



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
September 27, 2018 – 1:00 PM
4th Floor Conference Room
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Chair; Yvonne McBride, Bill Malinowski, and Paul Livingston

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, John Thompson, Eden Logan, Bryant Davis, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Kimberly Toney, and Nathaniel Miller

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. C. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:09 PM.
2. **Approval of the Minutes**
 - a. September 27, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **Discussion: Transportation Penny Funds being utilized for the following facilities at Three Rivers Greenway:**
 - **Bathrooms (Under Construction)**
 - **Parking Lot (Under Construction)**
 - **Ranger Station (Under Construction)**
 - **Rescue Station (Not Started)**

Dr. Thompson stated, in light of the Department of Revenue’s investigation, you have \$850,000 worth of investment that cannot be paid for out of Penny Tax funds. The question here is how do we find another mode of funding. The General Fund, of course, is definitely an option. We wanted to bring this to your attention, so that we can do our due diligence, and show the Court that we are righting the wrong.

Mr. Malinowski stated his recollection is that we discussed this a few months ago at a meeting. He inquired if Dr. Thompson had the results of what the committee recommended at that point.

Dr. Thompson stated it was tabled.

Mr. Malinowski stated the question he had was if we had already incurred these expenses.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
October 25, 2018**

Dr. Thompson stated on p. 13 it gives a breakdown of where we are, in terms of completion.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, those dollar amounts are what we have incurred.

Dr. Thompson stated those are the total amounts for the projects, not what has been incurred, to date.

Mr. Malinowski stated it is 80% of the total costs. He inquired if these projects were in the referendum.

Mr. Beaty stated the referendum included the Three Rivers Greenway, but it did not get down to the specificity of bathrooms and parking lots.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if these facilities lie within more than one jurisdiction, municipality or with an agency that receives other funding (i.e. Fire Service). He stated the reason he is asking is to find out if these costs can be recouped from the other entities. These facilities will benefit them.

Dr. Thompson stated, once the project has been completed, it will be turned over to the City of Columbia for maintenance. Mr. Beaty can chime in, in terms of conversations with the City, regarding the recouping of the funding.

Mr. Beaty stated they have approached the City staff, and inquired about cost sharing, or what their participation could be, and the answer was, of course, they do not have any budgeted funds. They tried to brainstorm a future pot of money, but they did not think it would apply retroactively to a project. So, their answer to us was, "No."

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we have budgeted funds.

Dr. Thompson stated the budgeted funds were Penny Tax funds; however, because of DOR we cannot take it out of budgeted funds.

Mr. Malinowski stated he personally feels this is something that lies within the municipality. They can say they do not have budgeted funds, but he does not believe we should be footing the whole bill either.

Ms. McBride stated, at this point, we are trying to determine if the County should move ahead, in terms of paying for this.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, the work is already ongoing, so whether we take it all out of our funds, or not, the project is well underway. One of them is 80%, one is 75% and the other is 70% complete. The reality is we are going to have to pay. If we do not get anyone else to pay, it would be a good effort, on our part, to try to continue to work on other funding sources, but where we are now is these projects began with the understanding, at that time, Penny funds were going to be used. We found out while the projects were underway that they were not going to be authorized to use Penny funds.

Ms. McBride stated, at this point, we invested 80% of the costs, so not to do anything would be like throwing away the money we have already placed in it. Unless we can find some grants or other means to get the funding.

Mr. Livingston stated because of where we are now and we anticipated using Penny funds for that, and the residents of the City pay taxes to the County, as well as those outside of the City limits, his recommendation would be to continue the project, and ask the City to commit half and the County to commit half, and move it forward.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, for the City and County to each commit to paying half of the costs for the project.

Ms. McBride stated, if they choose not to pay the other half, we will go ahead and pay the full amount.

Mr. Livingston responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if we put that statement out there, if he is the City he would say, "Forget it. I'm not going to pay you. You just said you were going to do it anyway."

Mr. C. Jackson stated that was not part of the motion.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for the clarification, the motion is that we move forward with 50/50.

Dr. Thompson stated, in terms of moving forward, what is the mode of paying on the County's part. In essence, we have already taken money out of the Penny funds, and we need to reimburse that. Moving forward, he wants to make sure we get the appropriate funding mechanism for this.

Mr. C. Jackson stated we should amend Mr. Livingston's motion to simply say, "The County's funding will come from the General Fund."

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Discussion: Sunset Sidewalk Project Cost Alternatives** – Mr. Beaty stated this item is the Sunset Sidewalk Project. We have discussed this previously, and we have provided an overview map. The project termini is from the top of River Drive and Sunset, what we call down the hill toward North Main, and approximately a block from North Main. Crossing the culvert is the most challenging part. There is an existing City sewer line that is in conflict. We have evaluated all options to relocate that waterline, and to install a sidewalk is going to require the installation of some type of a retaining wall. We have investigated a steel sheet pile-driven wall, which the SCDOT will not allow, and there would be long-term issues with. The SCDOT has said that we could construct a concrete retaining wall, which is a very common item, and construct the curb and gutter, and then have the sidewalk continue across the culvert. The cost would be an additional \$1 million in construction. We have provided the 2 construction cost estimates; \$1.7 million vs. \$600,000. The question is, does Council feel that it is a worthwhile investment to spend an additional \$1.6 - \$1.8 million to continue the sidewalk along Sunset. The only other item he is not fully prepared to discuss today, and hopes to have on a future agenda, is the sidewalk category, in general. The sidewalk category had 56 sidewalks in the referendum. A number of those were previously completed by others outside of the referendum, so there is money available from those projects to pay for other sidewalks.

Mr. Livingston inquired if these are sidewalks that are not in the Penny.

Mr. Beaty stated the sidewalks are in the Penny. Obviously, some projects are most expensive than what the referendum allowed. For instance, this sidewalk is more expensive than what was in the referendum. That will be another global question to seek guidance from Council is, if there is money available within the category, would you choose to spend it and finish as many sidewalks as you can, even if those individual sidewalks were greater than the referendum. That could come into play with your decision on whether you would like to expend the funds to continue the sidewalk across the culvert.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if Mr. Beaty believes, there is enough money for all the sidewalks in the Penny.

Mr. Beaty stated there is about 4 -5 sidewalks, that were defined in the referendum, which are beyond the financial ability to do within the referendum. One of them was to extend sidewalk on Two Notch Road, for a number of miles, almost to the Kershaw County line. That project alone is going to be \$5 - \$6 million. We have got 2 - 3 major sidewalk projects that are \$4 - \$8 million, which is obviously outside the ability to do. If we were to table those significant sidewalks, then he believes you would have the funds available to work on Sunset, and the other major sidewalks that are underway.

Mr. Livingston stated, if we were to do Sunset at the \$600,000, and not do the culvert, and you had the funds to come back to do the other part, would it cost more than a \$1 million then, if you had to do it by itself.

Mr. Beaty stated it probably would. The fact that we would have to re-advertise it, a contractor would have to re-mobilize, you would pay more if you were to delay. It would not be significantly more, but it would more to come back. Anytime you have a contractor come back, it cost them money to mobilize.

Mr. Livingston stated he asked that question to see if one of the options is to do that part, and then wait to see if we have some money to do the other part.

Mr. Beaty stated the only thing that he will offer, for information, in our communications with the City of Columbia, City staff has said that they feel this is a highly traveled route, and they would strongly desire that Richland County construct the sidewalk.

Mr. Livingston stated it would be better if it continued, there is no question about that, but it is just a big cost for that gap that's there. If there is enough money in the sidewalks, in the Penny, then we need to do the whole thing. He stated is what he is trying to figure out. How close are we to having enough to do the whole thing, if the Penny money is there for sidewalks? How do we get to determine that point?

Mr. Beaty stated, an alternative would be, to allow them to continue with the design, at a minimal cost. The designer is already under contract and they are already working. They can come back in a month or two, and it will only cost the County minimal design time. They can come back to committee with the full picture of the entire sidewalk category, which they need to do anyway because there are a number of projects that are outside the financial capability. This will keep the project on schedule and the financial decision can be deferred.

Mr. Livingston stated, to him, that might be the best alternative so that we have a better picture of what we are dealing with. Particularly, if he can do it within a month or so. His recommendation is to support Mr. Beaty's suggestion and come back within a month, or so, and decide then.

Ms. McBride stated she is really concerned that we do not miss or defer any project that are already a part of the referendum, but she agrees with Mr. Livingston.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if continuing with the design allow us to remain within the referendum amount.

Mr. Beaty responded, "No, sir." The project, and a few other sidewalks they are developing, are already beyond their original referendum amounts.

Mr. Malinowski stated, it was his recollection, in the past, we said, with regard to the greenways and roadways, if there was excess we would wait until all projects were done to decide how we would continue to move down the list or go back. We would not arbitrarily take it from "A" and give it to "B" when "C, D, and E" may be wanting also. He thinks this would be the same case. If we go over the referendum amount, we are taking from other projects, and eventually we are going to have to say we cannot do these. He does not think

that is right. The people voted on it, and he thinks we need to appease them the best way we can.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he believes what he is hearing Mr. Livingston say is that we will simply defer it for a month, and get the larger picture. From what Mr. Beaty said, there are only 4 – 5 sidewalks that may be outside the referendum amount, so we will defer this until Mr. Beaty comes back with a comprehensive assessment of where we are with the sidewalks and the funding available.

Mr. Malinowski stated he was fine with that. He thought what we were doing was paying to move ahead with the architectural stuff. He stated, for clarification, that Mr. Beaty is going to bring us the big picture before we spend the money.

Mr. Beaty stated on construction. He stated they could theoretically stop the designer for 4 – 6 weeks.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to defer this item to next month's committee meeting to allow the PDT to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the sidewalk category and the funding available. The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Discussion: Calhoun Road Diet Status, City Coordination and Referendum Budgeted Amount** – Dr. Thompson stated the proposed cost for the Calhoun Street diet project is approximately \$1 million. In the referendum, there is only \$780,000 for this particular project.

Mr. Beaty stated he would like to bring back the bikeway category, which had 87 separate projects. Some of them have been done by others. Some the SCDOT will not allow to move forward. He stated he needs to present the entire list, talk about the funding, and look for guidance on which projects to develop. That directly would apply to the Calhoun Street Bikeway. The referendum only had approximately \$700,000. To do the work would be about \$1 million. They have had 1 public meeting. City staff led the meeting, with the County and PDT staff assisting them. They have presented it to the committee. They have presented it to a City Council work session, about 2 – 3 weeks ago. City Council members requested an additional public hearing be held, especially coming off of some bikeway issues in the City. They wanted to have another opportunity for the public to comment. They feel they have modified the project, from the initial public meeting, to alleviate any of the public's concerns. However, we have coordinated to have an additional public meeting to present the project again. This is for information, and no decision is being requested. It is simply to make you aware of the public meeting, and the costs. They intend to have another public meeting, solicit comments, summarize those comments, and then come back to committee for direction.

Dr. Thompson stated, with this particular project, and the Hampton Street diet, in the future, what we can always recommend from staff, is the City of Columbia could pursue these funding amounts, as outlined in the referendum. They have done it with 3 other projects. He thinks, as a way to reduce the risk to the County, is for us to consider that option on this one, as well.

Mr. Livingston stated, if they want to spend anymore, then they can spend it, but they will just have what was minimum from the County.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski stated these public meetings come at a cost to the Penny Tax, correct?

Mr. Beaty stated they come at a very minimal costs. All of their time is already included, so there is no additional costs.

Mr. Malinowski stated the PDT said they had already had a public meeting, and they felt they had satisfied the public. Therefore, he wondered why we are going back. Are they going to stack the meeting with people that are more to their liking?

Mr. Beaty stated he could only speculate on City Council's desire to have a 2nd public meeting.

Mr. Malinowski stated, as far as Mr. Beaty is concerned, the first public meeting satisfied the public.

Mr. Beaty stated the first meeting had good participation. They had 2 groups of comments they feel they can address. They have not presented those to the public. They wanted to leave the parking near a church, and then Transitions Homeless had a concern. He stated they have verbally told both parties that they can take care of that.

Ms. McBride stated she does not see a problem with having an additional meeting to make sure that we get as much input as possible from the public. She inquired if that is the public meeting that had approximately 78 people, or is that another one.

Mr. Beaty stated the public meeting had approximately 55 people in attendance, and they probably had another 50 in comments.

Ms. McBride stated she supports having a 2nd public meeting.

7. **Approval of removal of select roads from Resurfacing due to absence of homes** – Mr. Beaty stated, when the Penny Program got started, the PDT physically drove all of the County-owned resurfaced roads, which was 555 miles. They ranked all of those roads, and gave them a numerical score, with “0” being terrible and “100” being a brand new road. He stated they are going down the list from worst to first. As they put together another package of roads to be resurfaced, they reviewed them in the field and they came upon a few interesting items they want to bring to their attention. In some neighborhoods, you may have a little stub out or short section where the developer never finished the road. A lot of times you will see that between 2 houses where the developer just stopped, so you have a little stub out in a neighborhood where some people park their cars, play basketball, etc. You have some other areas where the developer did continue the streets, but he never developed any houses. These streets have fallen into a state of disrepair. The pipes have failed. The asphalt is in such disrepair that we cannot simply resurface it. They have identified 2 – 3 neighborhoods, and a couple of streets, in each, where this is the case. Fincastle in Mill Creek is a stub out between 2 homes that is in decent shape and could be resurfaced. Sprucewood Lane in Crane Forest, Sun Meadow Drive, Old Oak Drive and Oak Forest Circle in Meadowlake, are all in District 7. The 3 that are in Meadowlake Subdivision are in such a state of disrepair that the PDT's contractor cannot just resurface them. They need to be completely reconstructed. The PDT and County staff, including Public Works, has looked at these in the field, and it is beyond the scope of our contractor to repair, and basically rebuild these roads, in areas where there are no homes, at this time. He stated his recommendation would be, those roads that are in such a state of disrepair that we cannot resurface them, Public Works has recommended that these roads be closed and physically barricaded with concrete barriers to prevent anyone from accessing these areas. Then, if there is a stub out, that we can resurface, in a neighborhood, he thinks it would be beneficial to go ahead and resurface that to prevent it from deteriorating even worse.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why we would resurface the stub out if we are going to close it off and barricade it.

Mr. Beaty stated they would not. In the case of a stub out, it does not serve anybody because the road ends right at the back of someone's property line. The asphalt is still in good shape. You could resurface it, at an expense. It would improve the appearance, and it would preserve it for the future, if it were to ever be

utilized. Now on these roads that we are recommending to be barricaded off, they are recommending they do no work.

Mr. Malinowski stated he was looking at it that we are basically paving someone's private drive if it is not serving any other homes. If there is a future development that is going to take place, at point, whoever the developer is can handle that.

Mr. Malinowski moved to approve staff and PDT's recommendation to not use the Penny Tax funds for any of these roads. The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. McBride inquired, if you close this road off, how close is it to the next home. She stated this is a very old community, and the people have a lot of pride in that community. She would not want to devalue their property, based on this road being closed off.

Mr. Beaty stated it could be right next to someone's home, but they could move the concrete barrier down so you would not visually see the barrier.

Ms. McBride stated she would have concerns about having a barricaded road right next to her house, and she does not think anyone would want that.

Mr. Livingston stated he shares Ms. McBride's concerns, but the only other alternative would to find someone to do something with the roads, or leave it the way it is. The community might prefer you barricade it than leave it the way it is. He stated it is a question of what alternatives you have. He might ask the people if they would rather be barricaded or remain the same, since there is no money to do anything with it, and proceed from there.

Ms. McBride stated she thought the initial part was to do pavement for at least part of it. She inquired if that was a part of the initial recommendation, or to completely leave it as is, because you said it was in dire need. This is in the County, so we have a piece of property that is in close proximity to residents within the County, and you would let that type of road stay without having anything done. And, if this was a part of the referendum, she has concerns about that. If it is there, we need to do something about it.

Dr. Thompson stated, for these particular roads, that Mr. Beaty is talking about, these will not be regular resurfacing. We will have to rebuild these roads, so we have to work on the drainage issues with these roads, so in essence, we are building a new road. It is not just resurfacing like we would do for the other roads. The options for these roads are to do absolutely nothing and put up the barricades, to do nothing and do not put up the barricade, or rebuild these roads. If we have to rebuild, it is definitely not Penny funds because the Penny funds for these particular roads is to merely resurface the roads.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he wants to go back to what Mr. Livingston said about the possibility of having a conversation with the homeowners or homeowners' associations. He likes the idea of going back and letting them get engaged and involved. You have presented us some options, but he agrees with Ms. McBride, and some people may say they would rather have the barricade, and others may say they would prefer to leave it open. He would like to hear what they have to say before we make that call.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to get some feedback from the homeowners. We let them know what the alternatives are, and see what they have to say about it. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he wanted to publicly thank Mr. Livingston, who is Chair of the Administration &

Finance Committee for assisting, in some ways, with the ad hoc committee's work, with regard to discussions that were held at their meeting on transportation related matters. In addition, to thank the A&F Committee members for what they did with regard to addressing some of the critical issues that we have been grappling with here.

8. **Transportation Program Update** – Mr. Beaty stated they have provided a sheet summarizing the entire program, and breaking it down into, are we designing it, is it in the right-of-way acquisition phase, or construction. He stated they tried to expand the text to make it a little bit more legible.

Council allowed them to move forward with the resurfacing program, such that in the Spring, they will have committed \$37 million out of the \$40 million in the referendum.

Shop Road Phase I is under construction and is scheduled to be complete in January, providing access to China Jushi.

Shop Road Phase II, they are scheduled to have a public meeting on December 6th. The new location route is underway. The design has started. It has been flown and the mapping is underway.

Clemson Road Widening, they are about to advertise; one of the first widenings to be fully developed from 0 – 100%.

In 2019, they will be able to have under construction the following widenings: Hardscrabble, Leesburg (by SCDOT), Clemson, Atlas and North Main. They just got approval from the SCDOT to start acquiring the right-of-way on Blythewood Road Widening. It is possible that we could go to construction on that project in late 2019, so that widening will be pulled in a little sooner than what they anticipated.

Of the 15 intersections, that were in the referendum, 8 have been completed, 2 are under construction and they are acquiring the right-of-way on the other 5. Of the remaining 5, they will go to construction on 4 of them next year, to include Bull/Elmwood, 3 other smaller intersections, and the larger remaining intersection is at Clemson/Sparkleberry, which will probably go to construction in 2020.

Mr. Beaty stated there are a series of public meeting in December, January, and February for all of these recent projects they have started to design. He stated they have received bids on a group of pedestrian intersections, and they are reviewing the bids now. The bids are with County staff to let them know if they can move forward with awarding construction. They have received good bids on Candlewood Phase III Neighborhood. They will probably be coming to you in November 13th, with a recommendation to award the contract. They are about to advertise the Broad River Neighborhood, a small sidewalk along Clemson Road, and another package of dirt roads. They are going to put together approximately 7 dirt roads and advertise those in a week to 2 weeks. They should advertise the Southeast Richland Neighborhood Project in 2 – 4 weeks. Clemson Widening is the largest project. They are waiting on the Federal government to authorize some Federal funds they brought into this project. As soon as they get the go ahead, they can submit the document to staff to allow us to advertise.

Mr. Livingston inquired if Mr. Beaty could tell him how the public hearings are managed now, in terms of advertisement, attendance, inviting participants, etc. He stated he remembers a time, for example, when there was something in his district, he was invited. He was even asked to be on an agenda to speak to the people and answer questions from the Council's perspective. Since that is not happening anymore, he would like to have some idea of what is happening with the public hearings, and what we are missing. That was a good part of the program, in terms of, the public being able to ask questions and know what is going on throughout the process within their areas.

Dr. Thompson stated, with the PDT no longer providing that PIO function, the County PIO Office assists the Transportation Department in getting the word out. The Planning Department is also able to disseminate information. Email is one mode of communication, as well as social media. They are not mailing out the information to people. In addition, they have the street signs, which are placed up 2 weeks in advance of the public meeting. He stated if Mr. Livingston has not received any notification of a public meeting...

Mr. Livingston stated he has been notified of the public meeting, but he has not been informed of the agenda.

Dr. Thompson stated, he wants to make sure the next meeting that is in Mr. Livingston's jurisdiction/area, that Mr. Livingston is informed of the layout of the meeting. The bottom line with the PDT is, they continue to do the same great work, in terms of bringing their engineers to each of those meetings, having their interactive displays up, so that the citizens can understand what is going on with that particular project. We just want to make sure they focus on the safety aspect of it, and do not focus on public relations so we can be in alignment and agreement with what DOR is telling us to do.

Mr. Livingston, in his opinion, one of the most significant parts that is missing is key stakeholders in those areas were identified and invited to come.

Ms. McBride stated she agrees with Mr. Livingston that the public education component is very important, and that is why the Federal government have a public education component in their designs. She inquired if they are comfortable with the education that is received, and public information that is going out, or is there a need for additional. She knows we cannot use the Penny Tax funds, but is there a need for additional resources to help ensure some of the issues that Mr. Livingston addressed are met.

Dr. Thompson stated it would definitely add value to it. If people that influence the community are not coming to these meetings, or have no knowledge of these meetings, additional outreach definitely would help. He stated there is not a public relations person in his office; therefore, we are not being able to hit the churches, or the radio and TV stations.

Mr. Livingston stated, on a personal note, what bothers him is if something negative happens it is all over, but there is no good stuff to match that.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he wanted to echo what Mr. Livingston said. He stated, if it is necessary, for this committee, to send a request to the Chair, or the Assistant Administrator, to ask for a greater level of commitment of time or resources from our PIO Office, in this effort, they would be more than happy to do that. He totally agrees. He went to those that we were doing where he was on agendas, and he has gone to those where he just sat in the audience, like a wall floor, and he was okay, but you could tell the difference. If that is what's needed to make it more informative, engaging, and interactive with the community, then we need to do that. We are more than happy to inform the appropriate officials, here at the County, that we need to reallocate some funds to make that happy.

Dr. Thompson thanked the Chair and the members of the committee for their support. With that being said, he is going to work with his colleagues and PDT to put together a communications plan, so that we can follow that and present it to this body.

Ms. McBride stated, in terms of the right-of-way phase, there are approximately 5 – 6 projects that are in the right-of-way phase. She knows it depends on the length of the project, and the amount of work that has been done, but for those existing projects in the right-of-way phase, will they be completed with the next 2 years.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative. He stated it typically takes, on the roadway widening projects, 18

months to buy all of the right-of-way. Now, that overlaps with the design, so it is not an additional 18 months. The intersections, if they only have 5 – 10 properties, takes 6 – 9 months. Everything they are showing in right-of-way today, will be completed. He stated they just started Blythewood Widening, which has 22 tracts. They will be done in 12 – 14 months. They have requested the SCDOT to allow them to start buying the right-of-way on Clemson/Sparkleberry, and 2 – 3 other projects. They are constantly pushing the SCDOT to let us keep moving forward with acquiring the right-of-way.

Mr. C. Jackson stated if Mr. Beaty would send the dates and times of the public meetings to Ms. Onley, so she can do invites to the Council members.

Mr. Beaty stated the Carolina Crossroads Project is going to hire a contractor in late 2019. Utilities companies are already ramping up to get out of the way of Carolina Crossroads. He stated he is giving the County a 2-year advance notice that, when Carolina Crossroads gets started, they are going to have a hard time to get contractors and utilities companies to move. They are all going to be tied up on Carolina Crossroads. He stated they are doing all they can today to get the utilities coordinated early, and develop every project they can. But, in a couple of years, he would expect coming to Council to say they are having a hard time on this project because of Carolina Crossroads.

9. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:56 PM