to affect bird migration, it would be helpful for us to learn as much as we can about that issue. It would seem, if we put the lighting up at one time of the year, it would keep them in the South, or, if we put it up at another time of the year, it would keep them in the North.

Ms. Newton stated, with whatever lighting options that we consider, there is significant research that goes into lighting that decreases light pollution, and focuses the light on the things we want to protect (i.e. people and property). She stated she feels like she is being presented with a binary choice, and she wants to make sure she does not miss it. The choices are we do not do the lighting or we do the lighting for a few hundred thousand dollars up to hundreds of millions of dollars, depending on how we go across the County. She inquired if these are the only two options we have explored or are there others that are appropriate for us to look at.

Mr. Jackson stated Ms. Myers mentioned solar lighting, so we should definitely should explore other options. His understanding is, the will of the committee is, to take another look at what possible options are available and see if there are any other options in neighboring counties or counties of comparable size.

Ms. Newton stated, the way she understands this is, that we are looking at this lighting, in totality. To give staff the opportunity to provide guidance on, "these are some places you should absolutely consider it" or "these are some places where it might be more optional" so we are looking at tiered choices.

Ms. Steele stated the reason this came about was they located a paragraph in the ordinance that said, "If you are going to proceed with lighting, on some projects, you have to look at it countywide."

Ms. Terracio inquired if every road, the County maintains, would have lighting or if they were more focused on business center areas.

Mr. Livingston stated one of the most significant thing, as it relates to the program, is the realignment of the program. He would like to urge staff to come up with a plan and/or give us significant feedback, in terms of their thoughts, about what is being recommended by the PDT.

Mr. Jackson stated, if ultimately the decision is going to be ours to make, he thinks many of us have a grasp of the challenges we are facing now, and in the few months to come, he would suggest Council weigh in on the recommendations/options.

6. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:32 PM.