



Richland County Council  
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
**MINUTES**  
May 23, 2023 – 4:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Overture Walker, Chair; Paul Livingston, Don Weaver, and Jesica Mackey

Not Present: Jason Branham

OTHERS PRESENT: Derrek Pugh, Ashiya Myers, Michelle Onley, Michael Maloney, Angela Weathersby, Anette Kirylo, Patrick Wright, Dale Welch, Stacey Hamm, Chelsea Bennett, Lori Thomas, Kyle Hosclaw, Jennifer Wladischkin, Zach Cavanaugh, Leonardo Brown, Susan O’Cain, Aric Jensen, and Tamar Black

1. **CALL TO ORDER** - Chairman Overture Walker called the meeting to order at approximately 4:06 PM.  
Mr. Walker noted that Mr. Branham was out of town on business and unable to attend today’s committee meeting.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. **March 28, 2023** – Mr. Livingston moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Mr. Weaver.  
In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, Walker, and Mackey  
Not Present: Branham  
The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Mackey moved to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Mr. Weaver.  
In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, Walker, and Mackey  
Not Present: Branham  
The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEM FOR ACTION**
  - a. **Innovista Phase 3 – Project Funding** – Mr. Michael Maloney, Public Works Director, stated this item was previously voted on by Council in a generalized way due to not knowing the final amount. He noted we have completed construction, and the only thing remaining is a known retainage with the General Contractor. The remaining balance has been calculated to be \$4.5M, which will be utilized for Phase III. The project was initially allowed to go to the referendum amount of \$50M for Phases I, II, and III. With Phases I and II behind us, the remaining balance for the City of Columbia to manage Phase III of the Innovista is \$4.5M. The City will draw, through reimbursements from the County, as expenses are incurred.  
  
The County Administrator, Leonardo Brown, noted action was previously taken on this item with an amount of \$4,088,000 given. Now the amount we are talking about is closer to \$4.5M. After discussing the matter with the County Attorney, staff felt it was appropriate to come back and have Council authorize the use of up to \$4.5M.  
  
Ms. Mackey inquired if the City of Columbia had applied for grant funding.

Mr. Maloney responded he was not aware of them applying for new grants. He noted there was a \$9M fund that may be matched to the \$4.5M.

Mr. Weaver inquired if anything is left in the Vista the Penny is funding.

Mr. Maloney responded there is not.

Mr. Livingston moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the City of Columbia's request to receive the balance of the funds from the \$50M Innovista Project once Phase II of the project is complete. The balance of \$4.5M will supplement other funding provided by the City for Phase III of the Innovista. The City will manage and draw on the fund via a reimbursement process. Mr. Walker seconded the motion.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, Walker, and Mackey

Not Present: Branham

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Proposed Chapter 21 (Dirt Road Paving) Ordinance Amendment – Mr. Maloney stated the request is to eliminate language in Chapter 21 that allows 25% or more of the property owners to decline a road paving project. Sometimes those residents have another access point that is paved.

The language to be eliminated is in Section 4: "A return receipt from the last known address of all property owners will be required. Each such property owner shall have thirty (30) days to respond. If twenty-five (25%) percent or more of all such property owners decline said road paving, then the subject road shall not be paved."

Mr. Weaver inquired if we remove the 25% clause what kind of feedback do we get from the owners.

Mr. Maloney stated they would put out notices, similar to how they handle resurfacing projects. The department would be okay with leaving the return receipt and a thirty (30) day time limit.

Mr. Weaver inquired what percentage of owners have not wanted their roads paved.

Mr. Maloney responded some of the roads only have three homes on them. Therefore, if one person does not want their road paved, you are looking at 33%.

For clarification, Mr. Weaver stated the recommendation is not to have a percentage. He requested to maintain the thirty (30) day time limit.

Mr. Walker noted that most homeowners do not point to that one homeowner but the County for not paving their road. He inquired if the individuals who presided over Horry County's road paving program had a comparable requirement and ultimately removed it.

Mr. Maloney responded he was not sure if they had to remove anything. What they did have is what we do have. He reiterated that we can pay for land if the value is proper. If the road improvement exceeds the land value we need to put the road upon, they would not be compensated. He noted that someone who lives at the end of the road, near a State or County road, they are typically not paid, but the ordinance could allow us to do so.

Mr. Walker inquired if roads are frequently unpaved because a minority of homeowners have objected and if this has been a barrier to paving dirt roads.

Mr. Maloney replied approximately 25% of the dirt roads have gone unpaved because of the consent denial process.

Mr. Livingston moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to proactively pursue and complete the paving of Richland County roads by removing the requirement in Chapter 21 that allows 25% of property owners to decline a road paving project, seconded by Mr. Walker.

Mr. Weaver would like to allow the property owners to provide feedback, so he would be in favor of keeping the thirty (30) day time limit.

Mr. Wright responded nothing keeps the property owners from providing feedback when they receive notice that the road is being paved.

Mr. Maloney asserted he also favors the thirty (30) day time limit remaining in the ordinance.

Ms. Mackey inquired about what happens if the property owner responds in forty-five (45) days.

Mr. Walker responded we would honor the ordinance.

Ms. Mackey inquired if we are operating this way now.

Mr. Maloney responded the County has not put out notices for new roads in a while because of the consent denial process. He indicated the notice states they have thirty (30) days to respond.

Mr. Walker pointed out the property owners are responding within the thirty (30) day timeframe, which is why we are getting the consent denial.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, Walker, and Mackey

Not Present: Branham

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ITEM FOR INFORMATION**

- a. **Resurfacing Package T - Small Contract for Drainage Improvement** – Mr. Maloney indicated Signal Lane was discovered to have a drainage problem while it was under construction. The General Contractor could do the underground, but they did not want to fix the drainage issue. After some delay, they did give the County an estimate of \$121,000 to do the work. They signified it would likely delay the project and would wait until the project's end to begin the work. The damaged curb was removed. Public Works placed some stone chips to allow the drainage to continue in a less-than-desirable situation. To keep the project moving, they hired a small contractor under emergency procurement to complete that part. About a week ago, they replaced one of the inlets. They requested a change order for \$70,500 to do the complete soil exchange, which was approved.

Mr. Brown stated this was certainly a situation staff could not have anticipated. We wanted to make sure we communicated this because this was necessary to keep the project going.

6. **ADIJOURNMENT** – Ms. Mackey moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Livingston.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, Walker, and Mackey

Not Present: Branham

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:25 PM.