



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
September 27, 2018 – 1:00 PM
4th Floor Conference Room
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, John Thompson, Eden Logan, Bryant Davis, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Kimberly Toney, Nathaniel Miller and Quinton Epps

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. C. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.
2. **Approval of the Minutes**
 - a. July 10, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **Discussion: Garners Ferry Road and Harmon Road Intersection Condemnation** – Dr. Thompson stated this is regarding an elderly woman. He asked Mr. Beaty to share the details.

Mr. Beaty stated this is 1 of the 15 intersections included in the referendum. This lady lives and owns property at the very intersection. They are adding a right turn lane along Garners Ferry coming from Sumter to Columbia, and then improving Harmon. They would be acquiring a small strip of land on both sides of the property. They have been coordinating with the property owner for a number of months, and have made over 20 contact with her. They believe they have the issue resolved, and she has stated she would willing to meet with their agent to sign the agreement the first of next week. They want to be cautious and keep the schedule moving, so they are requesting permission to move into condemnation. However, if she signs next week, they will immediately accept her signature and stop the process.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to support the recommendation.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the property owner has committed that she is ready to move forward.

Mr. Beaty stated the property owner verbally told his staff yesterday that she has concluded that she can accept the offer, and she understands everything. She is willing to meet their agent.

Mr. Livingston inquired if this is the only thing holding up the project.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
September 27, 2018**

Mr. C. Jackson stated his understanding of Mr. Livingston's motion is that the condemnation action will be withdrawn if the property owner signs the documents with the PDT's agent.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Discussion: The removal of paving the culvert within the Sunset Sidewalk Project** – Mr. Beaty stated one of the more significant sidewalk projects in the referendum was to place sidewalk along Sunset, from River Drive down across the culvert, and then tie into North Main Street. As you cross the culvert, the shoulder drops off vertically, so there is no real way to add a sidewalk. There is utility conflicts along the roadway, so they only have one option that the SCDOT will be willing to accept, and that would be to build a concrete wall along the shoulder to widen the shoulder and support the sidewalk. To get across the culvert, to do this wall, is approximately \$1 million. An option would be to only build a portion of the project. They could build from River Drive down to Falling Springs, and then leave a gap in the project. Then go over to Abingdon and build to almost North Main. They have exhausted all design opportunities. They have looked at a steel sheet pile wall. The concern for Richland County would be it is a \$1 million cost, and then the SCDOT would want the County to be responsible for this concrete wall. There is no maintenance in a concrete wall, and it should last greater than 50 years, but the SCDOT would want to assign that responsibility. The only thing he did not include, as information, is right now it appears that the sidewalk category is coming under budget. They are updating their costs estimates, and he will have a better answer in the near future on the total sidewalk program. He stated he would recommend the committee take this under advisement, and allow him to come back in a month with better numbers.

Mr. Livingston stated most of the walking traffic will be coming from North Main to Abingdon. The people coming from the apartment complex on the other side of the culvert are usually coming from the other direction. So, rather than spend the \$1 million, he would agree and support and the recommendation that we look at all sidewalks first. If we have money to do it that one thing, but if we do not then he does not want to use money that is going to affect other sidewalks. He supports the recommendation to let them come back with a more specific recommendation once they look at all the sidewalks in the referendum.

6. **Discussion: The replacement of County mailboxes during construction** – Dr. Thompson stated on pp. 32 – 34 of the agenda packet there is some pictures. The bottom line is they need guidance from the committee as the PDT, and their people, are going out there to build sidewalks. Either they can remove the brick mailboxes that have been there for decades that match the family's home, or they can extend the sidewalk to go around those mailboxes. If they remove those brick mailboxes, then we put up a standard USPS plastic mailbox by the sidewalk. They want guidance from the committee on which direction they should head.

Mr. Livingston inquired about how many mailboxes we are talking about, and the costs.

Mr. Beaty stated the pictures in the agenda are in the Candlewood Neighborhood. They have broken that project into 2 phases. In Phase 1 had probably 100 tracts and only 4 have brick mailboxes. What they are proposing, instead of tearing down the mailbox, is to go around the mailbox and make the sidewalk 4 ft., instead of 5 ft. They could do that within the present right-of-way, and they would work with the property owner to make sure they understood what they are doing and work with them. In his opinion, it would be a few thousand dollars, by the time they hired a brick mason to come back in and brick it up. But, they probably could not reuse the brick and the brick would not match the house.

Ms. McBride stated she was having a similar issue within one of her communities. She had inquired if they could take the sidewalk around, but she was told it is very dangerous. She stated, in this situation, the way the road is constructed, it is not as dangerous. She stated these people had invested in a brick mailbox to

match the house, and now we are telling them we are going to have to tear down the mailbox and they could only get the standard. Then, she was told this was a part of a State mandate, from SCDOT, that we provide those types of mailboxes and not replace it with the bricks. She requested clarification on what is feasible, and what is not, based on the ordinance or the law.

Mr. Beaty stated the SCDOT would have authority, and they could enforce. He stated this happens all the time. Property owners construct mailboxes within the SCDOT or County right-of-way. If it is the County, then the State does not have any authority to require the County to take action, within their right-of-way. The issue is that cars run off the road. The cars could strike a brick mailbox, which is less safe than a standard USPS mailbox. In this neighborhood, it is low speed and in a community that has been in existence for 40 years. There is not a history of cars running off the road in these yards. So in these cases, he would say safety is not an issue. He would have to look at another case. Maybe the speed is higher. Maybe there is more accidents. In these neighborhoods, he would suggest going around the mailboxes with the sidewalk.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, to Dr. Thompson's knowledge there is no requirements for us to use the standard metal mailboxes.

Dr. Thompson stated, based on what he has learned, there is no requirement on the County's right-of-way.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, this is a practice the County has followed, more so than a policy.

Ms. Toney stated the County does not have a written policy on mailboxes. They have some of the same concerns that you just mentioned, but not a written policy on mailboxes.

Ms. McBride stated, it was her understanding, it was a policy when she was questioning it.

Mr. C. Jackson stated this is in his district, and he certainly would support the recommendation to work around it. This is a much older neighborhood, and the mailboxes have been there as long as the houses, in many cases. He would want to be the least disruptive to the homeowners, as possible, in any sort of improvement, including the extension of sidewalks. He is certainly in favor, and in fact, Rhame Road is a road that has been a painful reminder of another issue they have been dealing with over there, as well.

Ms. McBride stated she was not sure what the staff's recommendation.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, the recommendation is simply to work around the mailbox.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to support staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. **Discussion: The extension of sidewalks on Westridge Road to Clemson Road and the installation of sidewalks on Rhame Road and Summit Center Drive** – Dr. Thompson stated he received an email from Councilman Manning, who had received a request from a constituent wanting the County to extend sidewalks because they have seen Penny Projects completed, but sidewalks were not included in this area. However, he understands from the ordinance that we can only build projects, based on what was established in the referendum. He informed the constituent that he would present it to the committee.

Mr. Livingston stated he cannot say he is support of a sidewalk that is not there. He does not know where it stops. Somebody else want one next week, and so forth. He thinks Mr. Beaty had mentioned that we are slightly under budget. If that is the case, we can come back and look at something then, but we want to take care of what we have on the table right now.

Ms. McBride stated if that is done, then we will have to establish priorities.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if Dr. Thompson is going to respond back and tell her, based upon the recommendation of the committee, that we are not interested in considering her request, at this time. We will put it on the list of other possible projects, if there is some remaining funds.

8. **Approval of the Executive Summary and Recommendations for Hampton/Calhoun Road Diet Project**
– Mr. Beaty stated the PDT, Transportation staff, and City of Columbia staff conducted a public meeting in late June. They presented 2 road diet projects to the community. Calhoun and Hampton are existing 4-lane roads, 2 in each direction, with parking on the north and south sides. What they are recommending is dropping one lane, and increase the width of the remaining 3. Instead of having four 9 ft. lanes, you would have three 11 ft. lanes, 1 in each direction and a middle turn lane. They would provide a bike lane on each side. On the north side, they would remove the on street parking. On Hampton, they would begin at Harden and go all the way up to Sumter Street. And, on Calhoun, they would begin at Harden. They would not be removing any parking until they got to Pickens. They would remove parking on Calhoun until about Lincoln. They presented this to the public. There was a majority in support of during these actions, but there were some concerns. Some people on Hampton, where there are some law firms, they expressed concern with losing any parking at all. On Calhoun, there were 2 issues raised. St. Timothy's Episcopal Church is at the intersection of Calhoun and Lincoln in the Federal Courthouse block. The Federal Courthouse has taken a bunch of on street parking already, so the church asked them to leave the on street parking on that one block. They have recommended, and have talked with the City, and the City has concurred that they could leave that parking and only apply sharrows, which is basically a share the road marking. They could alleviate that concern by leaving the on street parking. The other concern expressed was by Transitions Homeless. They offer reduced rate parking for some of their homeless folks that use the facility. Although they are homeless, they do have a car, and they need to park. The City has committed that any spots that are lost that was dedicated to Transitions, they will provide them in the immediate vicinity. He has spoken with the Director of Transitions and he is good with that approach. Their recommendation is that we defer developing Hampton, at this time, and focus on Calhoun. The City staff is in agreement. What they would propose is that from Harden up to Pickens they would do sharrows, which is very minimal costs. It is only painting a symbol. And on the other end, between Lincoln, towards Wayne, they would only do the sharrows. Between Park and Pickens they are going to recommend resurfacing the roadway, which be them milling the top inch of the asphalt, and then put down new asphalt, so the markings would be fresh. The road would look new and it would be a better facility. The alternative would be to leave the pavement the way it is and go in there with a grinder, and grind up the old pavement markings, which always leaves a mark on the pavement. Then they could go back in with new pavement markings next to those. Physically it would work, but it would look very unattractive. The City has stated they do not support that, at all. They want the road to be resurfaced. They even stated that if they had to give up Hampton completely, to get Calhoun done, they would be more in favor of that. The cost differential is about \$250,000 just to grind up the markings, and put down new markings, or \$1 million to resurface the roadway. The City has requested, and they support, resurfacing the roadway, and moving forward with the road diet. That is the PDT recommendation, assuming you empower them to move forward. He is going to give a short presentation Tuesday to City Council with the same recommendation. The only way they are going to move forward is if both bodies support moving forward with this proposition. If this committee supported moving forward, he would carry that message to City Council, and ask them to officially endorse the project moving forward. Then, they would come back to Council for a full vote, to make sure you endorse the project moving forward.

Ms. McBride stated she had a similar experience on Farrow Road. And, she knows the City is going to be very careful. She does not want to be a part of anything like the debacle that took place on Farrow Road. The last community meeting was held in June. She inquired about how many people were in attendance.

Mr. Beaty stated he believes it was about 55. He does have it documented.

Ms. McBride inquired which page in the agenda has the pictures of the bikeway, and how it would look.

Dr. Thompson stated the pictures are on pp. 42 – 47.

Ms. McBride stated the last one was so confusing, in terms of where to turn, and whatnot. She knows, at this time, she would not be able to support Hampton.

Mr. Beaty stated he recommended Ms. McBride to look at p. 47 “Calhoun and Hampton Street Road Diet”. To the left is what is out there today. You have four 9 ft. lanes, and parking on both sides. Then on the right, they would remove parking on the north side, and you would have a bike lane, a through lane, a two-way left turn lane, a through, and a bike lane, and parking on the south side.

Ms. McBride stated she does not see how we can give up any parking spaces on Hampton Street. She knows they recommend deferring that, at this point. She is not sure whether we are looking at Calhoun or Hampton right here.

Mr. Beaty stated it would be the same way.

Ms. McBride stated she has some concerns regarding the safety issue of it. She stated Mr. N. Jackson and Mr. Beaty can help us with that, in terms of the turning, if there are bikes.

Mr. Beaty stated the lanes would be marked, as shown in the drawing. It does meet roadway standards, and City standards for markings. The bicycle would have to follow all the same rules as an automobile.

Ms. McBride inquired where it ends on Calhoun.

Mr. Beaty stated between Park and Pickens.

Ms. McBride inquired about how you eliminate the bike lane.

Mr. Beaty stated, from Wayne toward the Lincoln Tunnel, you would have sharrows, so it would be a combined vehicle/bicycle in the same lane. When you come up to Park, you would begin the bike lane, and then whenever you would pass Pickens, it would turn back into a sharrow. The 4-ft. wide, dedicated lane would just end, and we would have a sign “bike lanes ends” and they would see that the sharrows are on the pavement, so it would let them and the cars know that the rest of Calhoun was marked as a shared roadway. Then, it would come down to Harden, and Harden already has some bike lanes that were previously constructed.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, as a Transportation Engineer and Planner, in a lot of cases, he is against street dieting, especially when you have an increase in traffic/business and you are going from 4 to 3, when you should be increasing, but there is no more land and you cannot increase unless you buy additional land to widen it. He inquired if the City developed a specific bike route. You have certain streets parallel that has bike lanes also, and they are proposing bike lanes. If they have a specific bike route, it would eliminate the effective on some streets. His main concern is losing parking spaces from businesses and residents. It becomes a burden on them because we made some changes. He is not sure if they expressed that at the public meeting.

Mr. Beaty stated the City of Columbia has adopted a walk/bike plan, where they have identified numerous walking and biking routes. Calhoun and Hampton fit into their plan. Additionally, the City is moving forward

with a very similar project on Marion, which will intersect Calhoun near the No Name Deli. The City is moving forward with their own project, so they are coordinating. He does not recall getting any comments at the public meeting, or in writing, expressing concern about losing parking on Calhoun. They did on Hampton. He stated we are losing approximately 30 spaces. They have reviewed it in the field, and there are oftentimes spaces available along Calhoun, and they are available spaces on the adjacent roadways. The City Parking Division is okay with this project, and losing the spaces.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there are some areas that parking is not a problem. He is talking about areas where there are because he has seen Lincoln where it was 4 lanes, and they brought it to 2 lanes. You have the Convention Center, Colonial Life Arena, and businesses right there. He stated whatever you do if it is a well-traveled area he has concern with street dieting with that. If you have alternative bike routes, but in town downtown district it would be more limited routes for bikes because of the space that is not available.

Mr. Livingston stated he appreciates the approach we are talking about taking with Calhoun Street. If we are going to make a motion to move forward, it goes to the City and see what they need to say about it. Then, we decide on it. He likes that approach. He stated he has a mixed reaction on Hampton Street. He stated he comes down that street every day, for whatever reason, and he worries every day about whether or not he is going to hit somebody, or he is going to lose his mirror. He stated it is a safety hazard right now. He stated you cannot open your door because you are in the street. He does not know if that creates any liability for us because we brought it up now, in terms of it's an issue and we could do something about it, and choose not to. He stated we need to keep that in mind. Since we started talking about this, he has gotten a couple phone calls from people that have businesses. He has intentionally paid attention to the parking spaces every time he went by there, and he can tell you every time he went by, with the exception of the block where our facility is, he has never seen more than 10% of those car spaces taken up. He thinks we need to objectively look at it and see what is best. He thinks one point that important, and he will be asking the City about it, is the connectivity when it comes to the bike lanes.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to support moving forward with the recommendation regarding Calhoun, and delaying the decision on Hampton.

Ms. McBride requested clarification of the motion.

Mr. Livingston stated we are going to vote to support the recommendation. It will go to the City. The City will look at it and decide, then it will come back to us for final approval. And delay the Hampton until later.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he knows the City has got into the bike realm. It is very big in Charleston. He believes there is going to be a proliferation of bikes downtown, as well as the mopeds rentals. Anything we can do, in terms of a lane that enhances safety for cyclists and moped riders, particularly downtown with one of the University's dorms being right on Main Street. He thinks it would be a big help to create an option. He also knows that the Mayor, who is President of the National Mayor's Association, has been trying to move something like this forward because some of the other cities this is commonplace. He is sure the City is all over wanting to make this happen. He agrees with Ms. McBride the way they went about it with the Farrow Road process was putting the cart before the horse. He thinks doing this way, as the motion on the floor exists now, will give you authorization to go and make the presentation to consider Calhoun first, and defer Hampton to a later time. Then to allow the City to determine their level of commitment before it comes back to us is a reasonable request.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

9. **Approval of the draft to House Representative Bales clarifying that the Shop Road Extension Transportation Project does not include bicycle lanes** – Mr. C. Jackson stated this is a draft letter that is going to Representative Jimmy Bales clarifying the Shop Road Extension. You may remember, Rep. Bales sent a letter to Dr. Thompson, and the committee.

Dr. Thompson stated to express his opposition of bike lanes on the Shop Road Extension.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the bottom line is his letter was based upon information that was not accurate, and we wanted to make sure we contacted him in writing, since he contacted us in writing, to inform him of that status. He asked that we wait until the full committee resumed to send the letter out without us being comfortable with it. He has read it, and he is comfortable.

Dr. Thompson stated Rep. Bales opposition was to bike lanes on Shop Road Extension. What we are telling him is that with Phase 1 there is no bike lanes. They are getting ready to do a planning phase for Phase 2. They will go out and do their community meeting and they will invite his office, but they do not anticipate bike lanes on Phase 2 either.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the initial concept was from Rep. Bales in the 80's. He stated he also worked on the design for it.

Mr. Beaty stated the public meeting on Phase 2 will be December 6th.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the funding is there to do Phase 2.

Dr. Thompson stated they will have to modify the number of lanes.

Mr. N. Jackson stated whatever funds SCDOT received from the Feds, they are supposed to give it back. It is a SCDOT project. The project is in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Project, so they get the Federal funds for the project. We decided, in the Penny Tax, that we do it because they did not have the money at that time. If we do not ask for it, then they will say they have another project.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the letter to Rep. Bales. The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. **Approval of the Polo Road Right of Way Easement with the City of Columbia** – Mr. Beaty stated they brought this to the committee a couple months ago. On Polo Road, they are proposing to construct a shared-use path from Alpine until about Mallet Hill along I-20. In some of the areas they will be crossing over the City of Columbia's waterline, and they have an easement. They have a standard agreement, and essentially it says, if they have to work on their waterline and they go into a section where the County has a concrete pathway they will remove the portion of the pathway that they need to work on the waterline. They will repair the waterline, put the dirt back like it was, but they will not fix the concrete path because the County is there by permission. If you are on someone else's property, by permission, then if they want to do something with their property you have to get out of their way, and then come back. They were directed to go back to the City and ask them about the frequency, and what kind of liability the County would have. They found out it is a ductal iron pipe. It has been in the ground for 30 years, and should have another 75 -100 years life. There is no reason for the City to go in there and maintain it. What the City did in lieu of modifying the agreement, they have communicated in writing that any repairs are expected to be very infrequent, and they will do their utmost to coordinate with the County prior to any work, to minimize any expense or inconvenience to the County. The PDT's recommendation is that Council authorize staff to move forward executing the easement, allowing the shared-use path to be on the City of Columbia's easement.

Mr. C. Jackson stated there is a letter in the agenda packet that was sent to the City explaining our understanding of their willingness to be involved in the process, and our understanding that the maintenance and repair would be very infrequent, and the City would make every effort to coordinate with County prior to doing anything. They wrote back and said that was correct, so that is about as close as you are going to get to a contract modification.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to accept staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

11. **Approval of the Spears Creek Church Widening Contract for 30% Plans** – Mr. C. Jackson requested Mr. Beaty to put this in context, in terms of where we are with all the rest of them.

Mr. Beaty stated there were 14 widenings in the referendum. According to how they were ranked, Spears Creek Church was in the lower group to be moved forward. Back in July, they came to the committee with 10 contracts they asked to allow staff to sign the contract, and Council approved. This is one of those contracts. Spears Creek is going to go from 2 lanes to 5 lanes. Back in March/April the PDT presented how to get the entire program in alignment, with the available funding. There is where Council agreed to defer some of the work on Bluff and Pineview, and specifically on Spears Creek they are proposing to delay improving a piece of Spears Creek from Percival across the interstate bridge. This project would be from the interstate bridge all the way up to Two Notch. When people are coming home in the afternoon, they will turn left on the existing bridge, then the roadway widen out. The argument being that is a SCDOT interstate bridge. This would allow Richland County to stay within its overall budget, and get the project completed through this part. That is not to say, they cannot come back in the future and complete the rest of the design. They are only halfway into the building project, so there is opportunity, they just do not know the details yet. They presented an executed contract to staff by the On-Call firm back in August. There is a concern since the termini does not exactly match the referendum that this contract needs to have 3 readings and a public hearing. This is the last of the widenings that has not begun. The others are design at this time. Some are in construction and right-of-way acquisition. The last 3 have been approved and the On-Call firms are working. The On-Call team is ready to work. They have already signed the contract. They only need approval to move forward.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded Ms. McBride, to go through the process of 3 readings and a public hearing. The vote in favor was unanimous.

12. **Approval of the Resurfacing Authorization** – Mr. Beaty stated the referendum for resurfacing had about \$40 million in the referendum. The CTC has been so kind as to contribute \$1.4 million. To date, of the \$40 million that was in the referendum, the program has committed about \$27 million. So, that equals about 400 separate existing paved roads have been resurfaced. That leaves about \$11 million left. They are asking to go ahead and do the design, and go to construction on \$8 million more. They could do the design this calendar year. They could advertise it in the Spring, and the contractors could build these resurfaced roads in 2019 and 2020. Out of the \$40 million, they will have committed about \$37 million, which will leave about \$3 million that could be reviewed next year. Basically, they are asking to deliver the resurfacing program, at this time and commit \$37 million of the \$40 million.

Dr. Thompson stated Council approved \$117.5 million budget for this current fiscal year for the PDT to do their work. Mr. Beaty is asking, in terms of moving forward with the actual projects, that money was approved, and a part of the budget.

Mr. Beaty stated prices are only going up and he would advocate getting the work done today instead of

deferring it.

Mr. Livingston inquired if a dollar amount has been assigned to each of these particular roads.

Mr. Beaty stated the referendum had a lump sum amount of \$40 million, just like the dirt roads had \$45 million. They are tasked with getting as much done as they can for the money.

Dr. Thompson stated because of the SCDOR they have to tether every single penny to a project, so PDT is well aware they have been doing their due diligence and working with Transportation budget personnel, as well as the Budget and Finance Department to make sure as soon as they give us an estimate of how much it is going to cost for each particular project that they are able to create that budget, and create the purchase order, so they can do the work. He stated they have some hang ups now, in terms of payments going out the door, as they are doing their due diligence with SCDOR.

Ms. McBride inquired if we have the ability to do this, and in a timely manner.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride stated she knows in the past, due to so many issues, we were delayed on things.

Mr. Beaty stated with the resurfacing program they are ahead of what they projected 4 years ago.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to accept staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, that Mr. Beaty will come back with the remaining \$3 million unspent, as well as, the prioritized resurfacing projects to show how many more of those we can get done, at that time.

Dr. Thompson stated he does not see them coming to the committee for additional funds until next the fiscal year.

13. **Transportation Program Update** – Mr. Beaty stated the “Program Status Report” is included in the agenda package, which list the 10 different project categories. He wanted to highlight what was in construction, and what is complete. When a project is in the right-of-way stage, it means they are 70% done with the design. They know enough of the design that they are out there buying the property. He can update this monthly, and provide a quick overview of 700 projects.

Mr. Livingston stated it would be helpful if the various steps are outlined, so it is clear for everyone.

Ms. McBride inquired about the right-of-way stage.

Mr. Beaty stated when they start a project, and no work has been done, that is what is labeled as the design phase. They do the surveys, the traffic counts, engage the public, and the designer is developing the project. When they are about 70% done with the design that is when the design is done enough that we know how much new property they will have to buy. When they get approved to go start acquiring the property, they call it the right-of-way phase. The designers are finishing the plans while the PDT is out there acquiring the right-of-way for the new road. After the right-of-way is purchased, and the design is done, they can advertise it for construction.

Mr. Beaty stated, to date, they have committed to 56 dirt roads. Approximately 45 have been completed, and another 11 – 12 are in procurement. There has been about 400 roads that have been resurfaced.

Mr. C. Jackson requested that this information be included in the agenda packet.

14. **Personnel Program Update** – Dr. Thompson updated the committee of the personnel changes since he joined the program. Ms. Kimberly Toney and Mr. Mohammed Al-Tofan are the staff Transportation Engineers, Ms. Eden Logan is the Administrative Coordinator and Mr. Nathaniel Miller is Contract/Budget Manager.
15. **Approved Work Authorizations** • – Dr. Thompson stated the PDT will occasionally give them work authorizations and tell them explicitly the work they are going to complete.
 - #60: Garners Ferry Road, Harmon Road, North Springs Road, Harrington Road, Screaming Eagle Road, Percival Road – The work authorization is to pay \$194,000 for their construction resource management.
 - #61: Blythewood Road Widening – This work authorization is for acquisitions.
 - #62: Bull Street and Elmwood Avenue – This work authorization is for acquisitions.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he asked Dr. Thompson to do, rather than hold up the authorization, is those that are in his purview to go ahead and authorization and then inform the committee.

Mr. Livingston stated that one of the things that he noticed that is missing from the project is the public involvement. He stated people keep telling him they do not have any idea what is going on, they are disappointed in not seeing the signs that stated “Your Penny At Work”, etc. He stated they are losing their edge they had with people being proud of what they are doing with the Penny.

Ms. McBride complimented staff and PDT for the working they are doing and how well they are working together. She inquired if there are any concerns for staff or the PDT.

Dr. Thompson stated what is on his radar screen is to work through the budget issues. He stated they have a general ledger, a job ledger, and approximately 600 sub-job ledger, so they can tether every penny spent on a particular project.

Ms. McBride inquired if we are on target financially with everybody getting paid on time.

Dr. Thompson stated he would not say that because Budget and Finance will not allow them to spend the money until all the budgets have been set up. The budgets have to be set up, and then they have to work with Procurement to do the purchase order, so that has been taking some time.

Mr. Beaty stated the PDT’s invoices are about 2 months behind. Some of the On-Calls and Contractors are more than that.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he echoes Mr. Livingston’s comments. He stated they can pay for some of that; they just have to pay for it out of General Fund. He stated, as a committee, they may want to think about how they want to make a recommendation to Council to reinstate that.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there are some lingering things with Gills Creek Part B. He stated they need some recommendations on how we can move forward in other areas that may be able to use those funds.

Mr. Livingston stated he thinks we told them that we were going to finish what we had, and then look at other projects.

16. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 PM