



## Richland County Council

TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE  
June 6, 2017 – 3:00 PM  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Manning, Chair; Bill Malinowski, Yvonne McBride, and Paul Livingston

OTHERS PRESENT: Dalhi Myers, Michelle Onley, Shawn Salley, Tony Edwards, Roger Sears, Donny Phipps, Quinton Epps and Larry Smith

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Manning called the meeting to order at approximately 3:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. May 16, 2017 – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE** – Mr. Manning congratulated Mr. Edwards on being chosen to serve as the Interim Transportation Director.

4. **STATUS UPDATE: PROGRAM BONDING** – Ms. Frannie Heizer stated the referendum question presented to the voters included both the approval of the sales tax for defined projects and the issuance of up to \$400 million in General Obligation bonds.

Approximately a year after the successful referendum, the County issued a \$50 million bond anticipation note. Immediately after the commencement of the legal dispute between the County and the Department of Revenue, the market was very concerned about the existence of the dispute; therefore, the cash was used to repay the outstanding \$50 million and no further debt has been issued.

There have been meetings that included Mr. Perry, Mr. Driggers, and Mike Gallagher to discuss what the long-term bonding program could look like.

Mr. Malinowski requested a copy of the chart Ms. Heizer referred to during her presentation.

Ms. Heizer stated the next step would be to bring together the PDT and their financial projections, the Transportation Department and the financial advisors for the County.

*The Committee went into Executive Session at approximately 3:12 PM and came out at approximately 3:47 PM.*

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve as discussed in Executive Session. The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **BLUFF ROAD WIDENING PROJECT:**

- a. Options for reducing termini
- b. Update utility undergrounding estimate
- c. Estimate for roadway lighting

Mr. Edwards stated the Bluff Road Widening Project was broken up into two sections. The portion to be discussed at this meeting is the portion from National Guard Road to South Beltline Boulevard.

The 2012 referendum approved \$16,700,000 in funding for the entire project and \$1,800,000 in additional funding was secured from the SCDOT. The project cost for Phase I of the project is \$8.8 million, which leaves a remaining balance of \$9.6 million.

The cost estimates for Phase II (National Guard to South Beltline) are as follows: \$40.4 million without undergrounding and \$47.9 million with undergrounding.

Mr. Manning stated there is \$9.6 million remaining for the project and there is not even an option listed on the chart in the agenda for that amount. The least expensive option is National Guard Road to Idlewilde Boulevard at \$15 million.

Mr. Manning inquired if this is project specific or is this throughout the Penny Program.

Mr. Edwards stated the majority of the 2012 estimates were under the projected cost estimates for today; therefore, it is going to be an issue.

Mr. Manning stated he felt like it is already an issue.

Mr. Edwards stated it is an issue.

Mr. Seals reiterated it is an issue and one of the reasons why a performance review of the PDT was suggested in order to address the issue. Council will be provided a new plan they can say aye or nay to and understand fully instead of responding on a case by case basis.

Ms. Myers stated when she inquired about this issue in the past she was told the reason we were over budget was that we would essentially play catch up at the end because there are the startup costs at the beginning.

Mr. Manning inquired if the committee or Council put the matter on hold.

Mr. Seals stated the matter was put on hold via an offline discussion.

Mr. Manning stated, "He would be happy to entertain a motion that the committee recommend to Council that whatever happened offline, in somewhere, whatever the agenda item was, that sent it into the secret room, to get it online, without offline conversations and that we don't keep going day by day with something, at least to me, that seems nebulously and mysteriously...on hold."

Mr. Seals stated there was an indication that the fact the estimates had been done at a certain time; and therefore, there would be this catch up. He questioned it at that time, and still does. Part of the business is to project, but the reality is that when you project now we're in trouble in terms of being able to meet the expectations of the program, as enumerated.

Mr. Seals further stated the County needs to be careful going forward with bonding without understanding what it is we're bonding.

Mr. Livingston stated the main problem is the widening projects. It would be helpful to look at those projects and decide what we can and cannot do.

Mr. Malinowski stated when it comes to the widenings it appears there are sidewalks being installed, which should be looked at on a case by case basis.

Ms. Myers stated her concern is that the revisions need to square with the referendum.

Mr. Manning stated, "...you remember those telephones with the rotary dial and the light would flash. You put someone on hold and the light was flashing...we're sitting here with a doggone light flashing and we're talking about well maybe we just put sidewalks on one side of the road, or what about this...maybe we go out and drive around and look at dirt and see how wide they're going to be on widening stuff. And I'm sitting here, as your Chair, telling you we've got a phone sitting here with the thing for somebody to pick up the receiver and push the doggone button and talk. And we ain't got no talking going on. And somehow and I don't know how. So I'm asking ya'll, but as the Chair I would like to have some discussion here to where do we go because we as a County Council, whether you were here or not, there was a County Council...there's only one Richland County Council. And there were people on it 50 years that are all dead, but we're the same County Council. There's one County Council for Richland County and it's like a train. Some people get on at election and some people get off at election. Some people don't run again and other people...but the Council is the County Council. And the County Council, at the time, put it on the referendum. The County Council never passed the penny. County Council put it to the voters. They voted for it. We, as Council, have responsibility. We have the Program Development Team. We have staff. We have a Transportation Interim Director. But we are the County Council. We are a committee that is a sub of that Council. And that light is flashing and I don't know whether we need to go out of town for 2 days and find out what in God's name is going on with Richland County and the Penny or whether we need to direct somebody...but if I went out to a community meeting tonight and tried to explain to them...do you and your colleagues got a handle on this penny? I would have to look at them and say I'm ashamed to tell you, I don't think me or any...we don't know what in the world...where it is. And I hope ya'll can help me to brainstorm for a minute to try to figure out something when we walk out of this room. And if it's a bad idea. It's better than no idea because we came in this room with no idea. And I'd rather go out of here with a bad idea and try to find a way to make it a good idea. Hopefully, go out with a good idea. But ya'll we just can't walk out of this room mesmerized by it's a mess and what about this little piece and that little piece. We've got to do some fixing and if we can't do it as a committee. If we don't have the authority as the committee. Then I'd like you and us as a committee to go to our Chair and Vice Chair and say this is beyond us. And we've just got to tell you we got to do something here or if it's something we can do in the purview of the committee, fine."

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to request staff of this committee to get with the PDT to create a performance plan to see what options there are to correct what is an obvious problem regarding the overruns in the budgeting for all of these programs. The options should be available for Council review by the July Council meeting.

Mr. Livingston requested updated cost estimates of the projects and recommendations.

Ms. Myers stated she would like to have the committee's recommendation to include a suggestion that all of the extras (i.e. undergrounding, sidewalks, etc.) be halted.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **MITIGATION BANK: EXCESS CREDIT SALES** – Mr. Edwards stated there are 2 buyers for mitigation credits.

Mr. Manning inquired where the funds go from these sales.

Mr. Edwards stated the funds go back into the Penny Program.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to move forward with the sale of the credits. The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. **DECKER BOULEVARD NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** – Mr. Edwards stated staff is recommending approval of the Executive Summary.

Mr. Manning stated there was a community meeting and the community gave their input. He then inquired if the input is then taken back to the community for a final thumbs up or thumbs down.

Mr. Edwards stated the process in the past was to take it back to the community.

Mr. Manning requested this item be deferred to a subsequent committee meeting.

Mr. Malinowski stated in the report it states the comments were split equally on undergrounding and not undergrounding, yet the recommendation is for undergrounding. In addition, the minority requested planted medians and the recommendation was for planted medians. Furthermore, there was not a budget for the project included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Livingston requested the balance of the Neighborhood Improvement Projects when it come back to the committee.

Mr. Beatty stated all of there was an original neighborhood plan (i.e. Master Plan), which was reduced in order to be placed on the referendum. A public meeting was held to present the reduced “master plan” and the public ranked the options. The dollar figures were not provided, but it is believed all of the ranked options could be accomplished within the \$12.3 million and the project was designed up that amount.

Ms. McBride does not feel there is a need for an additional community meeting.

Ms. Myers stated she does not feel it is prudent to spend up to the whole amount.

Mr. Manning is concerned about moving forward without the community seeing or hearing the recommendation.

Mr. Beatty stated in the past letters were sent to all of the community members that commented to let them know what the results of the public meeting were and Council’s decision going forward.

Mr. Smith stated he was under the impression Council had addressed the issue of undergrounding and that a decision had been made to not do any undergrounding of utilities; therefore, he does not see why that would be a part of any evaluation.

Mr. Manning stated the issue of undergrounding came up in the category of widening. What went before the voters in the category of Neighborhood Improvement “Master Plans” was a certain amount of money to fund transportation projects within that master plan. And within that master plan for this community it included undergrounding. So it was already included in the master plan.

It was requested that the Clerk's Office review the minutes regarding undergrounding of utilities and report back to the committee.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **PROGRAM INTERNS: OVERVIEW** – The interns introduced themselves to the committee and a brief overview of the program was given to the committee.
9. **OTHER BUSINESS**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:35 PM.