



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
MINUTES
July 2, 2024 – 1:30 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Overture Walker, Chair; Paul Livingston, Yvonne McBride, and Jessica Mackey

Not Present: Don Weaver

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Overture Walker called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. June 18, 2024 – Ms. McBride moved to approve the minutes of June 18th, 2024, as distributed, seconded by Mr. Livingston.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: Weaver

The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. McBride moved to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Mr. Livingston.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: Weaver

The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEM FOR DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - a. Final Review of Penny Principles – Mr. Ray Jones, Parker Poe, noted that at the Transportation Work Session held on June 25, 2024, Council provided feedback to the Principles, and he will be sharing the highlights that were discussed and will go to full council at the July 16, 2024 meeting.
 - *Revised highlights of the Principles Document*

GENERAL CONDITIONS:

The funding of Transportation Needs from revenues collected from the New Penny is at all times subject to the following:

1. The Transportation Need must be addressed in accordance with applicable policies and ordinances of the County;
2. The Transportation Need should support or further the current strategic objectives of the County as periodically adopted by County Council;
3. Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements including, specifically, SC Revenue Ruling #22-2; and
4. The proceeds of the New Penny shall be expended equitably across the County, and each County Council district shall receive a minimum of \$20 million in funding from the New Penny for projects in the Community Investment or County Advancement categories.

Mr. Jones proceeded to share that the General Conditions state that the funding of Transportation needs from revenues collected from the New Penny has to follow the guidelines, the rules, and County Ordinances at all times. He stated that the critical elements of the principles are as follows:

2012 Needs:

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 (defined below) assigned to each by the Transportation Department.

Isolated Communities:

2. Overall Impact and Cost Ratio (up to twenty (20) points). The number of County residents affected by Transportation Need subject to the following factors:
 - a. One (1) point for every one thousand (1,000) Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT);
 - b. In case of a road that serves and the primary means of access to a community, one (1) point for every five hundred (500) AADT.
 - c. In case of a road that serves as the sole means of ingress and egress for a community, one (1) point for every one hundred (100) AADT.
3. Safety (up to twenty-five (25) points). The effect a Transportation Need would have on improving public safety subject to the following factors:
 - a. Five (5) points for reducing the vehicle to pedestrian conflicts by fifty percent (50%);
 - b. Five (5) points if the road serves as the primary means of access to a community;

Updated Community Investment Project Description

Community Investment Projects: 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

Mr. Jones stated that 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. Working with TPAC, 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 recommendations to 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 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.

MANAGEMENT OF THE NEW PENNY

Mr. Jones stated the management of the new penny has always been on the principles to keep consistency. The Transportation Department shall be charged with the primary responsibility to manage the Projects to be undertaken with the proceeds of the New Penny. To accommodate the timely submission of the County's overall budget to County Council for consideration, the County Administrator will prepare a proposed annual budget for the New Penny for the next succeeding fiscal year together with a statement describing the important features of the proposed budget. The proposed budget and statement will be based on the recommendation from the Transportation Director of the Projects for the corresponding fiscal year that was determined in accordance with Section A. The annual budget may be modified by the County Council in accordance with its established procedures to address unforeseen or exigent circumstances.

Mr. Jones stated that the Categorized Needs List had been developed in partnership with Stantec. It revised the original needs list to include the City of Columbia’s submission and needs identified by the public, DOT, USC, and affected municipalities. This list has been further refined and grouped by Category with input from TPAC.

TPAC recommends the Principles and Categorized Needs List and suggests additional considerations of the split between Community Investment and County Advancement projects based on the numbers in the Categorized Needs List. TAHC accepted the TPAC Recommendations and suggested a new split. The proposed new allocation from TAHC is 50% to Community Advancement Projects and 30% to County Advancement Projects.

Summary of Current Needs

Community Investment Needs

<u>Type</u>	<u>Amount (in millions)</u>
Intersections	216.70
Bikeways	43.10
Greenways/Pedestrian	155.55
Nonprogrammatic Sidewalk	32.95
Programmatic (Resurfacing, Sidewalk, Dirt Road)	1090.00
Special	<u>168.40</u>
Subtotal	1706.70
(PE, RW, Utility, CEI @ 60%)	<u>1024.02</u>
Total Community Investment Needs Estimated Cost (not adjusted for inflation)	2730.72

County Advancement Needs

<u>Type</u>	<u>Amount (in millions)</u>
Widening	738.9
Special	64.7
Intersections	20.0
Programmatic (Resurfacing)	<u>75.0</u>
Subtotal	898.60
(PE, RW, Utility, CEI @ 60%)	<u>539.16</u>
Total County Advancement Needs Estimated Cost (not adjusted for inflation)	1437.76

Total Current Needs

4168.48

At the Second Reading, the following allocations were presented:

Estimated Cost: Amount of Bonds. In accordance with Section 4-37-40(a)(1)(c) of the Act:

- (i) The estimated Transportation Costs to be paid from the proceeds of the New Penny are approximately \$4.5 billion, which shall be allocated as follows:
 1. 30% or approximately \$1.350 billion to County Advancement Projects;
 2. 50% or approximately \$2.250 billion to Community Investment Projects; and
 3. 20% or approximately \$900 million to COMET Enhancement Projects.
- (i) The principal amount of Bonds to be issued and repaid from the proceeds of the New Penny is not to exceed \$950 million.

	Inflation Adjusted Total Cost	Inflation Adjusted Total Cost	Difference	Funding Percentage
County Advancement Community Improvement	\$8 billion	\$3.6 billion	\$4.4 billion	45%
COMET	\$1.1 billion	\$900 million	\$200 million	82%

Councilwoman McBride asked what inflation time period was considered for the analysis used.

Mr. Jones stated the inflation impacts over a 25-year period were analyzed. A straight-line projection was used to estimate the future costs of projects. If costs increase by 3-4% annually, the total costs could more than double. The estimate was adjusted to \$8 billion, considering that projects would be completed progressively, reducing the inflation impact.

Councilwoman McBride asked for the unfunded projects; in selecting the priorities, what system was used?

Mr. Jones stated that Emerging needs will be assessed using the same scoring system and reviewed by the TPAQC, this committee, and ultimately, the County Council.

Mr. Livingston stated that he is concerned about the perception of the needs list. This is not designed to cover every transportation need in the County. The needs that were identified and what we can afford will be addressed. It is important to understand that there will always be emerging needs, but we can't cover all of them, and we have to be mindful of the financial limitations.

County Attorney Patrick Wright requested that the Council go into Executive Session to receive legal advice pertaining to funding.

Ms. Terracio made the motion to go into Executive Session, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Walker, and Mackey

Not Present: Weaver

The vote in favor was unanimous.

*The committee entered into Executive Session at approximately 2:30 PM
and came out at approximately 2:40 PM*

Mr. Livingston moved to come out of Executive Session, seconded by Ms. Newton.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Walker, and Mackey

Not Present: Weaver

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Chairman Walker stated that the committee entered into Executive Session to receive legal advice and no actions were taken in Executive Session.

Ms. Mackey made a motion to accept TPAC's recommendation related to Community Investment and County Advancement Projects at the percentages presented.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Livingston made a motion to fund the COMET at 22% of the estimated \$4.5 billion budget and fund the other two categories whatever Council decides, seconded by Ms. McBride.

Mr. Walker made a friendly amendment to fund the COMET at 22%, County Advancement at 30%, and Community Investment at 48%.

Mr. Livingston accepted the friendly amendment.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Walker, and Mackey

Not Present: Weaver

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. McBride moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Walker.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Walker, and Mackey

Not Present: Weaver

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:54 PM.