



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
July 23, 2019 – 2:00 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 and Yvonne McBride

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Eden Logan, Kimberly Toney, Michael Niermeier, Allison Steele, Quinton Epps, Christine Keefer, Rasheed Muwwakkil, Cheryl Cook, Nancy Stone-Collum, Michelle Rosenthal, Sandra Yudice and Jennifer Wladischkin

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 2:00 PM.
2. **Approval of Minutes: June 24, 2019** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the minutes as distributed.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as published.

Ms. Newton inquired if the agenda needed to be amended to add the adoption of the Transportation Penny Policy, as discussed in the work session.

Mr. Niermeier stated, based on the debate and discussion, and the availability of what was approved in 2014, the consensus of staff is to remain with the original framework, which reduces risk exposure for going back and reshuffling what has been prioritized. He would like to bring that back at a later date.

Mr. Jackson stated the problem with that is that the next meeting is not until September. He was under the impression we were going to go with what was discussed at the work session.

Mr. Niermeier stated we could obviously use that option, and vote on that framework, moving forward. Again, his recommendation, in discussion with his colleagues and Administration, is that if we change it now we are opening ourselves up to risk because things could re-prioritized. He thinks it warrants further staff review before moving forward.

Ms. Newton stated it might be more appropriate to add a discussion item regarding the work session.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to add the discussion of the Transportation Penny Work

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
July 23, 2019**

Session to the agenda.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Manning and Livingston

The vote to amend the agenda was unanimous.

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

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:**

- a. **Presentation of First Tryon Financial Advisors** – Mr. Niermeier stated they have been working with the financial advisors to model the projected cash flow moving forward, which plays directly into the cash flow that will come before you. Emanating from the June 18th work session, staff recommended working with PDT, as far as projects, and looking at the funding that could be available. That data was been provided to First Tryon, to build into the model, and, therefore, show what we project to have over the several years and eventually zeroing out the program by 2028.

The goal in developing the model is to take what staff and PDT has been working on, in terms of the project cash flow schedule, and build that into a model that can look at different debt assumptions. As you know, you have \$175 Million Bond Anticipation Note that is coming to maturity in February 2020, so you have to do something with that. The question is going to be, do you go ahead and take it all out with a \$175 Million Long-Term Issue. Can you pay down a portion of that, and bond for less, and, therefore, pay less interest on it. They want to build everything under one roof, so they can look at different options, going forward, and find the option that works best.

Mr. Jackson stated, up until recently, he was listening to the debate that was happening by one faction of the organization said we had enough cash on hand that we did not need to draw down any of the bond money. Then, another faction said that we needed it. It was alluded to, a moment ago, that we need to draw down some, or all, of it. He requested the financial advisors to help him reconcile that, in terms of available cash on hand.

In the model, the balance at the beginning of this month was about \$200 Million. If you stopped construction, for the foreseeable future, you could pay off the BAN with cash. Assuming you want to continue with some of the construction, you would need to have some of that available.

Mr. Jackson stated he thinks going from the massive number of employees the PDT had in place, and the massive number of ongoing projects, versus what, in reality, will happen once it moves in house, he does not see it continuing at the current pace or rate. He needs to hear at what rate we need to consider borrowing, or spending, versus if we continue at the rate we are doing.

On the main dashboard page is where they can look at different debt assumptions and options/scenarios. There is an interest rate assumption built into the model. The main inflows are sales tax money and interest earnings. In terms of outflows, there is debt service and cash flow schedule. The total amount that can go to projects is \$1,037,900,000. It was noted that within the

project amounts they have to include any interest on the bonds toward the project limitations. Conversely, any interest earned can be offset.

Mr. Jackson inquired if the financial advisors have enough information to make a concrete assessment.

The financial advisors believe they do have enough information.

Mr. Jackson inquired about what the work of the financial advisors will translate into for the County.

Mr. Niermeier stated the result of First Tryon's work is to show what we can take resource-wise and project-wise, based on the projected cash available, and show the cash flow to do the project list in the referendum.

Mr. Jackson inquired about what information will be etched in stone to help us make the determination on Item e: "Approval of Modified 2019-2028 Project and Cash Flow Plan." What will the recommendation be, based upon the information provided.

Mr. Niermeier stated they recommend this going to full Council for approval for the modified cash flow plan, which they will continue to tweak over the next few days. As Mr. Beaty alluded to, there are some things that need to be dialed in a little bit more. There are certain things you will see in the cash flow plan that will be pushed out because the debt rates are a little bit lower. The recommendation to borrow or not to borrow will be included in the plan.

Ms. Newton inquired if this includes the \$52M in savings from the Carolina Crossroads Project.

Mr. Niermeier stated the \$52M is included. The SCDOT IGA says Council has the authority, and right, to do, or not certain projects they do not want to.

Mr. Jackson stated, the last time we had this discuss, Mr. Beaty recommended that the \$52M be pushed to the end, so that in the event we are not able to have those dollars it has not adversely affected any projects.

Ms. Newton stated she would be comfortable with accepting Mr. Beaty's recommendation for the \$52M to be added to the end.

Ms. Myers inquired if we have assumed all of the costs and modifications, listed on p. 101 of the agenda packet, that are being debated.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative. The I-20/Broad River Road is zeroed out. The three (3) decisions previously made by Council in June 2018 is also accounted for. Several projects were added back in that were previously removed and the money brought back into the Bikeways and Pedestrian Improvements.

Ms. Myers stated she thought we were debating what to do with the projects that were over budget, and those that we were potentially re-scoping. She stated there has been no public comment on any of that, and no process decided for making those decisions. She inquired if this is a suggestion, or are we proposing that Council adopt it.

Mr. Niermeier stated this is a recommendation to attempt to do the most projects, with the money

available. The only real variable is the \$52M, which we need clarity on from the State.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are planning to recommend this, as the decision.

Mr. Niermeier stated that is up to the body. They can only provide you the information.

Mr. Manning inquired what Mr. Niermeier meant when he said Council approved changing the termini for three (3) projects in June 2018.

Mr. Niermeier stated he believes there were three (3) actions taken by Council in June 2018 to re-scope Pineview...

Ms. Myers stated those were recommendations. Council did not do any changes to the ordinance, and there was no public hearings.

Mr. Beaty stated, in 2018, the subject was brought up 3 times in the ad hoc committee. There was a work session. After the work session, on June 5, 2018, Council voted to modified Bluff II and Pineview. The action did not specifically address Spears Creek Church, but that had been a part of the conversation leading up to that motion. What the PDT provided to First Tryon, and staff, the savings on Bluff II and Pineview, Spears Creek Church, and the \$52M from the I-20 Interchange, which is the basis for the model.

Mr. Manning stated the question before us is whether Council approval was really an official approval. He requested the County Attorney or a representative from the Legal Department to answer that question.

Mr. Jackson stated he requested Ms. Onley to send out a copy of the minutes from the 2018 meetings to the committee members, which is what Mr. Beaty is referencing. The Bluff Road and Pineview actions are crystal clear.

Mr. Manning stated it sounds like his colleagues are saying that because there were not readings and public input meetings that Council action is null and void, and did not constitute proper Council action.

Ms. Myers stated we were told to modify these roads in the referendum it required 3 Readings and a public hearing. We did discuss it, but we did not have 3 Readings and public hearing. She is suggesting that, if that is what we are going to do, the process has to be identified. If it requires just 2 more Readings and a public hearing, then that is that, but it cannot just be that we voted to scrap the widenings.

Mr. Jackson stated if Legal's interpretation of the action were that it is not an appropriate action, based upon that vote, then he would like to have Legal...

Ms. McBride stated her understanding is, that you have a good model to follow, but the validity of it is based on the credibility of the information that is being input. She inquired if this model includes everything that is in the transportation plan.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if the model includes the amount of funds, based on the referendum, or the

amount of funds, based on the PDT, etc.

Mr. Niermeier stated it is based on the funds in the referendum.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, that we have go back to using the cap, from the referendum, for the projects to be completed.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride stated there were projects that were funded, and completed, before we decided to use only the referendum amount.

Mr. Niermeier stated that is probably correct, but there has been debt and cash flow modeling done since 2014 using the same cap numbers.

Mr. Beaty stated the model does go to the cap of the whole \$1.07 Billion. There is about \$30M outside monies coming in. The projects have been input, based on the current estimates. Therefore, if a sidewalk project is over the original referendum, but that is where it is being developed today that is what went into the model. The total amount is capped, but each individual project is based on its current estimate.

Mr. Jackson stated Mr. Farrar had joined the committee, if Ms. Myers and Mr. Manning would like to restate their questions.

Ms. Myers stated we were talking about the modifications under the referendum to Penny Projects. The issue was raised because two (2) of the projects were voted on for modifications by Council, but were not subjected to three (3) readings and a public hearing. Her question was does the Council's mere voting on it stand, because she thought Legal told them that changes to project scopes, in the referendum, required three (3) readings and public hearing, or does it require three (3) readings and a public hearing.

Mr. Farrar stated, typically, when you have a modification of an ordinance, you have to follow the same formalities as the original adoption of the ordinance. For example, if the projects were done pursuant to ordinance, you would have to amend the ordinance to change the projects. If you are going back, you can ratify the action, if it is the will of Council.

Mr. Manning stated, what we did in June 2018, we have been proceeding like we did it, when we did not do it. We talked earlier about the money beginning to be collected in 2013. We may need to go back and look at the minutes of every Council meeting that we ever discussed anything related to the Penny, and see where we did anything that preceded on, based on the Council meeting and the agenda item, approved by Council and moved forward on it. It could be like this one, and we moved forward on a Council decision that was not valid.

Ms. Myers inquired if we have already done, when we ratified some of the work on projects that were already completed, or were completed out of scope of the referendum.

Mr. Jackson stated there were a number of projects that exceeded the referendum amount, approved by Council and completed. He does not recall them doing that because that meant we exceeded the ordinance for those projects. He believes we should get a list of the projects that exceeded the referendum amount, that are complete, and determine whether or not we took the appropriate steps

in approval of those.

Ms. Myers stated we did not go back and do three (3) readings and public hearing. We ratified them in an overarching document when we adopted the second BAN. We were instructed that, if we were going to change things going forward, it would require three (3) readings and a public hearing.

Mr. Jackson stated we need to get Legal, Transportation Department or Dr. Thompson to verify whether that is correct, in terms of where we are.

Ms. McBride stated one of her main concerns is that we funded a number of projects that were over budget, and now we are trying to put in new language without thinking about what has been done in the past. We must be consistent.

- b. **S. 401 State Law Regarding Utility Cost** – Mr. Niermeier stated the State of South Carolina passed a new utility cost bill in May that defines utility enterprises as small or large. Based on that classification, projects relating to utility relocation and design, if they are small it is put on that project. Essentially, this could have some implication on the Penny by increasing some of our construction costs for utility relocation. As it stands now, they have met with Legal about it, and Mr. Smith is currently writing an opinion that will be brought back to committee for evaluation.
- c. **Shop Road Change Order** – Mr. Niermeier stated Shop Road is essentially finished. There will be an announcement when the road is officially opened.
- d. **Pending Approvals**
 - Atlas Road – Authorization to Proceed to Construction (SCDOT)
 - Bull/Elmwood – Authorization to Proceed to Construction (SCDOT)
 - Blythewood Widening Phase 1 Condemnations (County Legal Staff)
 - Advertisement of Greene Street Phase 2 and Resurfacing Package R (County Staff)
 - Design of Shop Road Phase 2 and Blythewood Area Improvements (County Staff)
 - Maintenance Responsibility of Chatworth Connector as part of Decker/Woodfield NIP – (Meeting scheduled between County Staff, Recreation Commission and School District 2)

Ms. Newton stated her recollection is that Atlas Road, as currently specked, is one of the projects that would exceed the referendum amount, and we were going to come back and make decisions on those.

Mr. Niermeier stated Ms. Newton is correct. They are waiting on a Notice to Proceed from SCDOT; however, it is up to us, if and when, we act on that.

Mr. Jackson stated he requested Dr. Thompson, when he was the Transportation Director, to add the category “Pending Approvals” so the committee would know any that was waiting on approval by this body before any action could be taken.

5. ITEMS FOR ACTION

a. **Approval of Letters of Recommendation to Award Bid:**

1. **Resurfacing Package Q** – Mr. Niermeier stated the bids were opened on June 26. There

were five (5) bidders, and the recommendation is to award the package to Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve this item.

Ms. Newton inquired about the approximately miles that will be paved with this package.

Mr. Niermeier stated there are 16.74 miles in Package Q.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

2. **North Springs/Harrington Intersection** – Mr. Niermeier stated the recommendation is approve award of Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve this item.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

b. Approval to Increase Construction Contingency Amount:

1. **Koon/Farmview Sidewalk Project (10%)**
2. **Magnolia/Schoolhouse Road Project (10%)**

Mr. Beaty stated they have 2 sidewalk projects grouped together. Koon/Farmview is under the referendum. It is a relatively small project. The bid was approximately \$200,000. On construction awards Council usually allows staff a 10% contingency, in case things change. There has already been a contingency of around \$20,000, and there have been further changes in the field. They have had to modify the sidewalk to avoid utility and do some additional earthwork, which will bring the total to \$230,000 - \$235,000, so they are beyond the 10% approve. They are asking for an additional \$10,000 to make sure that we pay the contractors final bill.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we would still be under the referendum amount with the additional 10%.

Mr. Beaty stated the Magnolia/Schoolhouse is a little larger project. This project came in about \$589,000. Council approved an original 10% contingency. This project has had some delays, utility conflicts and some changes in the field to minimize impacts. The project will go beyond the original 10%. It should only require an additional 4 - 5%, but they are asking for the promise to go up to 10%. The reason they are being conservative, and asking for the 10%, is that Council does not meet in August. The contractor should be complete in that timeframe, and they would hate to not have Council's approval to pay this final bill.

Ms. Myers inquired if there is a process in place when a project goes over the contingency amount.

Ms. Wladischkin stated the standard process, for change orders, is whatever contingency was originally approved by Council is handled through Administration. When we breach the original contingency then we bring it back to Council for approval. The standard rule for change orders is 10% or \$10,000, which would be quite a few of the Transportation change orders.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, that even with the additional 10% we are still under the referendum amount.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the increase of construction contingency amounts for Koon/Fairview Sidewalk Project and Magnolia/Schoolhouse Road Project.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Brown inquired what happens if the contingency amount makes the project go over the referendum amount. He stated he would not feel comfortable, as he perceives that as a decision that Council would have to make. He requested further clarification on what Council expects to happen.

Mr. Jackson stated, if the project is at the point of being at the end, and it is all complete, except it has a 10% overage that has been exceeded, but the work has been done, he does not sure there is a lot of debate. He is sure that we are not going to pay the contractors. One of the issues that Ms. Newton raised was we need to revisit and resolve the plan on the front end, so we do not run into the scenario on the back end.

Ms. Myers stated maybe the issue is where it is paid from. If it is over the referendum, Mr. Farrar has just pointed out again, that going over that amount requires certain steps. It may well be that if we are setting that contingency; we can look at numbers too. Maybe what we need to do on the front end is make a catch all rule that speaks to it because it is coming out of another project, unless we identify another source of funds.

Ms. McBride inquired if this was a contractual issue. Do we not have a written contract that states, this is the cost, which also includes a 10% contingency.

Mr. Beaty stated, as an example, you enter into a contract with the contractor for \$100. You allow your staff an additional \$10, in case things change in the field and the costs of the project goes up to \$110. Your staff can make those changes in the field without having to come back to you. In this case, the contractor is going to exceed the original 10%.

Mr. Brown stated, he was saying, if the project itself is concluding, and at the conclusion of the project, the 10% contingency is invoked, but that in itself puts the project over the referendum, does he have the authority to finish it.

Mr. Jackson stated he thinks, at the beginning of discussions about future projects, the 10% being

added should be a part of that discussion, so it is determined if it is below the referendum on the front end. Rather than having to question that in the 11th hour.

- c. **Approval of Penny Project Features Inside SCDOT Right of Way** – Mr. Niermeier stated this has been before the committee several times. Ms. Steele will present staff's recommendation on this matter.

Ms. Steele stated we have several projects that include features proposed to be installed in the SCDOT Right-of-Ways that SCDOT has claimed they will not maintain. If we proceed with installing them, the County will be responsible for maintaining them.

1. **Shared Use Path** – This would be a joint maintenance between the County and SCDOT. The SCDOT will maintain portions of it, but not all of it.
2. **Landscaped Medians** – The SCDOT will not maintain.
3. **Mast Arms** – The SCDOT will not maintain.
4. **Street Lighting** – The SCDOT will not maintain. Ms. Steele researched the solar power option for street lighting. The installation is more expensive on the front end; however, over time you save on the cost of the light bill. For a 15-year timeframe, it will cost approximately \$100 million to light the County.

Mr. Jackson inquired what the funding source would be.

Ms. Steele stated the installation would be Penny funds. The maintenance funding would come from Public Works.

Mr. Jackson inquired if Public Works has begun building this into their future budget.

Ms. Steele stated there was not a lot communication between the Transportation and Public Works Departments, so Public Works was not aware that these features were proposed to be installed. Therefore, Public Works was not aware to request funding in their budget.

Mr. Jackson inquired as to what the source of funding would be.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the additional budgetary amount that would be needed is \$6 - \$7 Million per year.

Mr. Jackson inquired as to when the projects would begin.

Ms. Steele stated several of the projects are in design, and some are at 70%, so construction could begin in the next 6 months.

Ms. Myers inquired, of the projects they could start, what is the budgeted amount that would be needed for maintenance of those projects.

Ms. Steele stated they are currently not requesting funding, but whether to leave these items in the projects.

Ms. Myers stated that is the overarching question. The narrow question is, until we give you guidance, you have got something in a holding pattern. Of those things in a holding pattern, how much money would it take to maintain them if we took them out of the holding pattern and instructed you to proceed.

Ms. Steele stated the fiscal impact, for each item, is listed on p. 63 of the agenda packet. The mast arm signals will not have to be maintained, unless they are damaged by an accident or an act of nature. They would need funding for landscaped medians immediately.

Ms. Myers stated there are some shovel ready projects that fall in this category.

Ms. Steele stated the projects listed on p. 66 are under design. They are not ready for construction.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, all of the projects listed have these features, but all of them are not at the same level of design.

Ms. Steele responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated, for the ones that are ready now, and, therefore, we need to find maintenance funding for, what is the fiscal impact.

Ms. Steele stated she does not think any of the projects are ready to be constructed now.

Mr. Beaty stated, in the near future, they could do the Chatsworth Connector, which is a pedestrian accommodation path that Mr. Niermeier is working on getting the maintenance agreement. If we had the maintenance issue worked out, they could advertise it immediately. By the end of the summer, they could advertise Bull Street/Elmwood Avenue Intersection, which has mast arms.

Mr. Jackson stated the answer to Ms. Myers' question is the issue of getting our approval is simply to give you authorization to move forward, not a request for funding. At the earliest, funding would not be needed for at least 6 months.

Ms. Steele responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated we want to know what their projection is for the funding we are going to need.

Ms. Steele stated there are 14 proposed projects.

Ms. Newton stated, her understanding, the reason why we are looking at these projects as a whole, is that, per the ordinance, what we do for one project we do for all the projects.

Ms. Steele responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated, even if we only approve 14 projects, we are de facto approving that we will do the same for all projects.

Ms. Steele responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the projects in the referendum are clear, on a list and defined. However, let's say, tomorrow we work on another roadway that has not been named, then, per the

ordinance, the lighting we do on that road will have to conform to the same lighting specifications.

Ms. Steele responded the way she reads the ordinance that is correct.

Mr. Manning stated he was hopeful that Mr. Brown heard the comment that the one department did not talk to the other department. As he recalls, there was money in Biennium I (FY18 and FY19) for revivification. He is not aware of that money being spent, and could be funding that is available for the maintenance of these items.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve staff's recommendation to remove the items from current and future designs of Penny Projects.

In Favor: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Newton and Myers

The vote was in favor.

- d. **Approval of the Widening Memo** – Mr. Niermeier stated this is a direct result of the work session last week. In March 2018, we discussed realignment of projects with the funds available to accomplish as much as we can. Some of this goes back to the discussion of the June 2018 vote by Council to change certain scopes of projects, and free up funding in those categories. There are three (3) scenarios in front of the committee.

Scenario A shows the widening projects as defined within the referendum. Scenario B differs from the memo of last year, and shows the projects constrained by the referendum amount. Scenario C shows the recommended improvements.

Mr. Niermeier stated staff is recommending to allow them to move forward with Scenario C, which is based on the previous actions and allows them to complete the widening program within the funding allocated for it.

Ms. Myers suggested a decision on the widenings rest on Ms. Newton's earlier suggestion that Council make a decision rather than adopting either Scenario A, B, or C.

Mr. Livingston inquired if staff had a recommendation.

Mr. Niermeier stated the recommendation is to move ahead with Scenario C.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to move forward with Scenario C.

Ms. Myers made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Newton, to take up Ms. Newton's suggestion that we make a decision as to how to fund projects that are now over the referendum rather than taking money from the other projects and pushing them through to the detriment of the citizens.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers

Opposed: Manning and Livingston

The vote was in favor.

1. **Richland County Transportation Penny Project Alignment** – Mr. Niermeier stated when the recommended framework was presented it was based on incomplete information. It was brought to his attention that the criteria for prioritization of Penny Projects, approved by Council April 2, 2013, was available. The prioritization criteria was originally developed for all of the Penny Program Projects, in all of the different categories. The thought was, if it was already in place, let's not reinvent the wheel, but go ahead and stick with the prioritization. What they have discussed with Dr. Thompson, and others, is to stick with what they came with, which will expose us, and the program to less risk moving forward.

Ms. Newton stated her recollection, from the work session; the new criteria staff developed seemed to be more in line with where we are with the Penny Project today. It had more criteria that was based on community need and traffic patterns. She hopes we can have a discussion about this because staff put a lot of thought into the new criteria. She thought the criteria was excellent, and she would like to have a conversation before we jettison that.

Mr. Jackson stated it was a lot of effort and work to get to where we were at, at the last work session, concerning the recommendation. For that now not to be a consideration is a little disappointing. He was comfortable with placing all projects, which exceeded the referendum, on hold until we developed a clear policy that would address how those projects would be implemented and funded. If we are going to substitute what was presented to us at the last work session with a new idea, then we need to continue to let those projects remain on hold until we have the discussion at the next committee meeting.

Mr. Brown stated Mr. Niermeier, and his staff, need a decision as to what framework the Council will utilize. That plays a big part as to how projects are moved going forward. He think the intent of the conversation was to allow Council to make a decision, as to what framework will be in place. If it is the framework that was recommended, at the last work session, or the previous one that utilized in the development to the PDT, then staff can move forward and work. Right now, staff is on hold and trying to figure out what direction Council would like staff to move forward. He believes, what Mr. Niermeier is trying to say is, we want to feel confident Council has made a decision about the framework, so that staff can move forward, in whatever direction.

Mr. Jackson stated we came to the last work session with a presentation that, not since he took over as Chair of the committee, did we have that level of consensus among this body about a recommendation/framework that was being made. We came to today's meeting with the knowledge and understanding that was still in place. We found out today, for the first time, that was no longer in place, and we were considering going back to a previous one. He is not opposed to that. He is simply saying, if we were told that prior to today, and there had been some opportunity to vet that among ourselves, then we would probably be at a different point today. We were at a point of moving forward, with what we were presented at the last work session. There were a couple questions that came out at the Council meeting, we were going to go back and look at, and present at today's meeting. Instead, what we got today was, we are not going to go with that plan. We are going to go with the previous plan.

Ms. Newton stated she too was really excited by the work that had been done. She also felt there was consensus, in terms of using that criteria as a framework.

Ms. McBride stated she was not able to attend the work session, but she did not agree with the method used, and she is glad staff is taking the opportunity to review the information and coming with something that may be consistent with all Council members. She knows we have a

committee to vet issues, but she is very concerned with the recommendations that were made.

Mr. Jackson stated, to make sure we are clear in terms of Mr. Brown's question, "Where do we from here?" He thinks those projects that are over the referendum are on hold until we come back at our next committee meeting to discuss, with both documents and a recommendation from staff. We have a conversation and take a vote on it.

Dr. Thompson inquired, for clarification, if this takes into consideration those projects that have outside funding. For example, North Main. On paper, North Main would be over the referendum because of the outside funding.

Mr. Jackson inquired if North Main would be under consideration with the policy being developed, or would it be excluded because it has outside funding.

Dr. Thompson stated it should still be on the table.

Mr. Livingston stated, as you recall, North Main is not over the referendum amount, as far as the portion we are providing, so it should not fit in that category. It is clear that North Main is limited to the amount of the referendum; therefore, we cannot spend more on North Main than the referendum, based on the agreement with the City of Columbia.

Ms. McBride stated we have already funded some projects that were over the referendum. We are going to have to go back and correct those projects. We know have projects that are over the referendum that are just as important, or more important, than the ones we funded. There are safety issues. She cannot see making a global statement that we are not going to fund any projects, at this time, that are over the referendum, when we have already done that. If there are some projects that are safety hazards, then we should take them individually.

Mr. Manning inquired if pp 101- 103 of the agenda contains all the projects.

Mr. Niermeier stated those are only the widening projects.

Mr. Manning inquired if they could have a list of projects, as of now, they are putting on hold.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jackson stated that was a good suggestion, then at the next meeting we can have a composite list and discuss them individuals as we still discuss and develop the policy going forward.

Mr. Beaty stated we would be putting the ability to start construction on Atlas; the design of Bluff Road Phase II, Lower Richland Boulevard, Pineview, Polo Road, Spears Creek, and Clemson/Sparkleberry Intersection; the construction of Harrison, Polo, Alpine, and Sunset; and the sidewalks on hold.

Ms. Myers suggested that we look at the sidewalk category separately. The amounts they are over the referendum is minuscule.

Mr. Livingston stated he does not believe that is quite accurate because there is one sidewalk that is at least \$1M over.

Mr. Beaty stated, with the sidewalk category, there were 56 sidewalks in the referendum with a total value of \$27M. If we stay the course, we can finish 50 of the 56. The last 6 are the lower priority projects. He would advocate that we continue down the list with the higher priority ones. We get 50 of 56 done, and defer action on the remaining 6 until a later date.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, if we accept Mr. Beaty's suggestion of doing 50 of the 56 sidewalk projects, which represent the higher priority items, are those individual items within the referendum amount.

Mr. Beaty stated most of them would not be within the referendum amount.

Ms. McBride stated we should realize the County has spent millions on design already, so we are not starting at the beginning. Not to do these sidewalks, we will be throwing away millions of dollars. It is not fiscally responsible for us not to continue with them. In addition, some of them is a safety issue. She does not want the death of anyone on my conscience.

Mr. Jackson stated the request to defer continuing to work on those projects that are over the referendum does not mean they will not be done. The recommendation is that we were expecting to have a policy on how to address them. He came to the meeting today with that expectation, which would have addressed all them. Void of a policy, in terms of how we are going to address them, or where the funding is going to come from because we did not approve it today, it becomes difficult to make a decision on any project over the referendum.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to proceed with Mr. Beaty's recommendation to proceed with the 50 of 56 sidewalks.

Ms. Myers inquired about how much money we are talking about, what a shortfall looks like for the rest of the sidewalks and how close they are to completion.

Mr. Manning stated he was thinking the 50 of 56 would be funded with the amount left over by not completing the 6 sidewalk projects. To him that a part of the motion.

Mr. Jackson restated Mr. Manning's motion to authorize moving forward on 50 of the 56 sidewalks, based upon the funds available and the established prioritization list.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

Abstain: Newton

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous with Ms. Newton abstaining from the vote.

Ms. Myers requested staff to provide a list of the remaining 6 sidewalks, and the dollar amounts associated with them, at the upcoming Council meeting.

Mr. Beaty stated there are a couple sidewalks that are over the referendum, but they are ready to advertise to go to construction. He inquired if the decision of the committee is to go to Council, and Council approves the recommendation, then we could advertise those projects.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
July 23, 2019**

Mr. Jackson stated that is his interpretation of the motion.

Mr. Manning wanted to ensure that the items from the Transportation Ad Hoc Meeting would be placed on the August 1, 2019 Special Called Meeting agenda. Mr. Livingston assured him that those item would be placed on the agenda for action.

e. **Approval of Modified 2019-2028 Project and Cash Flow Plan** – No action was taken.

6. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:46 PM.