



Richland County Council

TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE

November 13, 2017 – 2:00 PM

4th Floor Conference Room

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Manning, Chair; Bill Malinowski, Norman Jackson, and Paul Livingston

OTHERS PRESENT: Shawn Salley, Tony Edwards, Roger Sears, Michelle Onley, Quinton Epps, Angela McCallum, and Jamelle Ellis

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Manning called the meeting to order at approximately 2:01 p.m.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. October 2, 2017 – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Edwards requested to add the “PDT Update” to the agenda.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to adopt the agenda as amended. The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ATLAS ROAD WIDENING PROJECT: RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION** – Mr. Edwards stated this item is in regard to potential right-of-way acquisitions. Mr. Willoughby and other right-of-way staff are on hand to address any questions.

*The committee went into Executive Session at approximately 2:04 p.m.
and came out at approximately 2:26 p.m.*

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to proceed with condemnation on all of the properties with the exception of Items #216 and #172. On Item #216 to direct staff to make a counteroffer to the property owner. On Item #172 to ensure the amount listed in the documentation is a typo and not a decrease in the offer. In addition, direct staff to contact Ms. Myers to secure contact information regarding Item #94. The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **BROAD RIVER ROAD WIDENING SERVICE ORDER APPROVAL** – Mr. Manning stated the service order is for the engineering design in the Town of Irmo. Staff respectfully requests the service order be accepted and forwarded to County Council for approval and execution.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the service order is the 35 page document received under separate cover. He stated he had spoken with Mr. Edwards regarding the document and requested that he look into a few things prior to the item coming to Council.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **THREE RIVERS GREENWAY: RIVERBANKS ZOO AGREEMENT** – Mr. Manning stated the project is currently in construction. The City of Columbia proposed a new location for the fire rescue and park ranger building prompting the zoo to request a license agreement to provide a set of final plans to the zoo that show all elements that are to be constructed within the boundaries of the zoo property. Staff respectfully requests the agreement be accepted and forwarded to County Council for approval and execution.

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

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Legal had reviewed the license agreement.

Mr. Edwards responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the County needs a MOU with Lexington County since the license agreement cited the “Richland-Lexington Riverbanks Park District” and there is not a place for them to sign off on the agreement.

Mr. Edwards stated he would say no since the agreement is between Richland County and the zoo.

Mr. Malinowski requested Mr. Edwards to confirm with legal.

Mr. Edwards stated he can confirm with legal. He further stated the agreement is not for funding it is for the location of the buildings.

Mr. Malinowski stated the City of Columbia proposed a new location for fire rescue and park ranger building; therefore, that is a new location within the zoo property.

Mr. Edwards stated that is correct.

Mr. Malinowski stated Lexington County may not want the relocation. He feels that as a joint partner you would include the joint partner.

Mr. Livingston stated the zoo commission makes those decisions on behalf of the zoo.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the relocation of the buildings was in the initial cost estimate. And if not, what would the costs be.

Mr. Edwards stated the initial cost was for a joint building and then the City decided to separate the buildings. There is still one dollar amount that can be used regardless.

Mr. Malinowski stated if it is anything more than that the City pays the difference. He further stated that “Exhibits B and E” were blank.

Mr. Edwards stated when the documentation was placed in the agenda the exhibits were still be worked on.

Mr. Malinowski pointed out the commencement date for construction was to be November 1st. He inquired if construction had commenced.

Mr. Edwards stated construction has begun.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the completion date was still viable.

Mr. Edwards stated that should fall in line with the contract.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if SCE&G is a part of the insurance agreement because they are leasing the property to the zoo.

Mr. Edwards responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski requested clarification if the 30 days written notice for the license to be terminated is calendar days or business days.

Mr. Livingston stated it was mentioned the cost overruns were to be paid by the City.

Mr. Edwards stated they have the option. The line item costs for the building is \$300,000. The City made the choice to separate the buildings.

Ms. Myers inquired as to current cost projection for 2 buildings versus the one.

Mr. Salley stated they are in the process of giving us a cost. We have to look at getting the buildings designed first. We had a design for one building, so now we have to get an estimate to design the 2 buildings.

Ms. Myers stated we already paid for the design for one under the penny. Now we are breaking it into two, so we are going back and getting a new design for two buildings rather than one.

Mr. Salley stated the design was already done before we got it.

Ms. Myers inquired if there was money for a new design.

Mr. Salley stated the new design will be paid for under the current contract. He believes there is enough hours on the contract for him to charge against it. He further stated we will not go over what we have.

Ms. Myers stated given the overruns already it might be helpful if we would go under. So if this new money on a new request by the City, why is the penny paying for the request not included in the referendum. There was already a building approved, so now we are backing into 2 buildings and we will spend excess money instead of doing what is already allocated. Her question is what is the current budget for this? And how does that differ from what was already there?

Mr. Salley stated we will not know the costs of the buildings in the construction phase until we get the estimate back.

Ms. Myers so you are recommending we accept changes without any estimates of costs.

Mr. Salley stated there is no costs for it to go forward.

Mr. Edwards stated the agreement is just for the location of the buildings.

Mr. Salley stated if it comes back over then we can dispute it.

Ms. Myers inquired if this is premature. If you do not have an estimate how is it that we are analyzing it and saying that this is a good or bad idea.

Mr. Salley stated mainly because it is currently in construction.

Mr. Manning stated for clarification if we had the design for one building and we are not paying anyone, although we have them contracted for so many hours, but then the City comes up and says they want 2 buildings. Now we are going to have to bring someone in to design and we are saying it is within their hours, but we are going to get down the road and we are going to be out of their hours. Then we are either not going to do a project or pay for more hours. So the question is why are we paying for the hours when the City wants new drawings?

Mr. Salley stated we can deny the agreement and we will have to go back to the City and tell them we are not going to change the building.

Mr. Anthony Lawrence stated with there being a combination of a fire rescue building and a ranger station there is concern with both of those entities. The Fire Chief did not want his apparatus being accessible because of the sensitivity and the expense of the materials. Putting a door with a lock between 2 shares uses was not acceptable. He further stated it was his understanding that the City was aware there may be additional costs to separate the buildings. The construction folks are determining what the costs will be, but it is contingent upon the designer preparing drawings to be used to base the cost estimate on. The license agreement was specifically for the zoo to be comfortable with AOS working on the property, where they could work on the property, and access points in and around the property. The agreement initially started as Exhibits A, B, C, and D and addressed those. The conversation about the maintenance building being split into two rolled into this agreement to make it one compressed agreement, which is what was requested by the zoo's attorney, Kevin Garrison.

The reason the building(s) are located within the zoo property is because that is the best location for immediate access to people by the rapids. It initially was on the bluff, but that cannot happen because it is in a flood zone; therefore, the only place it can be built is within the zoo property. According to the Fire Chief the only place they have issues is at the rapids.

Mr. Livingston stated for clarification this is still within the budget. He requested a rationale for why the 2 buildings are in the best interest of the citizens of Richland County as opposed to the one building.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the plans according to the referendum was for one building or two buildings.

Mr. Edwards stated it was for one building.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if they are expected to do both buildings for the same amount or will there be an increase in cost.

Mr. Lawrence stated the team can instruct the designer to design to the budget unless the City is going to come up with additional funding.

Mr. Malinowski requested a friendly amendment to receive a response from the City prior to moving forward to consider the 2 buildings and budget.

Mr. N. Jackson stated if the City is willing to pay the difference he has no problem with that.

Mr. N. Jackson made a substitute motion that any changes to the original plans will be paid for by the City. The substitute motion was seconded by Mr. Malinowski.

Mr. Livingston stated he believes it should be contingent upon what is right for the County; therefore, he cannot vote for the substitute motion.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it is his understanding that the City disagrees with the original design; therefore, they should be pay.

Mr. Lawrence stated in response to Mr. Livingston's question, the ranger building has always been conceived as being located next to the parking lot for policing and crowd control purposes. The other is located on zoo property for access to the river.

Mr. Manning inquired about how we did not know all this information prior to construction beginning.

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

Mr. Malinowski requested clarification on what happens with the licensing agreement.

Mr. Edwards stated the agreement was only for the location of the buildings.

Mr. Manning stated whatever parts of the agreement are still applicable they can move forward on.

7. **SOUTHEAST RICHLAND NEIGHBORHOOD PROJECT: DESIGN** – Mr. Manning stated the request is to remove the proposed signalized Century Oaks Lane/Schneider Access connector from the project and replace it with a "T" intersection with a stop sign control on the Garners Park Road intersection.

Mr. N. Jackson stated Century Oaks Lane is a County maintained road and was initially on the list to be paved. For over 50 years, Schneider has been trying to get a traffic light but it was too close to Lower Richland Boulevard. It was his understanding DOT had agreed if Schneider moved their entrance to the other side and lined it up with Century Oaks they would approve the signal due to sight distance. Now DOT is saying they won't approve it.

Mr. Edwards stated DOT is going through a signal diet where they are trying to find as many signals as possible to be removed. When this one was reviewed it fell into that criteria of not being needed.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he will have to talk to them again because there is an adult activity center with no sight distance. It warranted a signal light and they agreed. Now they are going through a diet and they are saying forget the safety of the citizens. He further inquired if there is a process to have them review it again because they agreed prior to the signal diet.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the road has been designed.

Mr. Edwards responded in the affirmative.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the whole design was based on DOT having Schneider move their entrance and parking lot to the other side.

Mr. Sears stated staff met with District Traffic and they said the signal did not work there. If it does not warrant a signal, there is no point in building the connection into the side of Schneider.

Mr. N. Jackson stated when the PDT had meetings in Lower Richland, we were told that DOT said if Schneider moved their entrance on the other side it warranted a signal. It served 2 purposes. Schneider had been trying to get a signal for a long time, but it was too close to Lower Richland Boulevard. The other side had the distance, plus there is a sight distance problem with the seniors coming out on the highway with people going over 60 miles per hour.

Mr. Sears stated the Assistant Traffic Engineer for District One was the one that staff met with.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he met with Tony Magwood to discuss the sight distance problem and he agreed. Then when we met with the citizens we told them that the signal was warranted.

Mr. N. Jackson requested to go back to DOT and have them review and/or reconsider the previous commitment to the design.

Mr. Manning expressed his frustration with plans/designs being changed.

Mr. N. Jackson stated after DOT committed and the design has been made and we are ready to move forward to make changes is wrong. This needs to be addressed by the Assistant Traffic Engineer's supervisor because this is a safety project.

Mr. Malinowski referenced the backup documentation on p. 23 of the agenda as follows: "Recently while reviewing the final construction plans...SCDOT indicated that the installation of a signal at a new location intersection did not meet traffic signal warrants..." He believes we need to go back and question why it does not meet these warrants. Secondly, the opening line states, "During the development of the Southeast Richland Neighborhood Project, it was determined that there a need to provide a connection..." but "the County DPW has indicated that they do not want to maintain this new roadway." It appears the right hand is not working with the left hand. If the signal is warranted, we need to inquire as to why DPW does not want to maintain the road (i.e. costs, etc.).

Mr. N. Jackson stated the signal was warranted. That is why there were neighborhood meetings held.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the traffic signal was included in the original referendum.

Mr. Edwards stated the design was not there.

Mr. Malinowski stated he also thinks if we are doing this to accommodate Schneider Electric we should inquire as to how much they want to spend to get the traffic light.

Mr. N. Jackson stated DOT told Schneider to move their parking lot if they wanted access to the light.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to direct the Transportation Department to determine if the road is warranted and to go back to DOT to find out why the signal was not warranted.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it was warranted and the funding is there for it. We have gone to the community and told them what would be done and the timeframe it would constructed. The problem is that one employee at DOT decided that they are doing traffic light dieting and they do not think it is warranted. The main thing that needs to be discussed is the traffic light and not if the road is warranted because the design is already there.

Mr. Manning stated the issue Mr. Malinowski's motion is dealing with is that County DPW does not want to maintain the roadway Even if there is a signal, no one is maintaining the roadway. It was explained that the Rabbit Run connector from Rabbit Run Road to Hwy. 378 will be maintained by the DPW. They do not want to maintain the Century Oaks/Schneider connection. DOT has said the signal is not warranted and we are getting word that DPW does not want to maintain that portion. Schneider has agreed maintain a portion of the road. If we do not have the agreement from DOT and we do not have DPW desiring to maintain the road, what else can we do?

Mr. N. Jackson stated for clarification the signal is not based on not maintaining that portion of the road.

The issue of the road maintenance and the issue of the signal are separate issues. The question is how to resolve the issues; therefore, the proposal is to cut it off.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the right-of-way is within DOT right-of-way.

The County will purchase the right-of-way and will be responsible for what is in their right-of-way.

Mr. N. Jackson offered a friendly amendment to have legal find out why DPW would not be responsible for maintaining what is in the right-of-way.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **HULON LANE ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS: MITIGATION CREDIT** – Mr. Manning stated staff respectfully requests the committee to concur with these credit sales and forward to full Council for consideration. The Richland County share is \$113,050.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve and have the funds deposited in the Transportation Penny fund.

Mr. Malinowski requested to have the blank Exhibit A provided prior to the item going to Council.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

9. **RESURFACING PACKAGE I** – Mr. Manning stated the cost of Resurfacing Package I has exceeded the contractual amount that resulted from improper construction by the developer on the roadways in the "Ballentine Cove Neighborhood". Staff respectfully requests the committee concur with the additional \$30,000 to correct the sub base issues and forward to Council for consideration.

Mr. Malinowski stated accordingly to the backup documentation, "...the roads had not been initially constructed to the standards..." He inquired as to when these roads were built.

Mr. Edwards stated the roads were constructed in the 1970s.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the developer is still constructing roads in Richland County and how many more roads they may have constructed in Richland County. In addition, we should consider some type of punishment for them.

Mr. Malinowski also inquired as to why the funding is not coming from the Public Works budget versus the Penny Tax Program.

Mr. Edwards stated there is \$45 million in the penny for resurfacing.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there are any other penny projects like this that cost more than the estimated amount of the contract.

Mr. Edwards stated this is the first one.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to how much over the contract is this item.

Mr. Edwards stated \$30,000 more.

Mr. Malinowski stated that is approximately 4% more than the contract.

Mr. N. Jackson and Mr. Malinowski inquired if we are able to approve to go over the budget. Although it does not exceed the overall paving program amount, it exceeds the contract amount.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about how many resurfacing projects we have.

Mr. Beatty stated there are 500 roads in the program. He further stated there is \$45 million in the referendum and we are going to resurface as many roads as possible with the \$45 million. The roads will be paved from worst to first.

Mr. N. Jackson stated any additional costs should be able to be taken from the road maintenance fee.

Mr. Malinowski stated a few years ago each Council district had so much money for taking care of roads in their district. Because a project in his district was not done, there was a balance for his district. Part of the balance was used to put a road in by the Ballentine Community Center and there is still a balance. He suggested taking the funds from the balance in his district.

Mr. Edwards inquired with it being a change order over the \$10,000 that the County Administrator is eligible to approve would it need to be approved by Council.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if it was in the ordinance that it was approved.

Mr. Edwards stated it was in the ordinance.

Mr. Manning stated if it is in the ordinance, whoever has the power per the ordinance to make the decision is who makes the decision. If it is Council then the Administrator cannot make it. If it is the Administrator then the Administrator makes it and not Council.

Mr. Livingston stated Council has to approve the bid.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council to approve the \$30,000 to correct the sub base issues. The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. **PROGRAM INTERNS: OVERVIEW** – Mr. Beatty stated the Penny Program has had 49 interns. There are currently 7 active. These are paid positions. They focus extensively on Richland County residents and Richland County schools. This was received as information.

11. **POLICY DECISION: ORDINANCE CHANGE/PROJECT PRIORITIZATION** – Mr. Manning stated this item is before the committee per the discussion at the October 23rd work session.

Mr. Livingston stated Council keeps screaming about project overruns because they are based on estimates from way back. We need to decide, as a Council, how we are going to deal with those project overruns and quite complaining about them because we cannot control that.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we need the Legal Department in on the discussions to let us know what we can do and how we can do it. He suggested holding this in committee and have Legal provide information for the committee to review prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Livingston stated to also find out if the Transportation staff and the PDT have any suggestions.

Mr. Edwards inquired as to what would be helpful for them to provide (i.e. cost estimates).

Mr. Livingston stated what would be helpful to him is for each category to show, based on projections, what we can do before we run out of money.

Mr. Beatty stated, to date, the entire program has been designed to budget for all of the categories with the exception of the widenings and technically the intersections. Some of the intersections are over and others are under. The key for Council to consider is the widenings have increased the costs. The special projects have been managed cost constrained.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the estimates were done approximately 2 years prior to the referendum being passed.

Mr. Beatty stated there is a significant change from the 2012 estimates to 2017.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the contracts were developed about 2 years after the referendum passed. It is his understanding those contracts have been negotiated.

Mr. Beatty stated the Parsons Brinkerhoff estimates did a price per mile and added an assumed amount for design, utilities, right-of-way and inspections. Then they added a 15% contingency to the estimate, which was the amount placed on the ballot.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the cost of oil in 2012 was very high, but now it is lower. Has the costs gone up significantly?

Mr. Beatty stated the PB studies used approximately \$5.7 million per mile for a 5-lane road and \$3.3 million for 3-lane road. Today a 5-lane road is approximately \$8.0 million, which is why the numbers are so much larger. The original PB studies did not have as much information as we have today. For example, when they estimated Pineview and Atlas they did not account for 2 railroads on each project, which added costs to the projects.

Mr. N. Jackson requested the cost per mile to build a 5-lane road.

Mr. Livingston stated it would be helpful to look at the projected costs on each of the widenings. If you continue with the widenings in the sequence they are in now, where will you run out of money? And what widenings you would not be able to do. Also, if you were to limit the widening to the exact amount allocated, how much road will you be able to complete?

Ms. Myers stated she has a paralegal who has been providing comparative information for other places where they are doing projects similar to what the County is doing. When theirs went into effect, what the estimates were compared to what the actuals were. She would like to see comparative information regarding the County's program. She stated other people have done it without the wild overruns we are seeing. She inquired as to what is driving the increased costs and what the difference is in what we were given and where we are now. In addition, she would like the projections that Mr. Livingston is requesting and what you think we can buy. As a separate question, we are designing to budget everything but the larger projects. The question is, if that is the case, are there cost savings we are ignoring. It may well be that we could realize some savings that could be put back into the bigger projects which are running short on money.

Mr. Livingston stated that becomes part of the legal question because the legal question is going to be if the referendum said "x" amount can I do less than that amount.

Ms. Myers stated we have done more, so obviously we can do it. We have not followed the referendum so that clearly has not been a constraint.

Mr. Malinowski stated the companies know about the Penny Tax, so is the price being inflated. He stated he would like to see a cost comparison to D. R. Horton, Essex Home, Mungo Co., etc. and what they are paying for it.

Mr. Beatty stated they have pulled sample DOT prices for other DOT projects.

Mr. Malinowski stated those are also government projects versus a private projects. He believes they are inflating all of the government prices.

Mr. N. Jackson stated DOT standards are different depending on what you are building (county or state road).

Mr. Malinowski stated the cost of a load of concrete should cost everyone the same price.

Mr. Beatty stated they may not be able to get that because the private companies may not tell us what they are paying for roads.

Mr. Manning stated per the work session held in October, the discussion before the committee is ordinance change and project prioritization. Mr. Livingston does not believe we can discuss this without legal being present at the meeting.

11(a). **PDT UPDATE** – Mr. Beatty provided hard copies of the most recent monthly report to the committee members.

- Hardscrabble and Leesburg Roads – Richland County's funding is capped to the referendum amount. How the DOT manages those projects and if those projects overrun, Richland County will not be responsible for any additional funds.
- Bids were opened on Wednesday, November 8, for 3 sidewalk projects
- Potentially advertising for another resurfacing project on November 16th. In the range of \$1.3 - \$1.7 million.

- Multiple procurement packages are being finalized
- Additional 2 dirt road packages will be put out in the near future
- Candlewood Neighborhood Plan Phase 1, which is a group of sidewalks, will be advertised within the month
- Pedestrian improvement projects are being prepared and procured
- Broad River Neighborhood Project is being prepared
- Pellham, Tryon, Magnolia and Schoolhouse Sidewalks are being prepared to be advertised within the next 4 – 6 weeks
- Clemson Road Widening – finalized all design, permitting and right-of-way; outstanding non-consequential permit issue with the County and the City waterline remains an issue
- Management of “Shared Use Paths” is an outstanding issue with the DOT which will affect the program. Transportation and PDT staff are working with the DOT to get resolution.

Mr. Manning requested Mr. Beatty to explain what a “Shared Use Path” is.

Mr. Beatty stated DOT normally provides accommodations for people to ride their bicycles or for people to walk is to add 4-ft. lane between the curb and gutter and the vehicle lane. Some of the County’s projects are combining the bike path and the sidewalk by constructing a 10-ft. concrete path, which is called a “Shared Use Path”. The standards say you need approximately 3-5 feet between the curb and gutter and the path. The DOT came back to the County and said that is different and they do not want to maintain that. They have asked the County to perhaps maintain the 10-foot or maintain the 3-5 feet grass strip. This issue is outstanding and could impact a number of projects.

Ms. Myers inquired about the distance for the Atlas Road and Clemson Road projects.

Mr. Beatty stated approximately 2.8 miles for Atlas Road and 2.0 for Clemson Road.

Mr. Manning inquired if they had the Shared Use Path.

Mr. Beatty stated Clemson Road has the Shared Use Path, but Atlas does not.

Ms. Myers inquired about what accounts for the difference in price. She stated she was looking at the length and specs on both of them.

Mr. Beatty stated the PB study did not adequately estimate Atlas and Pineview. The numbers were a little bit low based on what they provided the County.

Ms. Myers stated she is looking at the comparison between what’s been done on Clemson Road and what’s been done on Atlas Road. It appears to her that we are doing similar jobs on these roads. And the current numbers are wildly different numbers.

Mr. Malinowski stated the utilities show such a huge disparity.

Mr. Beatty stated the primary difference between the projects is that Clemson has 2 pipe crossings and very wide existing right-of-way and Atlas is ½ mile longer and there are 2 railroad crossings which cost approximately \$1 million each.

Mr. Manning inquired as to the status of the discussions with DOT regarding the “Shared Use Path.” He also stated that he lives 2 blocks off of North Trenholm and he would never ride nor allow his children to ride a bicycle in the bike lane. He stated it is unbelievable they call that a bike lane like someone would ride in, which people do with mirrors, etc. Then they put up white bikes when someone dies riding in these bike lanes. Therefore, we need to come up with some resolve or give up on talking about being a livable City/County where someone would want to do anything but drive a vehicle.

Mr. Beatty stated the decision that Council is going to need to make is if the DOT says they will maintain the 10-ft. concrete path, but will not maintain the 3-ft. grass strip, will the County be willing to commit to go out there and periodically and weed eat the grass.

Mr. Manning inquired if pebbles can be put in the 3-ft. strip instead of grass.

Mr. Beatty stated pebbles could be placed there, but the funds to do so would come from the penny. There may also be projects that are strictly a Shared Use Path project. For example, the entire Polo Road project is to construct a Shared Use Path. The PDT will provide additional information on this matter.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the DOT changed from their original agreement.

Mr. Beatty stated they did not change. The issue is that we are 3 years into the program and they have been reviewing the County’s plans. About 6 months ago, DOT wrote a letter and stated they were not going to maintain those and our question was why didn’t you tell us that 2 ½ years ago.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there was a 10-ft. Shared Use Path included in the Southeast Richland Neighborhood Project and he inquired if that was going to come to Council separate.

Mr. Edwards stated there will be a maintenance agreement developed by DOT.

Mr. Beatty stated it is cheaper to construct the “Shared Use Paths” versus the 4-ft. bike lane and 5-ft. sidewalk. And it would also be cheaper to maintain long-term, but it is different than what the DOT is used to and they do not want to maintain something different. Therefore, the answer has been no.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the Highway Commission has anything to do with the decision.

Mr. Beatty stated he does not know that the question has been pressed to them, but he does not believe at this point the Commission has been made aware. He does know the DOT changed their policy 10 years ago to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Ms. Myers requested supporting documentation where the projects have overruns.

13. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately at 4:00 p.m.