



Richland County Council  
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 29, 2018 – 1:30 PM  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Tony Edwards, Michael Niermeier, Shawn Salley, Nathaniel Miller, Angela McCallum, Melissa Watts, Sandra Yudice, Jamelle Ellis, and Beverly Harris

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30 PM
2. **ELECTION OF CHAIR** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to nominate Mr. C. Jackson for Chair. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. C. Jackson thanked his colleagues for the opportunity to Chair one of the most, if not the most, important ad hoc committee and responsibility Council has. He is excited to be able to make sure one of the largest ongoing project in the County gets the kind of appropriate attention and support it needs in order for it to continue to be successful. He is going to take the experience he has learned from watching Mr. Livingston do his work as Chairman of the Economic Development Committee and the temperament of Ms. McBride as she has deliberated through some tough issues, particularly the feline issue. He plans to vigorously defend and support the facts as they are. He is a strong believer in allowing all sides of an issue to be heard. He does not believe in formulating and making a decision based upon limited information. He would like for us, as an ad hoc committee, to exhaust all of the information that is available to us before we then make appropriate recommendations and decisions. He also wants to make sure we resurrect what Council voted on and approved last year. And that is, to make sure there is a monthly reporting of the project, specifically by the PDT, to full Council. It was moved, seconded and approved. He thinks it happened once. Since that time it has not occurred. In part, because he is not sure anyone forced that issue. He is going to make sure we force that issue and full Council gets to hear all of the things that are going on, on a regular basis. Before it gets to full Council, he is going to make sure, as an ad hoc committee, we get to hear, see and vet all of the information, as it relates to all of the work that is ongoing and talk about the work that is not going. He wants to be clear about his role and expectations, so there is no misunderstanding or misgivings about the level of involvement he plans to have and take in this critical effort. We are about to embark on a second effort, the Richland Renaissance, that is equally as important and significant. With that effort, there is multiple meetings and discussion about the process and multiple concerns about the process. It was interesting, he was in a workshop last week and there was a lengthy discussion regarding the role Council should play in the operations of that project. He was one of those that felt that was not appropriate for us to do. So, it is sort of ironic, in this effort, where he thinks there is much more valid reason for our becoming much more intimately involved in the operation. And, in the Richland Renaissance, he is going to make sure he does

Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 29, 2018

everything he can, with the support of his colleagues, to make that happen. With that, he wants everyone to understand that going in, so that you won't be surprised at how he operates, as it relates to his expectations.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. December 5, 2017 – Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **CANDLEWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AWARD RECOMMENDATION** – Mr. Edwards stated the item before the committee is an award memo on the Candlewood Neighborhood Improvement Project. It was bid back in January and AOS Specialty came back as the lowest, responsive bidder at \$399,966.20. Staff recommends approval of this item.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's recommendation to award the contract to AOS Specialty Contractors in the amount of \$399,966.20.

Mr. Livingston inquired why it took so long for this item to get to the committee.

Mr. Edwards stated we have been coordinating with the Budget Department on cleaning the overall budget of the program and it took a while, but it has been straightened up in some areas. As far as the Neighborhood Improvements and the Special Projects Category, we are somewhat fiscally side in that area to move forward with construction on Candlewood.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **PDT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE** – Mr. Beaty distributed a brief overview update and the February Monthly Report, which contains all of the active projects being worked on.

Design Update:

- **Clemson Road** – 100% Complete, as far as design, right-of-way, and permitting. We have a City of Columbia waterline being reviewed by the City, but we do not expect any significant comments. It should not delay advertising the project. SCDOT is reviewing the bid document because there are Federal funds. He does not expect any significant comments. A tentative advertisement date is July 2018. The one critical issue is a shared-use path maintenance agreement that will be required between the County and the SCDOT.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to where we are with the shared-use path maintenance agreement.

Mr. Beaty stated that is another agenda item he will get to later. It is something that Council needs to review and take action on.

- **Atlas Road** – The plans are about 95% done. Some of the significant issues is railroad coordination. There are 2 railroad crossings that take a lot of time and energy to get done. We need to start

designing a City of Columbia water and sewer line. We are finalizing the scope and fee, but the design may be critical path. Atlas Road Widening is expected to be advertised late this calendar year.

- **Southeast Richland Neighborhood Project** – The final plans are coming in Monday or Tuesday. At that point, the plans will be turned into the SCDOT for them to do their final review and comments while the PDT prepares the bid package.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he understood this project was changed from what was presented to the community and it was not brought to this committee. At a matter of fact, Item #7 on the agenda addresses that also.'

Mr. Beaty stated the Southeast Richland Neighborhood Master Plan was presented to the public on 2 different occasions. Early on in the process, County staff and PDT coordinated with Schneider Electric, who has a plant along Garners Ferry. There was interest in improving their access point, or providing another access point to Schneider, if we coordinate it with the Southeast Richland Neighborhood Project. A new location road is what we call the Rabbit Run connector. It will come from Rabbit Run and tie into Garners Ferry right next to the sports complex. It will be a new road parallel to Lower Richland, but towards the sports complex. Initially, we were looking at lining up the new Rabbit Run connector with a new driveway access road to Schneider Electric, so they could have a better ingress/egress point tied in with the Rabbit Run connector. Initially, the traffic study showed it warranted a new signal. They presented that to the public with a new signal and this proposed connector road. As the SCDOT reviewed the traffic report, they did not feel using projected development would be enough to warrant the signal. The SCDOT is hesitant to allow Richland County to put in a signal, at this point. There was also a concern raised by County legal staff regarding working with a private property owner to coordinate between public and private funds. Because of those 2 concerns, the project was changed. The Rabbit Run connector will still tie into Garners Ferry and form a "T-intersection" and there will not be a connector over to Schneider, as currently designed.

Mr. N. Jackson stated initially it was supposed to line up with Century Oaks Road. One property owner was against it and he mentioned it to Council sometime back. His concern is there was a fatal accident at Schneider on Saturday and there were 2 people from the activity center that got hit 2 weeks ago. He and Tony Edwards had a meeting with Schneider and their concern is they do not want any more blood on their hands. They do not want to relocate, but it is such a dangerous access to the major road that they are thinking about that. Whenever we do economic development, and we are bringing business into Richland County, we find some way to help and bring them here. Now they are here and it like you are already here we won't help you. He remembered with the BMW plant they built an access road and everything to just bring economic development. When legal is going to make a statement that they are concerned or it may look...he is just concerned about safety. If we tie it to Century Oaks Road and Schneider build their own road that could work. He would welcome their staff to meet with the committee. He met with their staff and SCDOT this morning. They were concerned about the traffic light and how the traffic study was done. They are willing to meet with County staff and PDT. Schneider Electric said they will pay to build whatever needs to be done. He thinks it is worth exploring any possibility. When a company is talking about leaving or relocating because they do not want any more blood on their hands he has concern. He has concern for the safety on the road also.

Mr. Edwards stated the consensus from the meeting was that we go back and revisit the traffic

study with the PDT to make sure that all the possible traffic scenarios were covered.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to where Dr. Thompson was.

Mr. Edwards stated he got word he was not going to be able to attend today.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he assumed Mr. Edwards was going to take the lead to make sure that happens.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if we need a motion for Council to ask him to go or how do we do it.

Mr. C. Jackson stated they had one meeting without us.

Mr. Livingston stated they proceeded forward with it.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he would ask they report back at the next ad hoc committee meeting.

Ms. McBride inquired if this will impact the advertising.

Mr. Edwards stated it potentially could impact the advertising.

Ms. McBride stated we are looking at a delay now if we have the additional meeting.

Mr. Beaty stated he would propose, for your consideration, allow us to proceed with the project without the signal and Schneider so we can get a good bid for the contractor. We go through the normal procurement process. We do not delay because there is a flooding issue on Rabbit Run. This new connector would relieve traffic from Lower Richland. The time that it takes to get the SCDOT approval and get procurement worked out. He requested the committee to consider allowing them to proceed with the project while they go down the simultaneous path. We can add any changes to the projects.

- **Greene Street Phase 2** – This is the new project over the railroad. The design is essentially complete. Right-of-Way is about 50% complete. There is a couple of major issues with right-of-way that has impacted the project dealing with a USC facility's building and the railroads themselves is a challenge.

Mr. Ott requested Mr. Beaty to remind the committee about the negotiations with the University of South Carolina.

Mr. Beaty stated by building a new bridge over the railroad you have got to get up so high to get over the railroad and have vertical clearance. When we do that, we are going build walls along the edge of the roadway as you go up. Whereas, if we just built dirt fill material the slopes would go really far out. Even with building up with walls, we are going to be impacting the use of a USC facilities building, which is located adjacent to the project. The subject of compensation that is to be paid to the University has been batted around for a couple of years now. It has not gone into condemnation yet, but the County's outside lawyers are assisting. That is a major item that is going to affect the project. The other right-of-way issues are rather straightforward. There is a State Credit Union and a couple other properties. Then we are working across the street of Huger, which is the undeveloped Guinyard properties. We are getting our drainage outfall because we have to

cross Huger and eventually drain into the river. We are working with that right-of-way aspect, as we speak. We hope the Guinyard Family will be able to work with us over the next few weeks.

- **Decker/Woodfield Neighborhood Improvement Design** – It was authorized about a week ago. Part of the design is going to be moving forward now.

Ms. McBride requested more information regarding the improvement design.

Mr. Beaty stated they broke it up into 2 pieces. The first one they could get under contract quicker and get the construction quicker would be placing sidewalks on either side of Richland Northeast. Then a new pedestrian pathway over to the Chatsworth neighborhood. Those 3 improvements are relatively straightforward. That is why they got them under design now, so they can get going. The other portion of the neighborhood improvement is going to repaving all of Decker Boulevard. Looking at some minor intersection improvements where we can add pedestrian crossings, streetscaping, etc. They are also going to look at how much undergrounding or changing of utilities could be done. They have just now gotten the design fees negotiated and presented that to County staff for review and approval.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, they were authorized to proceed with design on March 21, 2018. He inquired at what point they were ready to proceed with design.

Mr. Beaty stated they completed the contract negotiations 2 – 3 months that it took to get executed.

Mr. Livingston stated normally after that you are ready to move forward to design.

Mr. Beaty stated they would give the design firm a notice to proceed the same or next day.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to what month it was completed.

Mr. Beaty responded probably early – mid January.

#### Construction Update:

- **Shop Road Extension Phase I** – The floorless culvert is complete. They have begun paving and will be completed by approximately June 1<sup>st</sup>. The first 1,000 feet from Pineview will give access to the China Jushi plant.
- **North Main Street Widening** – Most of the work to date has been burying utilities. If you travel that road, it is all torn up. Mr. Beaty is glad to be criticized for too much construction. SCE&G is about 80% done. The Joint Use Duct Bank is 50% complete. Sewer rehab is 75% and they have started placing the stormwater pipe from the trestle back uphill toward Columbia.
- **3 Rivers Greenway** – Is about 15,000 ft. long and parallels the Saluda River behind the Riverbanks Zoo; 12,000 ft. of concrete pathway has been placed. About 13 individual boardwalk sections have been constructed. The most high profile location is the rapids. That is where we will have the high-level boardwalk where you will be able to walk under the boardwalk to access the rapids. There is going to be a parking lot and bathroom facilities constructed.

Mr. Livingston inquired if Mr. Beaty was referring to Phase II.

Mr. Beaty stated that is really Phase I, which is going to take up a lot of the original referendum budget. There will be some budget remaining. The River Alliance has a completely separate project. They are going to build a bridge over part of the Saluda to an island called Boyd Island. The goal will be for this project to terminate, but the River Alliance is actively building their own project, which will tie to our project and have a bridge to a large island. As you travel over I-126 and look down there will be an access point to the large island. The next phase of the 3 Rivers Greenway would be to come under the I-126 bridge and go upstream up the Broad and eventually build another bridge over the Broad to the canal. Then you would be connected from the City of Columbia all the way up to I-26. There is not adequate funding to do the construction, so that will be something for Council to decide upon. If we can partner with the River Alliance and use the available funding to do the design or any right-of-way, but that would a future decision of Council.

- **Transportation Improvement Contract 1** – Out of the 19 dirt roads 10 have been paved. The other 9 have some level of work going on.

Construction Award Update:

- **Candlewood Neighborhood Improvement** – Took action on at ad hoc meeting.
- **S-7 Sidewalk Project (Magnolia, Bratton, Grand)** – This is a sidewalk package they opened bids on November 15, 2017. Typically, a contractor's bids are required to be held for a 120 days. At which point, the contractor can walk away or if asked they can hold them again. Since it has been greater than 120 days, we did ask the contractor if they would be willing to hold their bids for 30 more days, which runs through April 15, 2018. It is Mr. Beaty's understanding that in the sidewalk category there are not available funds to authorize to award this project. His request to Council is do we tell this contractor, no thank you. They gave good bids that were below the engineer's estimate. Do we ask them to continue holding their price or can the funds be made available to award the project.

Mr. Edwards stated they are working with the Budget Department to get the budgets fiscally sound.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to who they need to speak to in order to get an answer. He stated the bids are going to be held for 2 more weeks and after that it is dead.

Mr. Edwards stated he was hoping to have this rectified by now, but he's not exactly sure.

Mr. N. Jackson stated his concern is how this project got to a point where it was bid and there was no funding to complete it.

Mr. Beaty stated, as far as he knows, they went through the normal process where the projects were designed, reviewed, and approved. They put together a bid package and submitted it to County staff. It was approved. They were allowed to advertise for construction. They received bids and recommended award right after that. He does not know how it came about that it could not be awarded.

Mr. Edwards stated prior to that the budget was thought to be there.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, so there is some confusion or misunderstanding of the budget.

Dr. Yudice stated the issue with the budget is about the phantom budget that was set up at the beginning of the program. The budget staff is trying to align the revenue we currently have with the budgets for the projects for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if Dr. Yudice could let them know about this looming April 15<sup>th</sup> deadline.

Dr. Yudice stated Mr. Beaty asked if they can request the vendor to extend the proposal. If they can do that, that will help.

Mr. Beaty stated they have done that once already, which takes us to April 15<sup>th</sup>. They can always go back to the vendor and ask again if they choose to honor their bids, but the risk you take there is their suppliers may not hold their bids for 4 – 5 months at a time.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is concerned about what has changed with this process. He is hearing there is not enough money in the specific budget, but when we first considered the Penny Tax Program we were going to build as we go. We initially decided to do a \$40 million bond to build as much project, as quickly as possible. The annual budget is whatever is available. Now he is hearing we have a specific budget. For example, if he has \$100 million and it is used up, we will have to wait until the following year when another budget is released. That was not the intent when we started the project. Council will have to consider any changes that has been made and how it will affect the initial intent of the Penny Tax Program.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, what he heard Dr. Yudice say was as a result of some other issues with the budget that would not necessarily be a part of the penny allocations. Those problems are now trying to be resolved, which has increased the delay.

Dr. Yudice stated it is not a delay. We have to align current expenditures with the current revenues through the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the reason their funds are not already identified, is what? That is Mr. N. Jackson's question.

Dr. Yudice stated the funds are there, but we need to align the purchase orders that have been encumbered already. There is more encumbrances than revenue.

Mr. C. Jackson stated so it may require Council enact the bond money that we approved.

Dr. Yudice stated we are still working on SCDOR on the guidelines. Once the Circuit Court makes a decision, it is up to Council to release that funding. Right now it would require action to do that.

Mr. Livingston stated to get some action and information, he would like to make a motion to refer this item to the next Council meeting. That would be before the 15 days, which would allow Council some time to do what need to do with it.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to refer this item to the next Council meeting.

Ms. McBride stated she talked with Dr. Thompson about this. This Magnolia Schoolhouse Road. She was assured the funding would be available, so she is really concerned.

Mr. Beaty stated, just like Package S-7, Magnolia is in the sidewalk category. If there is not available funding for S-7, he does not expect there to be available funding for Magnolia Schoolhouse since it is in the same category.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he is being told by Dr. Yudice that the issue is being addressed by Finance and what we have on the floor now is a motion by Mr. Livingston, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to discuss this item on this coming Tuesday.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

#### Procurement Update:

- **Dirt Road Packages G and H** – Actively working with County staff to advertise within next 2 weeks
- **Pedestrian Intersections** – Push buttons and crosswalks that exist in intersections
- **Resurfacing Package O** – Anticipate advertising in 2 weeks
- **Magnolia/Schoolhouse Sidewalks** – Pending funding availability, this will be ready to advertise within the next 2 weeks.
- **Broad River Neighborhood Improvement** – This project has been completed. The procurement package is being reviewed by SCDOT
- **Pelham/Tryon Sidewalks** – The sidewalk package has a couple months before completion.
- **Southeast Richland Neighborhood Improvement** – Anticipate advertising within next 3 months

Shared-Use Paths: A number of projects in the program have a shared-use path. It is a 10-ft. wide concrete pathway, which serves the purpose for pedestrians and bicyclists to be able to use the facility. A lot of times SCDOT accommodates bicycles by having a 4-ft. wide lane next to traffic and a 5-ft. wide sidewalk. These shared-use paths replace the 4-ft. bikeway and the 5-ft. sidewalk with the 10-ft. concrete sidewalk. The SCDOT considers that not normal maintenance. If you looked in your IGA it says the SCDOT will perform any normal maintenance. So what the SCDOT has offered is, they will maintain the 10-ft. shared-use pathway, but they are going require Richland County maintain the grass strip between the back of the curb and the shared-use path. Behind the shared-use path there is 2 more feet of dirt before we do a shoulder break. The SCDOT has provided these “Shared-Use Path Maintenance Agreements” that spell that out. We will negotiate with SCDOT on the specifics of the agreement. Richland will have to sign this agreement before SCDOT will allow construction on their facility.

Mr. Beaty provided a memo to the committee that outlined the costs with the different options for the shared-use path. He noted the memo has not gone to the County’s legal staff for review. This will be a schedule critical item to advertise Clemson Road and the Southeast Richland Neighborhood.

Mr. Livingston inquired if this was a MOU sent to Dr. Thompson on March 9<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Beaty stated the memo was provided to Dr. Thompson on March 9<sup>th</sup>. There are some email correspondence in the back of the packet showing how we got this point.

Mr. Livingston stated at the next Council meeting the Transportation Department needs to give a report on the shared-use paths.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to have the Transportation Department give a report regarding the shared-use paths at the next Council meeting.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, when Mr. Beaty is saying 2 options, he is referring to the SCDOT Standard Option and the Shared- Use Path.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he remembers SCDOT had a standard design for bike lanes. Then with the shared-path the concern was people walking, but people riding a bike and speeding on the shared walkway. Sometimes it causes problems because people think it is a path they are walking and the bike is trying use it. SCDOT is make a separate bike path lane in their new designs. If he had to make a decision he would support something like that.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Beaty stated if Council were to decide to go back to the normal SCDOT way of having 4-ft. of asphalt between the vehicles and the curb and a 5-ft. sidewalk, it would greatly increase the cost to Richland County and extend the schedule 6 – 9 months to make that change. The reason is today Clemson Road design has the 12-ft. outside vehicular travel lane and 2-ft. curb and gutter. Then a 5-ft. strip of grass and a 10-ft. pathway. If we were to change it and go back to how Trenholm Road is designed, we would have to take the 12-ft. lane and curb and gutter and move the curb and gutter out 4 feet. So we would have to construct 8 more feet, 4 on each side, of asphalt. Even though bicycles would be over there, we still have to build the full depth of asphalt. Then you would have 5-ft. of sidewalk on each side. If we changed it, we would have 10-ft. of sidewalk and 8 more feet of roadway versus 20-ft. of concrete of sidewalk. The cost would great increase. We would have to redesign it by moving the drainage out 4-ft. you have to redesign a lot of the drainage. Then the construction costs would go up extensively.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if it is already designed.

Mr. Beaty stated Clemson Road is already designed. If we were to go back, it is a 6 – 9 month delay. The construction costs would go up 7 figures, at least.

Mr. Livingston stated we are comparing an increased construction cost with a maintenance cost over time. Which is going to outweigh the other one? The maintenance cost will not be that much to cut the grass.

Mr. Edwards suggested coordinating with the PDT and Public Works to get an “apples to apples” comparison on what it would cost for the County to maintain the grass strip versus what it would cost for the redesign. That way we can present it to you and you can see the differences and make a call off of that.

Mr. Beaty stated they can run it by Public Works and get them to comment.

Ms. McBride inquired if there was a safety issue involved in Mr. N. Jackson’s comments.

Mr. Edwards stated there is a shared-use path on Rabbit Run, but as far as Clemson Road there is not a safety issue.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he does not want to see a 9 month delay in what has already been delayed, in his honest opinion far too long.

Mr. Ott stated, in a former life, Chairman C. Jackson was involved with the School Board and we had a lot of conversations about the safety of children from the Summit going over to the new Richland Public Library behind the Village of Sandhills. Part of that was kids having access to that. A lot of them are going to ride their bikes and we did not think it was a safe situation to have children riding a bike adjacent to traffic. The shared-use pathway was a safer alternative than putting children with cars.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he can see that with a community where there is a school that is using it. A major road, SCDOT's standard design is how it is.

Mr. Edwards stated when you take the bikes out of the road and put them on the sidewalk with the pedestrians that creates another conflict point between the cyclists and the people walking.

Ms. McBride stated, in her past life, she was in highway and pedestrian safety.

Mr. Beaty requested the Shared-Use Path memos be forwarded to legal, if there is a legal review required.

Mr. Edwards stated that was done a few days ago. Legal would like for Council to make a decision before they review the language in the agreement. According to them, the language does not matter. They need the functionality of the agreement to be made and then adopt the agreement.

PDT 3-6-18 Memo – Widening Categorical Recommendations to Align Program with Available Funding:

As you recall, the PDT quarterly updates the estimate of the entire program. The current estimate of the entire program is \$140 million greater than the referendum. He is not going to use the word overrun in this case because an overrun is once you have gone to construction and things change. You overran what you committed. He is only providing you that the cost of asphalt is greater today than it was when the referendum passed. So, the current estimate is \$140 million over the referendum.

Mr. Beaty provided a handout that addresses how we handle the \$140 million funding shortfall. He had his staff take 2 looks at it. What if you approached each project as if you were going to be constricted to the referendum amount for that individual project? One project may only have "X" million while my estimate is twice that much. Well, what can we get for the referendum money? A few of the projects you can get something of value, but a few of the projects you cannot get a full value for the money. We went through that on each project and showed that...

Mr. C. Jackson requested Mr. Beaty to repeat himself.

Mr. Beaty stated if we limited ourselves to the money available for Atlas Road. The referendum amount for Atlas Road was \$17.6 million. Our current estimate is almost \$42 million. There are a number of reasons why today's dollars are greater than the referendum amount. One approach that you could take is, what if you lived within your means on every roadway widening project and all you had to construct for Atlas Road was \$17.6 million. If you started at Garners Ferry, you couldn't even get to Shop Road for \$17 million. If we were instructed to build that, the SCDOT would probably tell us no. It would not serve a purpose just to carry folks on 5 lanes and drop them right back down to 2 before you get to a logical termini. For Atlas Road you couldn't get a project of value for the referendum amount. You are already going to be making improvements at the intersection with Shop. You could take the \$17.6 million and do some improvements

at Garners Ferry, but that is not his recommendation. The other alternative would be construct as much as you can of the entire program.

The way the whole program has been developed so far, all of the categories to stay within the referendum amount. So each individual neighborhood we are designing to budget. Whatever was in the referendum for the Southeast Richland Neighborhood, is what we are designing to. The Broad River Neighborhood...the resurfacing only has \$40 million. We are not going overrun that \$40 million. Dirt roads has \$45 million. The intersection group has 15 intersections and the referendum amount for all of them was \$42.3 million. We have designed all of those intersections that together will come in at that \$42 million. Some have been over. Some have been under, but the net of the intersections is \$42 million. Really the overruns is in the widenings. That is where the costs are greater than the referendum. To this point, the estimates Mr. Beaty is giving the committee are on the full project because Council has not changed any projects. His memorandum looked at how you could get the most bang for your buck. There are 3 projects that will be affected under his recommendation. The I-20/Broad River Interchange is a part of the SCDOT's Carolina Crossroads project. The referendum had \$52.5 for I-20/Broad River Road Interchange. That interchange must be constructed as part of the Carolina Crossroads project, which is fully funded by the State at \$1.5 billion. He would expect the SCDOT to write the County a letter and say, "Richland County would like to give us your \$52.5 million." If Council decides to remain silent or tell them thank you, but no. The SCDOT will have to replace that interchange when they build Carolina Crossroads. You cannot replace I-26 to I-20 without replacing I-20/Broad River Road, so if Council chooses to recognize that as \$52.5 million savings in the program, you can.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the funding is provided in the STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program)

Mr. Beaty stated the legislature has passed \$1.5 million for the entire project.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it is his understanding if the County builds a State road that funding was in the available in the STIP, the State will reimburse the County. He requested that staff investigate this because that is a lot of money the County should be getting back. Even the Shop Road Extension Phase II is in the STIP. He was not sure where the funding is for that, but there was \$50 million in STIP for Phase I.

Mr. Beaty stated the estimates are \$140 million over. You could recognize the I-20 Broad River Road Interchange as a savings of \$52.5 million. When Shop Road Extension is built all the way out to Garners Ferry Road, Shop Road Extension will basically act as a bypass. If you are coming from Sumter and want to go to Columbia you will turn left off of Garners Ferry near Trotter and get on Shop Road Extension. The Central Midlands planning shows when Shop Road is built there will be less using Pineview in 20 years. Travel will decrease on Pineview once Shop Road Extension is built. The current estimate for Pineview is \$40 million. We can spend \$40 million on a project that will carry less traffic than it does today.

Mr. Edwards inquired if that was once Phase I and II is built.

Mr. Beaty stated that is correct. That is when Shop Road Phase II goes to Garners Ferry. Shop Road Phase I is under construction. It will be under construction for another year. They have had started the design of Shop Road Phase II. He is recommending additional design to start. That could be recognized as a \$40 million savings if Pineview were re-prioritized and delayed. Thirdly, Bluff Road Phase II, the remainder of Bluff Road. The referendum went from Rosewood to I-77. They have been describing it to S. Beltline because from S. Beltline to I-77 is already widened. They have already constructed Bluff Road Phase I. Then the University of South Carolina constructed the middle phase next to the stadium. Bluff Road Phase II would from Williams-Brice Stadium to S. Beltline. Bluff Road is already 4 lanes. At all of your major

intersections you have a red light with left turn lanes. The project would be adding the middle turn lane, where it is not already, and adding 10 ft. shared-use paths. What makes the project so expensive is the stormwater pipes will be excessively large. Then as you go from the stadium toward S. Beltline there is a small creek that runs under Bluff Road. To meet current SCDOT Design Standards, they are going to have to replace the culvert and raise the grade of the road 5 – 7 ft. It will not improve capacity in it. It will only prevent it overtopping periodically.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, that none of that was done after the 2015 flood when they went back and re-did that culvert.

Mr. Beaty stated that is correct. The estimate for the rest of Bluff Road is \$40 million. Richland County could spend \$40 million and you would not really improve traffic or safety. The County would provide shared-use paths and raise the grade over the creek towards S. Beltline. He does not recommend the County do that. He recommends deferring the rest of Bluff Road Phase II. He stated \$40 million (Pineview), \$40 million (Bluff Road Phase II) and \$52.5 million (I-20/Broad River) = \$132.5 million. All of the construction estimates include a 10% contingency, so there is \$15 - \$20 million they may never spend, which could cover the shortfall between \$130 - \$140 million. There is one more project where they could make change, which is Spears Creek Church Road. The referendum goes from Percival all the way to Two Notch. The County would be widening Spears Creek Church Road in that little short section between Percival Road and the interstate, but you would be replacing the SCDOT interstate bridge. The County would be responsible for removal of the I-20 bridge and constructing back a 5 lane bridge over the interstate and taking care of the on/off ramps up and down I-20. He would recommend letting the SCDOT pay for that and skip over the I-20 bridge to where the frontage roads are. Then you go all the way from there to Two Notch Road and construct all of that 5 lanes.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to who is doing I-77 where it merges into I-20 now.

Mr. Beaty stated the SCDOT is. The short summary of the provided memo is: Pineview is not needed from a traffic and safety point. The rest of Bluff Road Widening you will be getting very little return on investment if you spent \$40 million. If the County does nothing, the I-20/Broad River Road Interchange will be constructed by the SCDOT. As we get into the final design, we could modify Spears Creek to make up any shortfall.

Mr. N. Jackson stated a lot of these things we partnered with SCDOT on was because of the gasoline tax. They were trying to find a way to do these projects that were needed. It was on their radar and now they have the gasoline tax. The State has some funding to do what they needed to do now. He thinks we should revisit some of these things and make sure SCDOT does not have the County doing what they are supposed to be doing. Those are State roads, even though they are in the County, we need to revisit those things to make sure we can have some savings.

Ms. McBride stated she was thinking about the Supreme Court findings and the referendum. She inquired if we can these types of adjustments or would it have to go through Legal to make the adjustments. She also stated as she processed what Mr. Beaty said, it makes a lot of sense, but she wondered why this was a part of the referendum at the time it was planned.

Mr. Beaty stated at the time of the referendum, and even before, Carolina Crossroads (“Malfunction Junction”) was not funded. There was no plan, with any money, to fix “Malfunction Junction”, so whomever put the interchange on the referendum felt it was an appropriate act, at that time.

Mr. Ott stated this original planning was done back in 2008 – 2009, so that was when the budgets were set. When the first referendum failed, Parsons Brinkerhoff was retained to come back in and review the estimates they did for the 2010 referendum. They actually lowered some of the project estimates that went into to fund the 2012 referendum. That is the situation they are working from. Basically scopes of work and estimates done 9 years ago is what they are working with.

Mr. Livingston stated also during that time we did not have all the design work done and prices have changed.

Mr. Beaty stated in his memo he detailed each of the widenings and what is more complicated than what went into the original cost estimate. A lot of these widenings the original Parsons Brinkerhoff estimate only assumed so much per mile. Whether it was Clemson Road or Atlas Road. And Clemson Road and Atlas Road are very different, so there is a reason the costs have gone up. Not only do we have more work today. We have a better economy. Prices have gone up. There are also additional details that were left out of the Parsons Brinkerhoff study.

Ms. McBride stated she can understand the price adjustment.

Mr. Beaty stated to offer a little bit of input on Council taking action. These widenings were not put in any priority in the referendum. Council provided the criteria to prioritize and the PDT followed the criteria and we came up with 1 – 14. If Council elects to change their priority list, you could change your list and Pineview and Bluff Road widening will be moved to the bottom of the list. They can be directed to complete the rest of the projects. There is opportunity for outside funding. Is there money in the STIP? Can we get outside grants or awards? By moving them and re-prioritizing them, there is still the opportunity to get outside funding. A lot of work is yet to be done, so hopefully the bids will come in below our estimates on Clemson Road, Atlas Road, and Greene Street Phase II. They do not want to give up on the jobs, but he does recommend re-prioritizing them.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the last time we had this conversation, he remembers there was a debate about any changes needing 3 readings and a public hearing. He just wants to be sure we keep this on the radar. He stated he wished it was as simple as making a motion here and changing it.

#### Public Meetings:

Mr. Beaty stated they conducted a public meeting on Blythewood Road Widening last week. There are 3 additional public meetings scheduled:

- Crane Creek Neighborhood, April 19<sup>th</sup>, Forest Heights Elementary, 5:00 – 7:00 PM
- Clemson/Sparkleberry Intersection, April 30<sup>th</sup>, Spring Valley High School, 5:00 – 7:00 PM
- Shop Road Widening, May 17<sup>th</sup>, Olympia Learning Center, 5:00 – 7:00 PM

They have been directed due to the Supreme Court ruling to cease and desist their public involvement staff and their functions. They have complied with that. However, the engineers will still staff the public meetings and County Transportation staff will augment them in conducting the public meetings.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he had attended a couple of these public meetings. One of the first ones he attended was the one done on Atlas Road. As a result of the first public meeting, he gave some suggested for some changes for the 2<sup>nd</sup> one that included a presentation, which was not being done. He was informed there was not a formal presentation at the Blythewood Road Widening public meeting, which disappointed him. The

people coming out there expecting to see what he saw at Atlas Road and Spring Valley High School did not get that. It was left up to them to have sidebar conversations and that is not, in his opinion, the way we should be conducting these. Whether public engagement staff was doing it or someone else, we need to do a formal presentation so people will understand what they are looking at. The people do not even have the knowledge to be able to ask the appropriate question without the formal presentation. He would like the committee to support the idea of who ever does the public meeting there be a formal presentation.

Mr. Livingston stated he agreed. He received some of the same feedback.

Mr. Ott stated Richland County felt very strongly before this program started that public information was a valuable part of the program. That is the reason it was included in the PDT's contract. Numerous pages of the contract were related to this. Also, if there is any opportunity for Federal funding being involved in a project, such as Clemson Road, there are requirements that we have to meet to educate the public about the project, in order to be eligible for those Federal funds. Even though the Supreme Court has ruled, we still need to sit down and think about what is the scope going forward. For example, in Blythewood they were instructed not to do a presentation. Like Mr. C. Jackson, he thinks this is a valuable public information. It is a safety issue to the public. Whether the Penny pays for it or the County pays for it, there needs to be some understanding of what is going forward. We have been instructed after these 3 public meetings no more public meetings. Maybe we need to train the County staff to put on these meetings, but a conversation needs to take place.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he is very disappointed the Director of Transportation is not here because he had such an elaborate presentation presented to us a couple weeks ago about transitioning all of this stuff and bringing things in house. Yet now we have a situation where this piece of it, there seems to be no plan for what to do and we have public meetings scheduled going forward with no plan for how these meetings are going to be conducted. He would have loved to have heard from him in terms of how he is going to do the next one differently versus what happened at Blythewood. And, if there is an opportunity for existing staff or others to do it, then they need to be trained and brought up to speed. At a minimum, 1 or 2 of those people who were a part of the public information team with the PDT be brought on. Mr. Seals in "Restoring the Penny to Health" recommended the in house Public Information staff be ramped up. He wrote a note to Mr. Seals saying if we were to do that the people currently doing it be given first opportunity to be considered for those positions because they know what they are doing.

Ms. McBride stated she concurs with Mr. C. Jackson. Also, based on her limited research she knows there are Federal guidelines that require we get input from the citizens. Even though they are Federal guidelines, there are no County guidelines regarding that. With the ruling of the Supreme Court, we can continue, but not with the Penny tax. She agrees we need to have some kind of public involvement going on with this contract.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that is why in our response to the Supreme Court he urged the Legal team to include some advice from an engineer to make sure they understand that as a part of Federal funding you have to have these public meetings.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to strongly support the need for public involvement and come up with a way to continue to do that. The vote in favor was unanimous.

### 2017 Annual Report:

Mr. Beaty stated they had completed the 2017 Annual Report prior to the cease and desist from the County. A copy of the report was distributed to committee members for their review. He requested that the PDT be allowed to disseminate it. The County can put it on their website and made available to the public.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the report has been presented to staff.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to when.

Mr. Beaty stated it has been presented to them numerous times because there has been numerous drafts. They started in early January with a draft and then they went back and forth with comments from staff. The report has been completed for 3 – 4 weeks.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to what Mr. Beaty means by disseminate.

Mr. Beaty stated they currently have the program website, which has more than public involvement on it. They could easily put it on their website or the County could put it on their website.

Mr. Livingston would like to instruct the Administrator to move forward to get the report on the County's website. He stated he can see the Administrator saying this is a County report, but it is not my report and I did not approve it.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the PDT was contracted to do the report for the County. As long as County staff reviews it, they can disseminate the report.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, this report is not coming from the public relations firm.

Mr. Beaty stated this report was completed prior to the PDTs cease and desist directive.

Mr. Livingston stated the report clearly says Richland County Transportation Program, which does not mean Richland County Department.

Ms. McBride stated she agrees with Mr. Livingston and at least send it to the Administrator to make a recommendation for it to be released.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to instruct the Administrator to move forward with the release of the report. The vote in favor was unanimous.

### Greene Street Phase II Right-of-Way Condemnation:

Mr. Beaty stated this is a minor condemnation. There is one track that they need to clear up the title on. The gentleman has 100 different tracks. He does not know which title goes with which property. This is a small piece of property and the gentleman has been very good to work with. He just does not know if he has a clear title. He requested the committee allow it to go forward to Council, so they can proceed with this track.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation for

approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Miscellaneous:

Mr. Beaty suggested the committee consider setting a standing meeting.

Mr. C. Jackson stated they plan to do that.

Mr. Beaty stated there are a number of projects with no design started. He requested the committee to consider allowing the PDT and the On-Calls to begin the remaining design.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he was looking at the report when we talked about approving the \$250 million bond and the things that could be done with that approval. If we did not approve the bond, where we would be and how we would be dead in the water. He inquired as to where we are.

Mr. Edwards stated he does not know. He has not been dealing with the bonding stuff. Dr. Thompson was heading that up.

Mr. C. Jackson stated we needed, once again, the Director of Transportation here today to answer that.

Mr. Ott stated he was involved in bonding conversations. One of the things that he thinks is appropriate is the projects they were going to be able to accomplish if the County got the BAN. That is all construction based. In order to get to the construction phase, you have to go through the design phase first. Without releasing the OETs to get started on the design, they cannot accomplish what they set forth in construction. The permitting issue gets very timely. The right-of-way issues can be started until the design is started. Releasing the design on these projects is the critical path. Especially the projects located on the chart distributed.

Mr. C. Jackson requested Mr. Edwards to take this back to the Transportation Director and get us a response back on releasing the design.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that is the reason for the OETs to engage. The public is trying to find out what is going on and we do not know.

Mr. Livingston stated a lot of these firms hire people to do this work and those people are sitting on their hands that they have to pay because there is no work to do.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is getting calls that some people have not been paid since July 2017.

Mr. C. Jackson requested Mr. Edwards to follow-up with the Transportation Director on the contractor's payments being delayed and the PDT's recommendation for additional design services being authorized to develop the remainder of the program. He would like to have the response prior to the Council meeting.

7. **COUNCIL MOTION: ANY CHANGES TO ANY TRANSPORTATION PROJECT MUST BE FORWARDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE THEN RECOMMENDATION FORWARDED TO FULL COUNCIL. ADMINISTRATION CANNOT MODIFY OR APPROVE ANY CHANGES WITHOUT FULL COUNCIL PARTICIPATION. NOTE: THE SOUTHEAST RURAL NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN WAS CHANGED THROUGH LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATION WITHOUT NOTICE TO THE COUNCIL MEMBER. THIS RAISES CONCERN**

Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 29, 2018

**AS THE SUPREME COURT RIGHTFULLY HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT SPENDING AND THE PROCESS. PLEASE LET'S START OFF BY DOING IT RIGHT THIS TIME [N. JACKSON]** – This item was taken up during the PDT's Update.

8. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:04 PM