



Richland County Council  
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 26, 2019 – 1:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Chair; Paul Livingston, Dalhi Myers and Chakisse Newton

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, John Thompson, Eden Logan, Bryant Davis, Kimberly Toney, Edward Gomeau, Michael Niermeier, Allison Steele, Clayton Voignier, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Nathaniel Miller, James Hayes, Quinton Epps, and Tiffany Harrison

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.
2. **Approval of Minutes: March 5, 2019** since Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed.  
  
In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston  
  
The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to adopt the agenda as published.  
  
In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston  
  
The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Jackson thanked the Transportation Department and staff for the work they continue to do, particularly after moving so many items forward at the March 5<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. He also thanked the PDT staff for the work they have been doing in concert with the Transportation Department’s staff, especially since we announced the plans of the transition in house. He thanked them for their tremendous spirit of cooperation, as evidenced by today’s agenda.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider the agenda.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to amend the agenda to include the following item: “Approval of CR Jackson’s request to utilize Richland County’s Property for their assets, during the construction of Clemson Road Widening.”

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 26, 2019**

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 3b. **Approval of CR Jackson's request to utilize Richland County's Property for their assets, during the construction of Clemson Road Widening** – Dr. Thompson stated CR Jackson has requested to have a laydown area for their equipment while they construct the Clemson Road Project. We want to be able to accommodate them. We have spoken to Mr. Niermeier, in his role as the Capital Projects Manager, and he okayed the area.

Mr. Jackson inquired where this is located.

Mr. Niermeier stated there is a former industrial parcel the County has directly behind Clemson Research Facility that is just a wooden area.

Mr. Jackson stated there is currently a laydown area on the corner of Clemson Road and Hardscrabble. He inquired if that is going to remain through the completion of Hardscrabble.

Mr. Beaty stated he would expect it would.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **Approval of the Executive Summary & Recommendations** –

- a. **Lower Richland Widening** – Mr. Beaty stated a public meeting was held on February 28<sup>th</sup> on the project corridor. There were a number of public comments the night of, and the 2-week period following the meeting. There was generally a lot support for the project, and the recommendation is keeping in line with the referendum to widen Lower Richland to 5-lanes, 2 in each direction with a middle turn lane, from Garners Ferry to Rabbit Run. The recommendation is design a traffic circle at the intersection of Lower Richland and Rabbit Run. The project also includes a 10-foot shared use path on the high school side, which will tie into the 10-foot shared used path being constructed separately as part of the SERN project.

Ms. Myers stated this is a major high school that abuts, at least 3 developments, as noted in the briefing documents. She inquired what the standard sidewalk width.

Mr. Beaty stated a standard sidewalk is 5 feet. He stated we have been designing, and are about to construct, a shared used path, which is 10 feet. On Bluff Phase I, they put 10 feet sidewalks next to the fairgrounds and 8 feet on the opposite side. The 10 feet sidewalk accommodates 2-way pedestrian/bike traffic. The 8 feet side was a split between a 10 feet and 5 feet sidewalk to account for the higher expected foot traffic.

Ms. Myers stated with the traffic from the high school, where there are a lot of kids walking back and forth, crossing the street to get to the store, and with the additional store being built on the other side, she is requesting that we consider making the sidewalks wider to accommodate for the children

walking back and forth in those paths.

Mr. Beaty stated, on the Lower Richland Boulevard, we are proposing a 10 feet wide shared use path.

Ms. Myers stated she is asking about the sidewalk piece where in some places we have expanded sidewalks because we know that people are walking both ways, not just people and bikes.

Mr. Beaty stated he believes the current typical section shows, on the other side of Lower Richland, us adding a 5 feet sidewalk. They could modify the typical section and add another 3 – 5 feet of sidewalk. The impact would be nominal costs and right-of-way.

Ms. Newton inquired how traffic going to Lower Richland High School is going to be safely accommodated.

Mr. Beaty stated they would require that the contractor maintain 2 lanes of traffic, at all time. There will be periodic time when they may have to flag traffic for a few minutes, but they will require the contractor to main a lane in each direction, throughout construction. During construction, he may have to shift those 2 lanes to the school side or to the vacant property side, which is a routine traffic control shift. He stated it is similar to the scenario on Hardscrabble Road where there are 2 schools, Rice Creek and Ridgeview High School. Typically, the contractor initially places barrels on each side of the 2 lanes, work outside those barrels, and then pave one side and shift his 2 lanes to that side while they work on the other. There will be a number of traffic shifts, but it will be similar on all widening projects.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Lower Richland Widening, with the requested accommodations mentioned during the discussion.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Polo Road Widening** – Mr. Beaty stated they held a public meeting in February, which had over 100 people in attendance. The Polo Road Widening is the only widening in the referendum to go 3 lanes. The recommendation on Polo is beginning at Mallet Hill Road, by the soccer fields, adding a middle 2-way turn lane all the way to Two Notch. Also, the referendum wanted to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians, so they presented 2 options for accommodating bikes and pedestrians. The recommended alternative was to put a 10-ft. Shared Use path on one side.

Ms. Myers stated she has heard a lot from her constituents in this area. In the original recommendation, there was to be an additional public hearing, but the amendment now says to move forward.

Mr. Beaty stated they typically have 2 public meetings on a typical project. They had the 1<sup>st</sup> public meeting to present the project, and provide alternatives to the public. In this case, how we accommodate bikes and pedestrians were the alternatives. If this body was to recommend a particular alternative, they would engage the On-Call to design project from approximately 30% to 70% design, and then go back out to the public with more detailed information. Usually at that point, they update the public, but they can tell them specific impacts to their property.

Ms. Myers stated she is looking at the recommendation that was in the agenda packet and the

recommendation today, which is slightly different. She inquired what the difference is, and what makes us ready to move further.

Mr. Beaty stated he would have to lean on additional comments they received since the public meeting. He does not know of any significant changes in their recommendations.

Mr. Jackson inquired where and how the feedback received from the public hearing has been incorporated into what is being proposed.

Mr. Beaty stated they summarize the comments, and take into consideration the number of comments opposing or supporting the projects. It should be noted, at the meeting, and then shortly after the meeting, approximately 1/3 of the respondents said they did not see a need for the project at all. To take the money and go elsewhere. The other 2/3 said they want the project, but they have preferences.

Mr. Jackson stated, for clarification, the next step, if approved, would be to take the On-Call Engineering design and scale it up to a greater degree of completion, and then take that back to another scheduled public hearing.

Mr. Beaty stated they would go back at what they call the 70% completion where they know the impacts to drainage and properties. They would have an updated cost estimate. This would be before they acquire any right-of-way in case any changes were wanted.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. **Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway A, B, C** – Mr. Beaty stated Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway had 3 sections identified in the referendum. Section A and B were more on the Smith Branch section, and would be described as being at the Broad River Road canal head works. One of the sections would begin there, go up the Broad River and come around and tie into Clement/Duke. Another section would go from Clement/Duke, follow Smith Branch to Earlewood Park, cross North Main, go all the way to the Bull Street development. The 3<sup>rd</sup> section, would go from Five Points to the Congaree. They have held 2 public meeting where they presented all 3 sections. They heard from the public and a number of Elected Officials weighed in on the subject. Due to the funding limitations, it was recommended Sections A and B not be further developed, and that further development begin on Section C, known as the Rocky Branch.

Ms. Newton stated this is one of several examples where there are not enough funds to do all of the projects that were approved in the referendum; therefore, there is a request and decisions being made to do some and not others. She inquired what the traditional process is for this. Right now it looks like we are basing this on the public comments, which makes sense, but there are so few. She understands we cannot spend more money than we have. She is just questioning how the body has made these decisions, and if there is any policy or referendum guidance as we move forward.

Mr. Jackson stated we had a similar situation with the Gills Creek Greenway where a community did not want it behind their homes, and it came back to this body. We moved it from one location to another. The City required that we widen it, and extend it. We did not have enough money to widen

and extend, but we widened it and took it as far as the money would take us.

Ms. Myers stated she has asked the same question(s) as Ms. Newton. She stated, at some point, we do need a process for how we rationalize the projects. It would probably help us, and the public understand what we are doing and give our transportation team better guidance. She suggested the committee coming up with some policies to recommend to Council for dealing with these shortages.

Mr. Beaty stated later in the agenda is an overarching greenway category memo, which addresses Crane Creek, Gills Creek, and Smith/Rocky Branch.

Ms. Newton stated it does not just apply to greenways, but to roads, road termini, etc. One of the things that she thinks will be critically important, as we move forward, is we are accounting for what we have done with Penny dollars, what is the best way to communicate this is where we had to make a tough decision, and this is the process.

Mr. Jackson stated, the good news is, this is only the 2<sup>nd</sup> time this has occurred, it comes at a good point and time, so the public does not think we have done a laundry list of these items and made random decisions.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Crane Creek Greenway A, B, C** – Mr. Beaty stated the recommendation is to have the funds from Section A and C transferred to Section B. The funds on Crane Creek would construct a greenway from the canal head works at the Broad River Road. It would go up the Broad a few hundred feet, go under a railroad trestle and follow a City sewer line to where Clement/Duke ties in. They did present other alternatives to the public, but they were not as well received. One of the alternatives was to go all the way up to I-20. It would have been difficult and be getting away from the water. Another alternative was to start at CIU and come down a power line easement to I-20 and terminate. There would not have been continuity and would predominately serve CIU students and faculty. The last alternative was extending from the canal head works all the way up to I-20.

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

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. Shop Road Extension Phase 2** – Mr. Beaty stated they held a public hearing in December 2018. They presented multiple alignments. This would be an extension of what is currently under construction. It would go a little over 3 miles and cross Mill Creek. It would cross Norfolk Southern with a bridge, and as it approaches Garners Ferry/Trotter, it would cross CSX, at grade, then it would tie into Trotter. There was a lot of support at the meeting, and comments on Alternative 4.

Ms. Myers stated Alternative 4 would take us away Lykesland Trail, which it has been noted there were substantial comments with people disagree with. She inquired how many comments were received.

Mr. Beaty stated there were a total of 12 comments received regarding this project.

Ms. Myers stated Lykesland is one of the roads the County owns. It is a terrible road for emergency and law enforcement purposes. She cannot imagine that we would go away from the plan to improve that road because of a 2 -3 comments. There is very little reason not to improve a County-owned road that we will have to maintain. She stated school buses, ambulance and police cars use this road, and it is abysmal. She would suggest that we revisit that.

Mr. Beaty stated instead of Alternative 4 maybe do Alternative 2. He stated they will be glad to revisit and summarize the impacts. Off the top of his head, he recalls that Alternative 4 was a little bit cheaper than the others, but at this preliminary stage we are preliminary with estimates.

Ms. Myers stated she is definitely not going to suggest something that is going to add \$1 – 2 million. In this context, it is her opinion, we might be pennywise and pound foolish here.

Mr. Jackson stated that he concurs with Ms. Myers, in terms of assessing the condition of the road, and if there is an opportunity to do something that we would go a long way, not only in terms of the public's satisfaction, but also public safety.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the plan, but revisit the alternative.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to what we are looking for with the revisit.

Mr. Jackson stated costs and public safety.

Ms. Newton stated, and while we are looking at, she would presume we would look at other implications.

Mr. Beaty stated, as he understands the direction, they will ask the designer to do is to reevaluate the impacts, to include costs, proximity, and any other impacts. They will bring the impact comparisons back to the committee in a month.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Discussion: North Main Street Total Cost Projection Estimate Update** – Dr. Thompson stated the County's investment is \$30 million in Penny funding and another \$5.4 million in Intersection Improvement funding, for a total \$35.4 million. In addition, there is \$16.6 million in TIGER Grant funding; \$1.3 in Federal earmarks, and the City of Columbia has contributed \$6 million. The last estimate comes in at \$62.1 million, so we are looking at a shortfall of approximately \$2.6 million. He stated there is not a protocol to address these issues, so this is a prime example of how Council wants to address this issue.

Ms. Myers inquired if Administration feels like we need a work session on options on how we handle these shortfalls, and come out of it with a policy. It is going to have to involve everybody. She stated that nobody is going to say go out there on North Main and stop construction until we figure out \$2 million on a \$60 million project. But, we also know we cannot spend the money if it is not appropriated for this.

Dr. Thompson stated, if the protocol is that we de-scope, that is an opportunity for the engineers to weigh in on that.

Mr. Beaty stated the City and the County have an IGA that addresses this specific issue. It says the County's funds are capped. Any additional funds, the City is responsible for. The agreement also says, if we come to the situation, the County and the City will come together and talk about identifying additional funds, which is the responsibility of the City, or make modifications to the project. He is not ready to make any recommendation today. The intent was to bring to your attention an issue that you may have to address later. He stated they could begin discussions with the City, and ask if they have available funds, or do they have thoughts on any potential project de-scoping.

Ms. Newton inquired how close are we to the "cliff" because intergovernmental conversations do not move at the speed of tweets usually.

Mr. Beaty stated the project is scheduled to be completed in the next 12 months. If you wanted to confirm the City has an additional \$2.5 million to commit to the project, that could end the conversation. Or, there is an opportunity to minimize some of the work.

Ms. Newton inquired as to how much time do we have to find these funds until critical decisions have to be made. At some point, it becomes more expensive to try to save money.

Mr. Beaty stated no greater than 6 months. If we have 12 months of construction, the easiest thing you could do is say do not install the street lights. The contractor would have to have time not to order these. He would suggest that these conversations be completed within the next 3 months.

Mr. Livingston stated he would like to see a discussion with the City and bring back a recommendation to Council.

Ms. Myers stated, if we give ourselves 3 months, and construction is still going, the decision makes itself. She inquired if this is the time to have a workshop, figure out a policy, and move forward. At some point, we have to make the decision, and say to the public, here is where we are, and here is what we think we are going to have to do.

Mr. Gomeau stated this is a conversation we want to have sooner, rather later. We need to have a plan now to finish off those projects, so we can look for funding for when the program ends in another 7 – 8 years. He stated we need to look at a policy within the next 90 days that allows the Transportation Administrators to work going forward.

Mr. Jackson stated Council has made some decisions and we will have to make sure we are reminded of those, as it relates to this topic. We need to go back and revisit, and determine where we are with regards to those decisions and the impact those votes has on projects moving forward. Although this item is only for information, it his understanding there were 2 charges: (1) pursue what methods may be available immediately, in coordination with the City; and (2) creating an opportunity for a full-fledged discussion on potential shortfalls in the future, and how we plan to address them.

6. **Discussion: Longwood Road Traffic Concern** – Mr. Beaty stated this was a specific request by Ms. Myers. It definitely has impacts to the Mill Creek community. They were asked to look at the current situation on Longwood and cut through traffic; and what kind of opportunities or options would we have to minimize that. They did some background research on the road and the volume of traffic. It is a State maintained that connects from Bluff Road over to Garners Road. The specific concern is, when we complete Shop Road Phase I, you would have the opportunity for traffic to turn left off of Shop onto Longwood, and then go through Mill Creek neighborhood and get onto Old Garners Ferry to gain access to Garners Ferry. People trying to avoid traffic elsewhere may use this as a cut through. There are currently approximately 550 cars per day.

Operations are not viable, under the current speed limit and functional classification, to add speed bumps. All that could be done currently, is to request additional enforcement from the Sheriff's Department, and signed for "No Cut Through Traffic" or "No Trucks". The #1 thing that is going to help this situation, is the completion of Shop Road Phase II, which will be more attractive for traffic to avoid the Mill Creek community. The only other viable option would be for the County to take Longwood Road into the County system. If it were a County road, you could reduce the speed limit, put up speed humps, etc., but it would come with the liability and responsibility of it becoming a County road. Otherwise, collectively our hands are tied to SCDOT requirements.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we can proceed, and then look at it later to decide if it would be in our best interest to try to get it deeded to the County.

Mr. Beaty stated he would recommend that we proceed down 2 simultaneous paths. Continue with the Shop Road Phase II design process, and, at this time, to consider if Council wanted to accept the road into the County's system.

Dr. Thompson introduced Mr. Niermeier as the new Transportation Director, and Allison Steele as the new Assistant Director to the committee. He stated he wanted to get with the team and get their input before we move forward.

Ms. Newton stated, it appeared to her, when she reviewed the briefing document, that they are suggesting the County could purchase the road, but as a part of that we are contractually required to purchase other roads from SCDOT.

Mr. Beaty stated a separate, but related, subject is that by State law the SCDOT cannot expand the State Roadway System. As the County is constructing Shop Road Phase I, which is 4 lanes, one-mile-long, the SCDOT is going to require, if they take Shop Road, that the County take some roads.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, it is a requirement to "swap" roads.

Mr. Beaty stated it is a requirement for Shop Road Phase I. What you will want to consider is what you are accepting. If Longwood is in worst shape than some other road somewhere else, you may be accepting a greater liability from a maintenance standpoint.

Ms. Newton inquired if there is some standard process that we follow where we say this is the next road on our list to swap.

Dr. Thompson requested to come back with that information.

Ms. Myers stated her Mill Creek constituents would have a heart attack if she did not say this for the record. There are approximately 56 houses in that area; 550 cars a day tells us that somebody is using it as a cut through already. And, despite that it is a longer cut through it takes 1-minute more to go that way, than the other way. If there is traffic, and it is standing still on Shop Road, you are going to go that way. The road is in great shape, but what they are saying is there are no barriers anywhere. There is a big drop off on one side, and all these houses that are on the frontage of that road, with all these big trucks coming through. Doing nothing in this case, would put the constituents in that area in harm's way. We know, if the traffic count is 550 today, once Shop Road extension is complete, it is definitely going to go up.

7. **Bluff Road Phase I Right of Way Transfer to SCDOT** – Mr. Beaty stated, as part of the IGA between Richland County and the SCDOT, as the County widens roads or intersections, and acquires right-of-way, you

are required to acquire the right-of-way in the name of the County. After the project is complete, and we have closed out all of the condemnations and the paperwork is complete, Richland County will transfer the property over to the SCDOT. At this point, we would ask the appropriate staff member execute the document on behalf of the County.

8. **Approval of Shop Road Termini Studies and Recommendations at George Rogers and Mauney** – Mr. Beaty stated, beginning at the Shop Road/George Rogers Intersection, the proposed design was to improve the existing intersection. If you are coming from I-77 into Columbia, you come up to George Rogers and make free flow right at the signal. When you are going the opposite direction, you come up to this intersection and you make a left turn to continue onto Shop. It would be a nicety to straighten that out, that way the through movement never really has to turn. They have the dominant flow. Again, it would be a nicety, but it is not a necessity. The current intersection works just fine today, and in 20 years it will still work just fine. We could save approximately \$8 million by not fixing a problem that we do not really have. The primary savings would be from the right-of-way acquisition of 2 active businesses. We presented this to the public in the past, and the 2 business owners came to the meeting. Now, we are recommending reducing impacts, saving money, and the engineering design will still work just fine.

Ms. Myers inquired as to when the last time discussions were held with these business owners.

Mr. Beaty stated it has been less than 2 years.

Ms. Myers stated she had a conversation with one of the business owners this week who is under the impression that he is moving because of this. We need to get these public meetings underway quickly. She stated he has changed his business model, and put a hold on a building. She requested Dr. Thompson and his staff to do this quickly. She thinks this is a great idea, but we also need to be sure the public, and the business owners are aware of what the proposal is.

Mr. Beaty stated he misspoke and this intersection will realize a savings of \$5 million. To expand on that to come up with the additional \$3 million to equal \$8 million, at the other end of Shop Road, they are recommending instead of going all the way to South Beltline to back up 2/10 of a mile, so that we do not improve what does not necessarily need to be improved. They would stop the project at Mauney, since from Mauney to South Beltline it is already 5 lanes. If they were to improve it, they would resurface it, upgrade the drainage and add railroad gates.

Ms. Myers stated once we widen Shop Road, and we have these 2 railroads, then we are not going to improve the railroad crossing. When she was reviewing the briefing document, she noted there is a public safety concern because the traffic count will increase. She inquired if that will have any impact on the need to make the improvements with the railroad crossings there. She inquired if we have looked at the cost to make those improvements (i.e. arms, lighting) and if that is something that we need to do.

Mr. Beaty stated the additional cost is approximately \$1 million. Every time you cross a railroad track it is going to cost approximately \$500,000 in the railroads design and their inspection during construction. The gates themselves cost another \$500,000. The incremental growth in traffic volume will not push you to a safety situation where you need to improve the gates.

Ms. Myers would like to have numbers that will substantiate that, so that we can make the public aware that this is a concern we have looked at, and here is the data that shows that this will not impact public safety.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item, and the request for additional information.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

9. **Approval of Decker/Woodfield Neighborhood Improvement Project Utility Agreement for AT&T Design** – Mr. Beaty stated this is a straightforward utility agreement with AT&T to begin their preliminary design to relocate their facilities. The Decker/Woodfield project is 1 of 7 neighborhood projects, which is being constrained to the referendum amount. This would only allow AT&T to start their design, so as not to delay the schedule. The PDT did request some clarity on how they came up with their \$100,000. They estimated the hourly rate, and the number of hours, which comes up to \$100,000. In all of our utility agreements they are a not to exceed amount. Although you approve up to \$100,000, the utility cannot spend more than \$100,000, without prior approval.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. **Approval of Greene Street Phase 2 Condemnations** – Mr. Beaty stated there was \$50 million identified for what was called the Innovista Project. That project included Greene Street Phase I, which has been constructed; Greene Street Phase II, that we are talking about today; and the Williams Street Connector. They have designed Greene Street Phase I and II to stay within the \$50 million, and any remaining funds could be used for the Williams Street Connector. This project is being prepared to be advertised for construction in mid- to late May. The railroad has been very cooperative and they expect to get agreements with them where we do not need to condemn their property. What they are asking is to maintain this aggressive they may need to condemn them, so they have access to the property. It would not change the result of any compensation; it would just allow the process to continue, and allow Richland County access to the property. They think the railroads are going to sign the agreements, and this is just a formality, but in the event they do not, and you want us to maintain the schedule, they need the ability to recommend that staff condemn the property and move forward. The 2 Guingard Tracts between Huger Street and the river are the identical situations. They have coordinated extensively, for approximately 18 months, with the representative of the Guigard family. They think the Guigard family is going to execute the documents, as they are. They have requested, and reminded them, that we need an answer by Friday, of this week, so we can meet this aggressive schedule. If they were to continue to have concerns, and continue us to modify agreements, that could delay the project. They are requesting the opportunity to go to condemnation if they cannot get a final resolution in the next few days. This will allow the project to maintain its May 15<sup>th</sup> schedule.

Dr. Thompson stated the caveat will be that they go through the County Attorney and our outside counsel, Mitch Willoughby.

- a. **5 Railroad Tracts** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve staff's recommendation.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. **2 Guingard Tracts** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve staff's

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 26, 2019**

recommendation.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

11. **Approval of Greene Street Phase 2 Gadsden Closure** – Mr. Beaty stated, as part of the railroad permit requirements, the railroad is requiring the closure of Devine Street just down from Thirsty Fellow Restaurant. They are also requiring the closure of Gadsden Street, behind the Greek Village. Because Gadsden is a SCDOT road, the protocol is that the County will send a letter to the SCDOT telling them the County would like to close the road as a part of the project. The SCDOT has already said that they expect it to be no problem at all, they just need it is writing. At the suggestion of Mr. Jackson, we are proposing that we move forward with a public meeting. We maintain the schedule of the project, advertise and go to construction, but we should let the public know that at the end of construction, which will be in 2 ½ years, we will close Devine and Gadsden. We are doing 2 things at once. We are asking for permission for staff to send a letter to SCDOT requesting to close Gadsden. We are also making sure you are okay with having a public meeting, in the near future, to notify the public the project is coming and 2 ½ years you will have 2 road closures.

Ms. Newton inquired if these are permanent road closures.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jackson stated he requested that we do a public hearing because of the volume of traffic, particularly as it involves the restaurant Thirty Fellow. He stated he is classmates of the lady that owns that business, and he wants to make sure no one is blindsided because it is 2 years, and then all of a sudden they find out it is a permanent closure. He inquired if Mr. Beaty, or staff, has had any conversations with the owners.

Mr. Beaty stated, to his knowledge, they have not spoken with the owners.

Mr. Jackson stated that is why he did not want us to make that kind of decision without having that conversation with them first.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, these closures have always been a part of this process, so even though we are having the public meetings for comment, which she supports, this has always been a part of the referendum.

Ms. Terracio inquired if it will be the Transportation Department or PIO Office that will schedule the public meetings.

Dr. Thompson stated the Transportation Department will work in conjunction with the PIO to advertise the public meeting.

Ms. Terracio stated she wanted to ensure that these meeting are publicized as much as possible (i.e. social media, flyers, etc.).

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

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

12. **Discussion: Three Rivers Greenway CSX Railroad Permit** – Mr. Beaty stated the Three Rivers Greenway Project is nearly complete. They will be right at the referendum amount. He stated the October 2015 floods moved the Saluda River into the railroad right-of-way. Before the flood, they had planned to build the greenway outside of the railroad right-of-way. After the floods, there was a scallop cut into the embankment. Now if they were to stay on dry land, they would be on the railroad's property. They are in construction, and they realize this. Up to this point they have coordinated with the railroad, and the railroad was going to give us a permit to be on their property. In the last couple of weeks, the railroad has changed their mind. The railroad wants us to go through a formal preliminary engineering agreement, where staff will come to Council and say we need to pay \$15,000 - \$20,000 to the railroad, so they will look at a proposed design. And, if we were to build this greenway, on their property, they most likely are going to request that we build a covered structure, such that if a piece of coal fell off of the train it would not hit someone in the head walking on the greenway. What we are proposing, and requesting your approval, is to coordinate with the railroad, get a preliminary engineering agreement, that staff could execute, engage the designer to relocate the greenway, and likely design this covered structure. At this point, he does not know the cost. It could be approximately \$100,000 - \$200,000, but he does not know yet because they have not done anything. The estimated cost will be brought back to Council. He stated they could fill in the Saluda River. It would take over a year to get a Corp of Engineer permit, if they would give it us. They have also looked at building a bridge over the scallop at a cost of \$500,000 - \$1 million. He stated it would be much cheaper, and quicker to get this permission from the railroad.

Ms. Myers stated in the briefing document the cost to construct a bridge is estimated at \$500,000, and we do not know how much it will cost to construct that CSX is likely to ask us to construct to prevent coal falling on someone's head as they taking a walk. She requested we get an estimate on that before we approve either of those because it may be what they are asking us to construct might be the same as the bridge, and we would not need the right-of-way, if that is the case. She would like additional information before making a decision. In addition, this may be a matter that the public would have some say as to whether they would rather be walking under the coal or over a bridge.

Mr. Jackson stated the length of the area affected is 88 feet. For clarification, it would have to be covered whether it is a bridge or not.

Mr. Beaty stated, if it were a bridge, we could construct it away from the right-of-way line.

Mr. Livingston inquired if Mr. Beaty would say a cover would be significantly less than a bridge.

Mr. Beaty stated he will conservatively say that the cover should be less than a \$100,000. It is only a wooden structure, with a shingled wooden roof. He stated they are requesting 2 things. They will have to engage the railroad with an agreement, so that they will look at the design and talk to us. And, then it would be a nominal fee to ask the designer to get started. So, before they constructed anything they would have a defined number.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to support the recommendation to pursue the permit that will allow the design to be developed, and then presented to CSX.

Ms. Myers inquired what is different about the motion that has been made, and the request she made.

Mr. Beaty stated, as he understands the motion, they could immediately engage with the railroad company and coordinate with the designer to start the design of what will likely be a covered shelter. Before they build anything, they will come back with the costs. He stated he thinks they have the number, but he will confirm it with the designer that has done them elsewhere in Columbia.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

13. **Approval of Greenway Category Summary and Recommendations** – Mr. Beaty stated the referendum had 15 separate greenways identified, with various dollar amounts each.

- Three Rivers Greenway – in construction
- Lincoln Tunnel – complete
  
- Gills Creek – had 3 sections
- Crane Creek – had 3 sections
- Smith/Rocky Branch – had 3 sections

As mentioned earlier, they are recommending the funds from 2 be transferred to the 3<sup>rd</sup>.

- Columbia Mall Greenway was identified as beginning at Trenholm Road, behind Decker Elementary, going behind Decker Elementary, crossing Decker Boulevard and going up Jackson Creek toward Jackson Creek Elementary, crossing O’Neil Court, and then tying back into Two Notch Road. That greenway has approximately \$650,000. He stated they have coordinated with the School District, and they are not in support of the greenway coming behind Dent Middle. The School District is concerned about cut through traffic. The proposal will be to partner with Jackson Creek Elementary. The school was designed to be an environmental conscious, or environmentally educational, school. This will be an opportunity to take this greenway, stay within the definition of the referendum. We could request to begin the greenway at the Jackson Creek Elementary parking lot and follow Jackson Creek. One of the termini would be at the school, and open to the public. The other termini may, or may not, tie into Decker Boulevard next to the Chick-fil-a or O’Neil Court.

Mr. Jackson stated he was on the Richland II School Board when they were designing and planning to build Jackson Creek Elementary. One of the things he specifically remembers is that particular school was designed with environmental thought in mind, and using the surrounding environment to be a part of the educational experience. He does not think that has actually materialized there. He knows the School District, and that particular school is very interested in doing something like this.

Ms. Myers stated it would cause her concern that it is open to the public, with it being that close to Two Notch Road. When we have those conversations, she would like for us to be mindful of the safety concerns of the small children, who can be gullible at this age.

- Dutchman Boulevard Connector is a very unique greenway. It is in Mr. Malinowski’s District on Broad River Road. The referendum and the PB studies identified a greenway from that vicinity of Broad River Road, going through some residential area, and tying into Hwy. 60. If you are going out I-26, just past the Columbiana Mall there is a new hospital, and that is Hwy. 60. The Dutchman Boulevard Connector was going to connect a new location from Hwy. 60 over to Broad River Road. Since the referendum, that area has been completely built out. They have built a cul-de-sac with some

industry in that area. They have built some apartments. There is physically no place to put a greenway today. There was never a stream that it was next to. It really appears to have been more of a bikeway because there is nothing green around there. The recommendation is to not move forward with this greenway.

- Woodbury/Old Leesburg Connector – There has not been any support or an identified champion for this project. What was identified in the PB studies, prior to 2012, was essentially a greenway beginning between 2 residences and extending a few hundred feet to tie into Old Leesburg. It would not be adjacent to a body of water. Mr. Beaty does not know the history of why it was selected. It does not seem like a very viable greenway. They propose taking the \$116,000, included in the referendum, moving it over to Lower Richland Boulevard and/or the SERN and consider extending the Shared-Use paths. We would be keeping the money in the relative community.
- Polo/Windsor Lake Greenway would begin at the intersection of Alpine and Polo Roads' traffic signal. It would parallel I-20 and I-77, and tie into Windsor Lake. With this greenway, you would connect the Windsor Lake neighborhood and Windsor Lake Boulevard. And, then have access at Alpine and Polo Roads. In addition, they are going to resurface Alpine, add sidewalks. A separate project is the Polo Road Shared-Use path, which begins at this intersection and goes up to the soccer fields at the Polo Road Widening. They recommend moving forward with this greenway.

Ms. Newton stated she does think the Woodbury/Old Leesburg Connector is an interesting place for a greenway; however, there are other things in the referendum that do not make sense. She wants to be clear on what we have the authority to go back and review, and say, "this is odd", so we are not going to do it. She inquired if we approve this motion does it mean that it is all approve and moves forward, or does it continue to come back to Council.

Mr. Beaty stated, if you approved it, as is, they would have to engage the On-Call consultants to begin the design. Gills Creek A is already in design, so, if we move the money from B and C, we would have to modify their design scope. The same thing with Crane Creek and Smith/Rocky Branch. They have not begun the design on Polo/Windsor or Columbia Mall Greenway, so they would have to engage the designer.

Ms. Myers stated it would be her recommendation that we move forward with the greenways that were approved in the referendum that are coming in at, or under, the referendum approved estimate. And, for the ones where there is a recommendation that we do something different, we exact the outline of process, and decide what our method is for determining to take something out of the Penny, or to move money. She would be in favor of taking these separately, and looking at the ones that are not controversial.

Mr. Jackson stated he is equally interested in hearing from those greenway advocates, experts, professionals and environmentalists that know a lot more about greenways, and the logic of where they are placed, or should not be placed. In addition to figuring out the money piece, he would like to make sure those people who have a higher level of knowledge regarding greenways have an opportunity to weigh in on this. He stated he had been approached by a couple environmentalists that expressed concerns about greenways that had little to do with cost, and more to do with the environmental impact of what was being proposed and recommended to be designed.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to go forward with the greenways that currently in design, or under construction, that we move the others into a different category, so that we can develop a process for involving the public, and getting input from the Transportation Department, as to appropriateness, costs, etc. to make new determinations for greenways.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

14. **Approval of Budget Transfers Between Penny Project** – Dr. Thompson stated Council approved the Blythewood Widening Project where we added additional money for the design work; Schoolhouse Sidewalk Project, Magnolia Sidewalk Project, as well as, Three Rivers. We needed additional monies for those projects because we did not enough in the budget. We want to make sure that we remain within the ordinance amount for all projects. In essence, you took action to authorize staff to reprogram dollars from one project to another.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, we have budgeted amounts for the Penny Program, but it is by project. Some projects are further along than others, and those that are further along may be spending more of their project money than those that are not as far along. She inquired if staff is sure if we take this action there will not be a later day where we come back and say we are a little short on this project because we used the money to advance the project that was approved, and in the referendum.

Dr. Thompson stated he is confident that will not happen. The bottom line is to make sure that we do not overspend the ordinance amount for any particular project. For those projects, we set the budget for the fiscal current year. PDT is further along on this project versus that project. Working with James Hayes, we will formulate the budget for the next fiscal year, then we will restore those budgets, so that we can begin those projects for the next fiscal year.

Ms. Myers inquired as to why the dirt roads are not itemized.

Mr. Beaty stated, in January 2018, the PDT provided what they thought would be the 2019 budget. It was approximately \$117 million. As has been mentioned, some projects have developed faster. Some have been slower. A couple of projects have been added since January 2018. What we are showing you is all of the projects that were in the 2019 budget. Some we need to increase the budget amount, and some we can decrease the budget amount because the projects are not being developed as quickly. This really independent of costs, overruns, underruns, or referendum amount. This is just the budgeted amount that we can spend up to. The request would be to allow them to move money, within the overall budget, from one project to another.

Ms. Myers stated she would like to know, for example, we are \$3.7 million under budget for the Atlas Road Widening, so what are the places you want to move the dollars. She would be less comfortable moving it to amorphous places, than she would to specific places, so she and the public have some idea what we are doing with the funding.

Mr. Beaty stated it would be the projects, without the parenthesis, that are included in the agenda packet.

Ms. Myers stated what she is saying is, when you take the Atlas Road money, are you telling her you are putting it on Blythewood, Broad River, Hardscrabble, etc. Where are you going to put it?

Dr. Thompson stated they will provide more specific information.

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, would widening projects stay within widening project.

Dr. Thompson stated widening funding should stay within widening.

Mr. Beaty stated there is a sense of urgency to this matter. Some projects that are underway, and the County has active contracts, and contractors are working (physical construction and design). If the approved budget amount is not approved, then staff is not able to pay those invoices that come in. The longer we take to take action on this, you have people not getting paid that are working.

Dr. Thompson stated, if PDT will give them that information today, they will get it done.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

Ms. Newton stated she understands the request, as it has been presented, and the information that staff is going to bring back to us. She inquired if we will be seeing a document like this again. Is there a way that we can think ahead, so that we can handle this all at once?

Dr. Thompson anticipated this will be the last one. From his perspective, we formulate the budget at the beginning of the year, make the best estimate for the year, and stick with it.

Ms. Myers stated there are groups of these that have identical numbers. How are they exactly...

Mr. Beaty stated there were 30 pedestrian intersections in the referendum. They all had the exact same amount. We have let all of them; 12 are complete. They have advertised, and are under construction for the other 18, so they took the remaining money available and divided it over the 18 intersections equally.

Ms. Myers stated that is not precise number. There are not contractors who have submitted invoices that are going unpaid because of this money. These are projects that we are putting in the hopper; therefore, we want the money at the ready. She stated this is almost \$20 million, and, to the extent, this is just a listing of projects that are under, and projects that are in need of money, with no justification as to where individual projects are. As she pointed out earlier, the dirt road paving program has just got an amount and does not tell us what roads we are taking it from. She gets being proactive, but these are not invoices that have been submitted. She would like us to have a number for actual invoices instead of theoretical numbers that could be submitted. We have an obligation to do it more precisely.

Mr. Jackson stated the request is that this be a budget transfer. Not to pay invoices, but that there be funds in budget categories, so when invoices come due the money is there to pay.

Ms. Myers stated that is exactly what was said initially, and then Mr. Beaty and Dr. Thompson stood up and said what is happening is we have contractors who are not being paid. That is a different issue than we want this money available for when the bills come in.

Dr. Yudice stated, in order to pay invoices, we need to have sufficient budgeted funds to pay that invoice.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

15. **Approval of Mitigation Credit Sales** – Dr. Thompson stated this is selling mitigation credit. The buyer is Kershaw County, and the price per wetland credit is \$20,000. They plan on buying 1 wetland credit. The County expects to receive \$18,400.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. **Discussion: Project Status Update** – The update was provided in the agenda packet.

17. **Pending Approvals** – Dr. Thompson stated the pending approval list will assist the PDT and staff members as they begin the transition process to ensure, that if we have any snags along the way, we have this pending approval list so we know who is holding us the project.

Mr. Livingston inquired about the status of the Spears Creek Widening design.

Mr. Beaty stated, in January 2018, they did not anticipate that Spears Creek would be under design in 2019. In June – June 2018, Council directed that we move forward with the design. They negotiated with the On-Call designer, completed the contract negotiations, then they realized it was not in an approved budget. They are back to, if it is not a budgeted item, a contract cannot be executed with the On-Call. This issue has been floating for a number of months now.

18. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:02 PM.