



Richland County Transportation Ad Hoc Committee

December 10, 2019 - 1:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

1. **CALL TO ORDER** The Honorable Calvin "Chip" Jackson
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** The Honorable Calvin "Chip" Jackson
 - A. Regular Session: October 22, 2019 [PAGES 1-15]
3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** The Honorable Calvin "Chip" Jackson
4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION** The Honorable Calvin "Chip" Jackson
 - A. Transportation Project Budget Approval [PAGES 16-22]
 - B. Transportation Projects in Acquisition and Under Contract Approval [PAGES 23-30]
5. **ADJOURNMENT** The Honorable Calvin "Chip" Jackson



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
October 22, 2019 – 1:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Eden Logan, Kimberly Toney, Michael Niermeier, Allison Steele, Quinton Epps, Christine Keefer, Rasheed Muwwakkil, Cheryl Cook, Jennifer Wladischkin, Leonardo Brown, Casey White, John Thompson, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Clayton Voignier, Nathaniel Miller, Erica Wade and Beverly Harris

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.
2. **Approval of Minutes: September 24, 2019** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Jackson and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:**

- a. **Transportation Transition Update** – Ms. Wladischkin stated the solicitation indicated that we would short list 8 firms. Should Council decide to invoke the Significant Purchase Ordinance, we would move forward with Council voting individual on the firms, which is where we would narrow it down to a maximum of five (5) firms.

Ms. Newton stated she understands that Procurement submitted a RFQ and all of these firms are qualified. There are different procurement mechanisms that creates a pool of resources you can call upon at will, without going back to procurement. She inquired if this list does that.

Ms. Wladischkin responded in the affirmative. Engineering Services are direct negotiations, so they would pull from this list to do negotiations for individual projects.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, as these firms are being submitted, they not only meet the required qualifications, but whatever the determined cost parameters are for the County, or is cost something that would be negotiated after this.

Ms. Wladischkin stated cost would be something that is negotiated as the projects are let. When Transportation identifies a particular project that needs a design, etc., they would enter into negotiations with someone from this list.

Ms. Newton stated, to make this official, this would have to go before Council to authorize the work.

Ms. Wladischkin stated the current OET contracts expire in March; however, there was some reticence with assigning new work under those contracts since the work would not be completed by March. The desire was to go ahead and get these contracts in place.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the current process is pretty much the same as with the current OETs.

Ms. Wladischkin stated the intent is to use the same process.

Mr. Jackson stated the concern he has, with the process, is that once we approve this global group of firms he wants to ensure there is some opportunity for a diverse mix of individuals. If the selection is being made, without having to have the consent and approval of Council, then he wants to make sure that someone is overseeing that. With a robust list like these, some are very large firms, and some are small firms. When he says diverse he does not mean just in terms of racial makeup, but also size and scope of their ability to do services. If we leave it up to someone else to select from list we run the risk of using the same people we always use and the ones that have not been used in the past do not get used in the future. He does not know how that gets fixed, but without some sort of oversight it concerns him.

Mr. Brown stated the idea is not to remove Council from the process. In terms of the qualifications, his expectation would be, as we move forward, Council would be having advance notice of what the intentions are, where we are, and how many projects we are using OETs on.

Mr. Jackson stated one of the issues he recalls, when he first got on Council, was the struggle the Office of Small Business Opportunity had with meeting its quota was tremendously aided by those small businesses using the transportation mode of providing services to boost that number up significantly. Without the role of some of those vendors, the overall numbers for Countywide minority participation was in a tough spot.

Ms. Newton stated one of the things we have an opportunity to determine, as a body moving forward, is what is the appropriate mechanism for updates, in terms of when we are letting the contracts, and how that is going to work. As far as she is aware, we have not determined what the communication protocol and process would be. She will be very interested in a robust way of having visibility, as we let these contracts, and move forward. She is always reticence to add unnecessary useless reporting, but there is some level of visibility, which needs to be established.

5. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

- a. **Mitigation Credit Sales: Alpine and Percival Road** – Mr. Epps stated this is a request to sell mitigation credits to SCDOT for the Alpine and Old Percival Road Intersection Improvement Project. The sale is for 1.4 wetlands credits and 868 stream credits. The credit gross proceeds is \$159,900, and Richland County’s share is \$147,108

Mr. Livingston inquired if the proceeds would go back to the Penny Program.

Mr. Epps responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers inquired about how many credits have been sold, to date, and the value of those credits.

Mr. Epps stated we have sold 14.47 wetlands credits and 2,350.04 stream credits. The value of the wetland credits is \$289,500, and the value of the stream credits is \$470,008.

Ms. Myers inquired about the cost of acquiring the mitigation bank.

Mr. Beaty stated it was just over \$13M and came from the Transportation Penny Program.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, in addition to establishing the mitigation bank, we bought wetlands credits.

Mr. Epps stated we did not buy credits. We created credits.

Ms. Myers stated she knows we created credits with the bank, but did we buy credits before that.

Mr. Epps stated he is not aware of any credits being purchased for the Penny Program.

Mr. Manning stated the property we bought had more bank credits on it than we are going to need.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the request.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Newton and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. **Edmonds Farm Rd./Railroad Crossing Closures** – Ms. Steele stated Edmonds Farm Road is a dirt road in Years 3 – 4, and is ranked high enough to be in the funded section. Public Works was approached a year ago, by the railroad. At that time, the railroad offered to contribute funding to paving of the road, if we would look at closing some railroad crossings. When she moved to the Transportation Department, she got back in touch with the railroad and renewed discussions. The railroad provided, in writing, their offer to provide \$25,000, per railroad crossing, in order to pave Edmonds Farm Road.

Ms. Myers stated she is familiar with both of these roads, and with this request. She stated this paving

project is much further down the list of projects, the cost to pave the road is approximately \$500,000, and the railroad is only offering \$25,000, per crossing, for a total of \$50,000. Her concern is this a road that would leapfrog the Years 1 – 2 roads. She is concerned with the process by which we have reached this decision. She stated there has not been any conversations on these roads, and the railroad crossing is the major method of ingress and egress for all the people who live along this road. The senior citizens in this area would be greatly inconvenienced. In addition, she inquired about how we explain these 2 roads leapfrogging over the others who are higher up on the list in Years 1 – 2.

Ms. Steele stated they would still continue in the same order. They would not necessarily put this to the top of the list. This is just a way to get the process of the railroad closure started, which could take a year.

Ms. Myers stated the railroad crossings are used more than the road because, when it rains, it is easier to get out of the road across the crossing than to go up the road. She knows there are only a few houses, but they will be severely impacted.

Ms. Steele would not anticipate them closing the railroad crossings until the project is under construction. It would be up to the railroad, but she believes they would allow them to pave the road and then close the railroad crossings.

Ms. Myers stated they have a vested interest in closing the crossing because it is unsafe. She has been begging them for years to put safety features (i.e. lights and arms), which are more expensive than \$25,000. Their interest is in not having the liability that runs with keeping those crossings open. She is concerned with the process we would use to make sure our citizens are not negatively impacted by this being closed to suit the railroad's needs, but not having the road paved, which suits the citizens' needs. She is for paving the roads, and she thinks the crossings, unless they are made safer, do need to be closed. She is concerned about sequencing and process by which they get in the system. She would request, before this is moved along, we have a guarantee that these crossings will remain open and will be made safer until these roads are being paved.

Ms. Newton inquired if there is a deadline associated with this offer.

Ms. Steele stated she does not believe there is. It has been on the table for approximately a year now. As long as they could get a closure out it, she does not think they would rescind the offer.

Ms. Newton inquired as to when this project would likely be ready to go to begin.

Ms. Steele stated the road is going to be designed and paved whether we get this \$50,000 or not, but she is not sure of a timeframe for it.

Mr. Beaty stated, at best, it would be 2 – 3 years.

Mr. Jackson stated, even with the passing of this, this simply initiates the process. From that, we still have to go back to the railroad and get their authorization to allow the crossings to remain open until construction begins. He doubts they are going to make it safer though. The road will stay in its appropriate ranking on the list of dirt roads.

Ms. Steele responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's recommendation.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. **Cash Flow Model Presentation – First Tryon** – Mr. Niermeier stated what is before the committee is three (3) models for cash flow, which are developed from the C-Tip that staff worked with the PDT on developing. One is a full debt financing of \$175M. The 2nd one is a pay-as-you go model. The final one is a hybrid of a cash/debt model.

Mr. Cheatwood stated he was before the committee a month ago talking about the different options you have as you look to take out the \$175M Bond Anticipation Note that comes due at the end of February 2020. The first scenario was the full take out of the \$175M BAN, with a long-term bond issue. The second option was a partial take out, with a long-term bond issue and utilizing \$25M of fund on hand in the Penny Tax Fund. At the last committee meeting, a third scenario was proposed to pay down everything and not take out anything with bonds.

Scenario 1: 100% Debt; Scenario 2: 100% Cash; and Scenario 3: \$25M Cash/\$150M Debt

Scenario 1 – Project Cash Flow Schedule: Assumes the last “Project Cash Flow Schedule” that PDT generated remains in place, and you continue along the plan of project spenddown. With this schedule, you would need to take out the \$175M BAN, with the long-term bond issue, in order to stay cash flow positive on a monthly basis. We are looking at a term of 8 years. In the “Sources and Uses” table you generate bond premium of a little over \$20M, which the County uses to pay the interest. Net Interest, which is Total Interest less the Premium, is approximately \$15.4M.

When we look at the different scenarios, what does it mean, in terms of the “Project Cash Flow Schedule”. If we are using all cash to pay the BAN off, we have to push the projects back. If are using all bonds, you can maintain a certain pace, and then there is an in between level. This does not include interest earnings or interest expenses on the BAN; it this purely project spenddown.

Scenario 2 – At the beginning of this fiscal year, you had a little over \$200M of funds on hand consisting of BAN proceeds, which had remained unspent from last year, and the quarterly sales tax collections, as they come in. Up until February, you use the funds on hand to pay off the \$175M, which is where it drops, and then you stay positive. They worked with the Transportation Department to determine what would have to be done on a “Project Cash Flow Schedule” to push the projects out and remain positive, on a quarterly basis. Instead of \$90 - \$100M, it would be \$45 - \$70M, so it would be more back loaded. The model reflects that you do not have to pay any interest on anything, but you will have to push the projects back.

Scenario 3 – We are using \$25M and issuing bonds to pay off \$150M of the BAN. The model takes into account the transition from the PDT to the County Transportation Department, and what may be some slow down in the project spenddown. The project spenddown is generated from the Transportation Department, with a goal to stay positive, based on the various assumptions, on a monthly basis. With this, the debt service goes down, in the later years. Your total net interest costs goes down to \$13.2, so there is less interest on this one.

Mr. Cheatwood stated, if we want to issue a bond, we have to close by mid-February to have the funds to pay off the BAN. To get process started, they, along with bond counsel, will have to prepare an offering document, and get those rated. Council has given the authorization to issue bonds; however, they would like a resolution about the amount that you would like to take out, on a long-term basis.

Mr. Livingston inquired if all 3 scenarios are based on a 3% growth.

Mr. Cheatwood responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we know what the average growth was over the last 5 years.

Mr. Cheatwood stated it has been an average of 4 ½ - 5%.

Mr. Livingston inquired why we would base this on a much lower rate.

Mr. Cheatwood stated to be conservative. If they assume a higher growth rate, it would leave you to get more aggressive on the potential pay down schedule. Worst case scenario, is that you have a debt service payment due, or contractual payments to make, and you do not have those funds on hand. If you continue to get the collections in at a quicker pace, you can accelerate some of the projects on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Ms. Newton inquired if these numbers assume that we will not have to pay the \$50M for the Carolina Crossroads.

Mr. Niermeier stated in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton inquired what would it take, from a Council perspective, where we definitively say we are going to assume the \$50M will come to us or it will not. For her, unless she has it in writing, she is not comfortable on counting on \$50M. As a body, what is the action that we would have to definitely take to confirm that is part of our assumptions.

Mr. Niermeier stated, based on Mr. Smith's recommendation, it would require 3 readings and a public hearing to remove the Broad River Road Intersection Improvement from the referendum ordinance.

Ms. Newton stated, to confirm the timeframes, we do this in February, but we need to decide on the model to move forward with by December, so that we have time to put this out to the market.

Mr. Cheatwood responded in the affirmative. Assuming the starting point is that we will need to take some portion of this, with a long-term bond issue, then that is enough for them to start the process, in terms of the documentation side, primarily the offering document. They will need to know that number because whether we are issuing \$20M or \$175M, it is the same offering document. Where we will want to know that amount is ahead of when they go to the rating agencies to get the bonds rated. They anticipate having those discussions in early January, so they can get the ratings back by the end of January or beginning of February.

Ms. Newton inquired if there was a particular reason the \$25M felt like the right number.

Mr. Cheatwood stated they started with \$20M or \$25M, but then there are 2 main components to

this. One there is a debt service side, and a monthly cash schedule. The other side is the project spenddown side. The Transportation Department looked at that, and said what is realistic for some of those projects spenddowns, and they think this is a reasonable "Project Cash Flow Schedule." With that in mind, the \$25M is the most you can pay down and still stay positive.

Ms. Newton inquired if the backup documentation for this item should have been in her packet.

Mr. Niermeier stated they did not receive the documentation before the deadline.

Ms. Newton stated these models are based on assumptions, so you are looking at a model based on how quickly you think we are going to be able to execute the project. She inquired if there are any particular milestones, or points in time, where you have identified that you will be able to look at where we are with the projects, to identify how well we are adhering to the model, or if we have to significantly change it. She knows that we are running up against the clock for the bond deadline, but when she is doing projects, and looking at the project schedule, she can say, if we do not hit these specific milestones, at this point, then I know things are going slow, faster, etc. Based on where we are with the transition, is there a particular time you have identified where you will be able to look at the progress we have made and say the assumptions for the next few years are probably right, or need to be significantly changed.

Mr. Niermeier stated the answer is driven by the decisions made by Council. What they are looking at is, if a cash flow model is developed, based on a modified schedule, which will need to be modified again, based on things being pushed out, because of decisions made, he would say, after the first of the year, we will have a good measure of where we are in relation to cash flow.

Ms. Myers inquired if we have modeled different scenarios. Are we waiting to model the scenarios for the answers, or have we modeled the different scenarios and we will say go on A, B, or C.

Mr. Niermeier stated the model, in this regard, is the cash flow model, which is based off of a schedule. We started with an original schedule, which was developed by PDT, and looked at by staff. The full bonding of \$175M is based on this schedule. They took some of the delays they see, and moved some of those projects to the right. Then, as Mr. Cheatwood said, we started with \$50M and asked if we could pay back \$50M? The answer was no, we cannot stay positive. We would have to adjust the schedule. Keeping an aggressive schedule, as originally developed, we were able to move down to take that model, change the schedule and pay back some, which is what is before you now.

Ms. Myers stated, Ms. Newton just said, "What are the milestones we are looking at, and do those milestones back into Mr. Cheatwood's model?" We have these 10 - 20 projects, and we know that if we hit these milestones, at these times, this will be what it costs, because that is what Mr. Cheatwood has given us. What Mr. Niermeier said was some of the milestones depend on what we are deciding right now. What she asked was, do we have alternating scenarios, so we know this cash flow model will work under scenarios A, B, and C, so that in January, we are not going, now that you have changed the schedule, we have not asked for enough money. She stated that surely we have milestones. She has not seen them, but she is sure we have them.

Mr. Niermeier stated we do, and we are looking at it quarterly. However, in discussions with Mr. Brown, as well as Dr. Thompson, they are requesting a level of detail from the Transportation, which they are currently working on.

Mr. Cheatwood stated once you sale the bonds that debt service is locked in, which takes one variable off the table. Then you know the minimum amount you need to have at certain points and times to pay your debt service. If you are working on a cash flow schedule that is dropped into the model and you show negative, then you have to adjust the project cash flow schedule. Again, we are dealing with 2 variables. One on the debt service side and one on the spenddown side.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve Scenario 3.

Mr. Manning stated Council can only make decisions as well as we receive information. He appreciated what Ms. Newton asked, in terms of us getting quite a deal of information here. He think the answer was that it was not in the packet because the information was not received before the deadline. He inquired if it was received at the deadline or after the deadline.

Mr. Niermeier stated they received the briefing packet on Monday. He stated the only addition to the information was the pay-as-you-go model.

Mr. Manning stated he appreciates that we had some of the information, although it was not a part of this packet, and not lined up with the new scenario. He stated, at some point, Council had what we referred to as "Our Team" that included bond counsel and a financial advisor. He stated he is concerned about only seeing the First Tryon group here, which is 1/3 of the team. He inquired if there is still a team to help Council understand this part.

Mr. Jackson stated he believes Mr. Jones, from Parker Poe, is on the team as new bond counsel. Council made a decision to relieve the previous bond counsel, as well as the financial advisor(s) out of Greenville and Summerville.

Ms. Newton made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Manning, to present the complete packet of information to Council, while noting staff's recommendation for Scenario 3.

Mr. Livingston withdrew his motion.

Mr. Jackson stated we have been "kicking this can down the road" and along the way, what is happening is that costs are continuing to increase. We are continuing to look at projects, in terms of pushing them out later, and further, which will also mean costs will continue to escalate. We have debated the \$52M Carolina Crossroads issue for more than a year. We have gotten everything from the SCDOT that they typically give. When we say we want it in writing, they have said they are not going to request it. At this point, he would also like, as a part of that motion, to have a motion that removes the Broad River project from our list. We will present it to Council with 3 Readings and a public hearing, so that it will be clear the \$52M will be de-obligated, from our perspective. If there is any push back, at that point, we will certainly hear about it from the SCDOT. Until we are willing to go for the bonding dollars, and lock them in, as soon as possible...He stated many will remember last year when we had the tremendous delay, and we were about to miss the date for the BAN because we were hesitant about pulling the trigger. He hopes that we, as a committee, will encourage our colleagues to be ready to make that vote, because after January, we are going to experience a tremendous slow down. It is going to be even slower than projected, in terms of that schedule. He wants us to be sure that we have done our due diligence in moving it along as much as possible. He went back and pulled the memo that was sent on March 6, 2018, where it talks specifically about

looking at the \$140M shortfall, and recommendations made by the PDT to us, in terms of how we could move the projects forward and cover the costs. We had debate about whether we actually took a vote on that. He wants us to be real clear about what we are asking, so when we get to the next Council meeting he is not here having a major argument, with his colleagues, who, in his opinion, appear to be obstructionists, and not willing to move forward with any amount of money, for any project.

Ms. Newton stated she would never presume to promise there will not be an argument among colleagues at any meeting; however, when it comes to the motion she made today, it does not change our timeframe at all. What would have happened, if we accepted staff's recommendation, is that would have gone to full Council, at the next meeting. Her motion simply refers this to that same meeting. It just provides a greater context for decision making. She understands many things have been kicked down the road, when it comes to the Penny, and the detriment of the County, but this motion is not one of them.

Mr. Manning suggested to make these 2 different motions (i.e. cash flow model and the \$52M for Carolina Crossings), and Legal may be able to tell us if this committee can...he does not know how it gets before Council for First Reading, to do that. He inquired as to why this could not be on the next Council agenda, as First Reading. He stated, if we separate these 2 things, then staff could bring that to the Horizon meeting for the next Council meeting.

Ms. Myers stated she wanted to make it clear that her objections have not been in an effort to obstruct moving forward, on the committee, but an effort to ensure the money being spent she can explain to the constituents. She stated questioning the process, in some cases, is necessary.

Mr. Jackson stated the problem he has with our questioning is, if we look at our first study by Parsons Brinkerhoff, and the estimates given in that study, and we now look at the current estimates for these projects, they were so grossly underestimated, but yet we have not had any discussion about that. There are projects they suggested would cost \$17M, which now costing \$42M. There are projects they suggested would cost \$21M, which are now costing \$39M. If you add all of those up, they are up to \$100M+, and we have never had any discussion, or conversation, about what to do about that problem, but we have spent a lot of time, in other areas of significantly less dollars, in terms of a discussion about where we fall. He does not disagree that we want to make sure we spend the appropriate referendum dollars, as they have been allocated. While at the same time, he thinks we need to be willing to talk about where there have been errors, and gross underestimations, rather than badgering the fact that they are no longer accurate figures. If you recall, Ms. Myers, he said early on, in a public Council meeting, that he did not believe the figures in the study were accurate. He thought they were unreliable, and he has said that on multiple occasions. He was refuted in those meetings, only to find out now that those figures were in fact unreliable. Now the study that we spent money on, is not an accurate reflection of what those projects cost. We need to figure out a way to move this forward knowing we have \$140M over the referendum, get the \$52M issue resolved, and then deal with the remaining issue that will help us move these projects along, according to the available funding.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to direct staff to bring a First Reading for the

referendum to take out the \$52M expense on the Broad River Intersection, based on the Carolina Crossings, and all of the communications we have had from SCDOT.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. **Blythewood Road Widening Condemnation** – Mr. Niermeier stated before you is staff's request to move into condemnation for seven (7) parcels that are pertinent to the Blythewood Road Widening Project. They have gone through the process, following the County's policy.

Mr. Jackson requested additional information on this matter.

Mr. Niermeier stated, in March 2015, the Right-of-Way Policy was approved by Council. What that does is, through the Right-of-Way Manager, for the Penny Program, they follow the policy to try to acquire the parcels required for the different projects. Whether it is getting permission or going forward saying we need to buy "X" amount of square footage off the front of your house for this right-of-way or easement. At some point, it escalates up to where you have made numerous offers, you have escalated the amount of money you can give them to a point where it does not make sense anymore, or they will not come to an agreement. You go to imminent domain, and then condemnation. What has been followed here is the said escalation.

Ms. Newton stated these condemnations are in regards to the Blythewood Road Widening, which is currently in the set of projects on hold because it is over the referendum.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated, with that being the case, and not yet being set for how we are going to handle the Blythewood Road Widening. Her question is how do these condemnations fit in, and does it make sense to vote to move forward part of something where the whole has not been determined yet.

Mr. Niermeier stated they thought a lot about that. What you are going to see before you is staff's recommendations. There are certain things you cannot change to achieve the desired result. Blythewood Road Widening is one of those. In order to increase the level of service that is needed, the road widening has to occur as designed, and currently scoped out. Moving forward, and knowing how long condemnations can take, if we can initiate that now, we can attempt to stay within a schedule moving forward with Blythewood Road Widening. There is a certain assumption, where we are going to make a decision, within the next couple months, on how we are going to proceed with all these projects that are over referendum. Let us take \$52.5M off the table. Let us look at some of these recommendations staff is bringing before you to reduce the scope. Let us look at other things that we are moving or realigning to fit the money that we have coming available. There are no other options, which we have been able to determine, moving forward with Blythewood Widening. We need these seven (7) parcels to achieve this end state.

Ms. Newton stated, for her as an individual, it is hard for her to approve part of something, when the whole or the timeframe has not been determined.

Ms. Myers stated, if we go forward with the condemnations, then that presupposes that we have decided that we are going to spend an additional \$5.2M to do the Blythewood Road Widening.

Notwithstanding there is no analysis of where we would get that money. She knows Mr. Niermeier is going to go to the next item, and she appreciates that, but that has not been approved. We are where we are now, without that approval, and that approval can only come from full Council. It still awaits three (3) readings and a public hearing. We are saying we are out of time and we need to go forward and condemn people's property. She would suggest, in that vein, we are not out of time because we do not have a decision, so why would we go forward with a condemnation that may never be relevant. Condemnation is actually a taking, and it is a taking of personal property. She is concerned we moved to that place, without the answer that Ms. Newton is asking about, because that means we do have time. We do have time to keep negotiating with these landowners. It may well be, if we let it sit for a minute, things may change. She would not want to pay the court cost of condemnation, and then come back and say we are not spending \$5M additional dollars. The road may be widened, but not with 8-ft. sidewalks and Shared-Use Path, and that may negate the need for this property.

Mr. Niermeier requested the committee to allow staff the authority to move forward, understanding that it may not be 3 months from now, which may shake some things loose and allow some settlements to occur, in the meantime.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, Council voted to put this on hold. He is absolutely going to vote no on this, and he will stick to that forever, because he will not be a Council member who voted to steal somebody's property, through the government, that nothing may happen there because Council said put everything on hold until we wait and see.

Mr. Brown stated part of what he is working with Mr. Niermeier on is specific details, and some of the frustration he has shared regarding the request, is there are some larger questions that have to be answered in order for him to provide some details before Administration can present it to Council and the public. He thinks the clarity he is requiring of Mr. Niermeier is putting him in a position where there are some answers, which have to come from the policymaking body.

Ms. Myers requested Mr. Brown to identify what he is asking for that Council is not providing.

Mr. Brown stated, when you look at a road schedule, where you want to identify the citizens, what work will be done, when it will be done, and the level of work that will be done. (i.e. asphalt, concrete, bikeways, etc.). To the extent that the work is impacted by the level of dollars, you have. We are saying, in this pot over here, we know there is some level of money that we do not have to spend that will impact the work that we are doing, or not doing, over here. He is asking Mr. Niermeier to give me dates, times, materials, scheduling, so we can present to Council, so they can provide information to their constituents. To that end, there are some things; he is unable to do effectively. He is talking about the larger picture of what a road plan looks like considering greenways, bike paths, and sidewalks, in a structure where a citizen can go to the County's website and look in their respective district, and see what work is to be done in the next 4 months, 6 months, 2 years, etc. He cannot do that effectively right now, because there are some other monetary issues that we have to decide.

Ms. Myers suggested that part of the disconnect, and the reason she has trouble voting on some of these things, is because she is sitting here look at pages and pages of information, with the knowledge we cannot pay for these projects, with the money that we have. For her, until somebody presents her with a schedule of how we would get the money from somewhere else to supplement, without cutting programs because we decided this one is not as necessary as this one. Maybe there are more people here will scream louder. What she has consistently said is that we need to have a come to Jesus, where we sit down and look at the projects, and we say to the public here is what we

think we can do, here is what we know we cannot do. Part of her frustration, with this whole process has been that we keep moving it along, and pushing things. It seems, the goal is to push these very expensive, over budget projects, as far as we can get them, without making the hard decisions, because then the decision is already made. Once you have already taken the property from the people along Atlas Road, which we know is \$23M over budget, are we going to give them the money and their property back. In her mind, some of what we have done is steam belled down this road knowing we cannot afford some of this stuff, without cutting things, but we have somehow compiled a list of things that we can cut without a whole lot of public involvement. The heartburn for her, is that we need a come a Jesus moment, where sit and discuss it openly and fairly, but that also means, when we sit to discuss it, there are some fundamental pieces that she has consistently asked for and has never seen. What is the cost, per mile, to pave a road? Why is it that some of these roads are paved under budget, and others are grossly over budget? So, moving this along, without a fundamental basis of understanding, and those answers, for her, is going to always be difficult. You are going to hear the same questions over and over again, because we do not get the answers to them. She thinks what we need is a work session where we sit and have someone facilitate this thing, tell us where we are, and what the numbers look like, who does not have anything to gain out of it. Not the staff. Not the PDT. Just looking at this, and helping us get through where we are, and where we need to go, so that we can make the hard decisions, which are causing the heartburn for Council and staff.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward this item to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Myers, to deny staff's recommendation, at this time.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor of the substitute motion was unanimous.

- e. **Staff Project Evaluation Findings and Recommendations** – Mr. Niermeier stated, at the last ad hoc meeting, we did preliminary recommendations. What is before you is what we have concluded. The recommendations are not set in stone, but there are options, which were independently assessed, and brought forward.

Ms. Steele stated the information is basically what was provided to you at the last ad hoc meeting. They did take a closer look, and tried to add the data they felt was being requested. They added the right-of-ways that were obtained, and how much we have paid for those properties, to date. We tried to make the traffic analysis consistent, knowing that not the traffic analysis was performed for every project. They went through all of the public comments that were received. Many of these projects we had 2 – 3 options we could do. They pulled what they felt would be the best option, with the funding that we have, and that we should try to address safety, if not capacity. Most of the projects, they could pull them under referendum, but again, you are not going to be able to cover capacity and safety.

Mr. Jackson inquired if this list reflects all of the projects.

Ms. Steele stated these are all of the ones that are over budget, with the exception of the sidewalks that Council previously approved.

Mr. Jackson stated he and Ms. Myers noted that Pineview was not on the list.

Mr. Niermeier stated Council decided in March to change Pineview from a widening to a repaving, with a sidewalk.

Mr. Manning inquired about the estimated cost for Pineview.

Mr. Beaty stated the estimate to do all of Pineview, per the referendum, is \$40M. To revise it to a Shared Use Path on side, and resurfacing is \$8M.

Ms. Newton inquired if this list, as presented, represents any type of prioritization or is it simply a list of all the items that are over the referendum.

Ms. Steele stated they did not prioritize the projects.

Ms. Newton stated, right now, we have possible savings, which to her is misleading because it is a savings over the overage, which is not exactly a savings. For example, if she sent her a child to the store with \$100, and he wants to spend \$300, but he only spends \$250 and he presents it as a \$50 savings, she is going to say that is not how the math works.

Ms. Steele stated it is not a possible savings between the referendum and the new amount. It is a possible savings from the current cost estimate to the recommended changes.

Ms. Newton stated she is saying that is not actually a savings. It is just an overage deduction. She stated the way she is reading this chart is that would make the total \$166.7M, with the new estimate, which is over what is allocated via the referendum.

Ms. Steele stated there are a few of these projects they could not get under referendum.

Ms. Newton stated, if we approve this list today, that still represents more money than is allocated with the referendum. Therefore, her question is how are we going to pay for that, and what is the mechanism that would appropriate the funds to pay for that.

Mr. Jackson stated there has been a list of recommendations of how to pay for it, which did include de-scoping some projects. He stated you can like or not. You can think it is fair or not, but to dismiss it is unfair. We either vote up or vote it down. He stated this list was submitted to Council prior to Ms. Newton's arrival, and we kicked it down the road. We had a vote, and then we said we did not have a vote. He stated we have never resolved that issue, but there is a document, which shows how you can save, meet the budget, and be at the referendum, but it does involve de-scoping some projects. He thinks we need to bring it back up and vote up or down, and make that decision.

Ms. Newton stated, not being here last year, or having read that document, the way she reads these recommendations is there are some recommendations that are based on the level of service, safety and future demands for roads. Her question would be, if we bring that back up, can we acknowledge how that is affected. She fully understands and acknowledges there are pending decisions, from this body, that impact staff's ability to work. She would request Mr. Brown to present those questions to us, where he has identified the dependency and the consequences of that. That way no one can say they do not understand what the consequences and dependencies are. This is a case where there are too many dependent variables. Without Council seeing how they fit together, they may not know

where one question that seems simple to them to put on hold may be stopping 50 decisions. Whatever those big pending policy questions are, at least, we can have them all out there so they are all equally aware. It may make the conversations we are having with Mr. Niermeier and his staff a little easier.

Mr. Manning stated he appreciated it being asked where we get the rest of the money. He stated we just added \$8M - \$40 M on this list, and earlier it sounded like we had a plan to go back and find \$52M, after three (3) readings a public hearing. He is not seeing it reflected in here the Mega-Millions we have saved by creating a mirror of the SCDOT. The other concern, he is having, is there are three roads on here, if he is looking at this right, where we were looking at widening that was going to keep the 2-lane, with the suicide lane in the middle. He sees where that gives us good money reduction, but if we are looking at capacity for those roads, which was his understanding when we originally put together the referendum, and why we had those widenings, in terms of road capacity. He inquired if we have overlooked some of why we were doing the projects because we are trying to cut money out, and we have lost sight. He does not blame staff if it was overlooked, or has been put on the side, because we have driven them about the money. If we are reducing the money to the point that the project is not looking like the original project, then when do we ask the question, "Well if the original project is changing significantly," maybe we need three (3) readings and a public hearing on changing the integrity or understanding." He stated, if he is driving down a road, which has a lane in each direction and is backed up at the light forever, and you told me you were going to put in 2-lanes each way to help with the amount of traffic we have on the road, and now you are only going to make left in and out easier, with the suicide lane, it may give him a whole different perspective about whether it is that much of an issue to turn in or out. It does not appear the original intent will be accomplished with the change of the scope with these three (3) projects.

Mr. Jackson stated he thinks it might be appropriate to take the 12 recommendations and have a work session, with clarification, explanation and recommendation on each one. He believes that some will be easier than others.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to refer to the 12 recommendations to a work session.

Ms. Newton requested to broaden the work session discussion to include how we move forward if the projects are still over the referendum.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- f. **OET RFQ Approval** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to accept this as information.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- g. **CE&I RFQ Approval** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to accept this as information.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:56 PM.



Agenda Briefing

To: Chair of the Committee and the Honorable Members of the Committee
Prepared by: Michael A. Niermeier, Director
Department: Richland County Transportation
Date Prepared: November 15, 2019 **Meeting Date:** December 3, 2019

Legal Review	N/A	Date:	
Budget Review	James Hayes	Date:	
Finance Review	Stacey Hamm	Date:	
Other Review:	Dr. John Thompson	Date:	
Approved for Council consideration:			

Committee

Subject: Transportation Project Budget Approval

Background Information:

On July 18, 2019, Council approved the n Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt Biennium Budget II (FY 2020 and FY 2021) for Richland County, South Carolina. Included in this ordinance was \$69,000,000 in new money for transportation.

Recommended Action:

Staff requests approval of individual project funding as presented in the attachments.

Motion Requested:

Move to accept staff recommendation for project budgets

Request for Council Reconsideration: Yes

Fiscal Impact: None

Motion of Origin:

This request did not result from a Council motion.

Council Member	N/A
Meeting	N/A
Date	N/A

Discussion: The approved biennium budget was developed from the individual project budgets shown in the attachments. These individual project budgets are a result of reviewing the PDTs previous submission and developing what we project as actually needed this year.

Attachments:

Project budget

Project Description	Phase	Budget	Cumulative for FY 20	Referendum	
Column2	Column32	Column4	Column5	Column6	Column33
Atlas Road Widening (Bluff Rd	RW	Acquisition	\$ 151,549.66		\$ 17,600,000.00
Atlas Road Widening (Bluff Rd		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 552,911.80		
Atlas Road Widening (Bluff Rd		Construction	\$ 6,324,972.27	\$ 7,029,433.73	
Bluff Road Widening Phase II	Design	Acquisition	\$ 987,380.00		\$ 7,054,370.00
Bluff Road Widening Phase II		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,025,867.07		remaining
Bluff Road Widening Phase II		Construction	\$ 632,020.65	\$ 2,645,267.72	
Blythewood Road Widening	RW	Acquisition	\$ 1,642,841.59		\$ 8,000,000.00
Blythewood Road Widening		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 311,684.15		
Blythewood Road Widening		Construction	\$ -	\$ 1,954,525.74	
Blythewood Road Area Improvements	Design	Acquisition	\$ 2,000,000.00		\$ 21,000,000.00
Blythewood Road Area Improvements		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 268,113.73		
Blythewood Road Area Improvements		Construction	\$ 204,809.74	\$ 2,472,923.47	
Broad River Road Widening	Design	Acquisition	\$ 5,220,994.55		\$ 29,000,000.00
Broad River Road Widening		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,613,265.23	\$ 6,834,259.78	
Bull St. and Elmwood Ave. Inte	RW	Acquisition	\$ 148,055.39		\$ 2,000,000.00
Bull St. and Elmwood Ave. Inte		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 192,001.99		
Bull St. and Elmwood Ave. Inte		Construction	\$ 2,118,157.93	\$ 2,458,215.31	
Clemson Rd. and Rhame Rd./Nort Inter	CO	Acquisition	\$ 19.61		\$ 3,500,000.00
Clemson Rd. and Rhame Rd./Nort Inter		Construction	\$ 41,517.88	\$ 41,537.49	
Clemson Rd. and Sparkleberry Intersection	Design	Acquisition	\$ 1,169,194.65		\$ 5,100,000.00
Clemson Rd. and Sparkleberry Intersection		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 609,531.58		
Clemson Rd. and Sparkleberry Intersection		Construction	\$ 61,986.50	\$ 1,840,712.73	
Clemson Road Widening (Old Cle	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 547,836.30		\$ 23,400,000.00
Clemson Road Widening (Old Cle		Construction	\$ 6,631,999.57	\$ 7,179,835.87	
Dirt Road Paving Projects	All	Acquisition	\$ 500,000.00		\$ 45,000,000.00
Dirt Road Paving Projects		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 3,021,416.06		\$25,000,000
Dirt Road Paving Projects		Construction	\$ 7,990,202.81	\$ 11,511,618.87	Remaining Approx
Farrow Rd. and Pisgah Church Rd Inter	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 16,339.02		\$ 3,600,000.00
Farrow Rd. and Pisgah Church Rd Inter		Construction	\$ 1,160,342.91	\$ 1,176,681.93	
Garners Ferry Rd. and Harmon R Inter	RW	Acquisition	\$ 143,357.00		\$ 2,600,000.00
Garners Ferry Rd. and Harmon R Inter		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 101,262.41		
Garners Ferry Rd. and Harmon R Inter		Construction	\$ 987,935.30	\$ 1,232,554.71	
Hardscrabble Road Widening	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 172,305.00		\$ 29,860,800.00
Hardscrabble Road Widening		Construction	\$ 1,423,715.00	\$ 1,596,020.00	
Innovista Greene Phase II	CO	Acquisition	\$ 1,113,952.52		\$30,102,030
Innovista Greene Phase II		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ -		Approc remaining
Innovista Greene Phase II		Construction	\$ 10,838,249.84	\$ 11,952,202.36	
Kennerly Rd. and Coogler Rd./ Inter	CO	Acquisition	\$ 3,325.79		\$ 1,900,000.00
Kennerly Rd. and Coogler Rd./ Inter		Construction	\$ 45,299.75	\$ 48,625.54	
Leesburg Road Widening	RW	Construction	\$ 2,000,000.00	\$ 2,000,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00
Lower Richland Boulevard Widening	Design	Acquisition	\$ 292,000.00		\$ 6,100,000.00
Lower Richland Boulevard Widening		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 821,700.00	\$ 1,113,700.00	
Neighborhood Improvement Trans	All	Acquisition	\$ 2,361,597.39		\$ 63,000,000.00
Neighborhood Improvement Trans		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 4,845,266.74		
Neighborhood Improvement Trans		Construction	\$ 9,162,464.30	\$ 16,369,328.43	
North Main Street Widening	CO	Acquisition	\$ 3,533.21		\$ 35,400,000.00
North Main Street Widening		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 433,000.63		
North Main Street Widening		Construction	\$ 17,910,298.74	\$ 18,346,832.58	
North Springs Rd. and Harrington Inter	CO	Acquisition	\$ 52,044.22		\$ 2,000,000.00
North Springs Rd. and Harrington Inter		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 105,784.74		
North Springs Rd. and Harrington Inter		Construction	\$ 2,060,225.45	\$ 2,218,054.41	
North Springs Rd. and Risdon Inter	CO	Construction	\$ 117,667.92	\$ 117,667.92	1800000
Pineview Road Widening	Design	Acquisition	\$ 951,039.80		\$ 18,200,000.00
Pineview Road Widening		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,375,747.65		
Pineview Road Widening		Construction	\$ 540,000.00	\$ 2,866,787.45	
Polo Road Widening	Design	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 955,443.90		\$ 12,800,000.00
Resurfacing Projects	All	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 189,889.49		\$ 40,000,000.00
Resurfacing Projects		Construction	\$ 7,494,097.48	\$ 8,639,430.87	Appr \$10M rem
Roadways - Intersections	NA	Construction	\$ -		

Roadways - Program	NA	Acquisition	\$ 2,451.64		
Roadways - Program		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 886,550.00		
Roadways - Program		Construction	\$ -	\$ 889,001.64	
Roadways - Special Projects	NA	Acquisition	\$ 2,447.27		
Roadways - Special Projects		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 2,653.36	\$ 5,100.63	
Screaming Eagle Rd. and Percival Inter	RW	Acquisition	\$ 137,080.00		\$ 1,000,000.00
Screaming Eagle Rd. and Percival Inter		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 165,313.54		
Screaming Eagle Rd. and Percival Inter		Construction	\$ 2,505,692.84	\$ 2,808,086.38	
Shop Road Extension Phase II	Design	Acquisition	\$ 4,155,000.00		\$ 40,171,392.00
Shop Road Extension Phase II		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 2,348,843.58		reamining
Shop Road Extension Phase II		Construction	\$ 2,934,540.60	\$ 9,438,384.18	(approx)
Shop Road Widening	RW	Acquisition	\$ 4,500,743.55		\$ 33,100,000.00
Shop Road Widening		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 837,677.59		
Shop Road Widening		Construction	\$ 2,175,210.29	\$ 7,513,631.43	
Spears Creek Church Road Widening	Design	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,182,264.34	\$ 1,182,264.34	\$ 26,600,000.00
Summit Pkwy and Summit Ridge R	CO	Construction	\$ 167,896.63	\$ 167,896.63	\$ 500,000.00
Total			\$ 133,650,582.14		

Scoped, Active Desing, or on Hold

In active Right of Way or on Hold

In procurement, on hold, active construcion, or completed

Will be removed in next FY

Descriptions in **RED** are estimated over the referendum or were completed over the referendum amount

Project Description	Type	Phase	Budget	Cumulative for FY 20	Referendum Amount	
Column2	Column34	Column32	Column4	Column5	Project Total	Column332
		Ped Imp				\$ 2,836,080.00
		Greenway				\$ 20,970,779.00
		Bikeway				\$ 22,008,773.00
		Sidewalks				\$ 26,926,370.00
Alpine Rd Two Notch Rd Percival Side	Sidewalk	RW	Acquisition	\$ 131,120.00		\$ 452,075.00
Alpine Rd Two Notch Rd Percival Side			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 489,391.34		
Alpine Rd Two Notch Rd Percival Side			Construction	\$ 862,388.04	\$ 1,482,899.38	
Assembly St and Calhoun St Ped Imp	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Assembly St and Calhoun St Ped Imp			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Assembly St and Gervais St Ped Imp	PIP	Co	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Assembly St and Gervais St Ped Imp			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Assembly St and Laurel St Ped Imp	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Assembly St and Laurel St Ped Imp			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Assembly St and Washington St Ped Imp	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Assembly St and Washington St			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Beltline Blvd Forest Dr Valley	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Beltline Blvd Forest Dr Valley			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 18,256.70		
Beltline Blvd Forest Dr Valley			Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 150,858.80	
Beltline Blvd Rosewood Dr Devi	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		
Beltline Blvd Rosewood Dr Devi			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 31,440.46		
Beltline Blvd Rosewood Dr Devi			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 214,042.56	
Beltline Blvd/Colonial Dr/Farr	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Beltline Blvd/Colonial Dr/Farr			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Beltline Blvd/Colonial Dr/Farr			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Blossom St and Saluda Ave	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Blossom St and Saluda Ave			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Blossom St Assembly St Sumter	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Blossom St Assembly St Sumter			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Blossom St Assembly St Sumter			Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Bratton St King St Maple St	Sidewalk	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ -		\$ 386,602.00
Bratton St King St Maple St			Construction	\$ 64,850.96	\$ 64,850.96	
Broad River Rd Bush River Rd G	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Broad River Rd Bush River Rd G			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Broad River Rd Bush River Rd G			Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Broad River Rd Greystone Blvd	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Broad River Rd Greystone Blvd			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Broad River Rd Greystone Blvd			Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Bull St Elmwood Ave Victoria S	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Bull St Elmwood Ave Victoria S			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Bull St Elmwood Ave Victoria S			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Calhoun St Wayne St Harden St	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		
Calhoun St Wayne St Harden St			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Calhoun St Wayne St Harden St			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Clemson Rd Brook Hollow Dr Sum	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		
Clemson Rd Brook Hollow Dr Sum			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Clemson Rd Brook Hollow Dr Sum			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Clemson Rd Longtown Rd Brook H	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		
Clemson Rd Longtown Rd Brook H			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Clemson Rd Longtown Rd Brook H			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Clemson Rd Two Notch Rd Side	Sidewalk	Design	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 6,400.00		\$ 564,728.00
Clemson Rd Two Notch Rd Side			Construction	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 506,400.00	
College St Lincoln St Sumter S	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		
College St Lincoln St Sumter S			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
College St Lincoln St Sumter S			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Columbia Mall Greenway	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 26,000.00		\$ 648,456.00
Columbia Mall Greenway			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 126,000.00	
Columbiana Dr Lake Murray Blvd	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Columbiana Dr Lake Murray Blvd			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Columbiana Dr Lake Murray Blvd			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Crane Creek Greenway A	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 1,541,816.00

Crane Creek Greenway A				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 51,000.00	\$ 151,000.00	
Crane Creek Greenway B	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 26,000.00			\$ 460,315.00
Crane Creek Greenway B				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 106,000.00	
Crane Creek Greenway C	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 10,000.00			\$ 793,908.00
Crane Creek Greenway C				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 95,000.00	\$ 105,000.00	
Dutchman Blvd Connector	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 3,000.00			\$ 105,196.00
Dutchman Blvd Connector				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 13,000.00	
Elmwood Ave and Park St	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29			
Elmwood Ave and Park St				Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Fort Jackson Blvd Devine St Ne	PIP	CO	Acquisition	\$ 25,982.31			
Fort Jackson Blvd Devine St Ne				Construction	\$ 382,998.89	\$ 408,981.20	
Garners Ferry Rd Rosewood Dr to True	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			Remove SCDOT
Garners Ferry Rd Rosewood Dr T				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Garners Ferry Rd Rosewood Dr T				Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Gills Creek A	Greenway	Design	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 520,068.62			\$ 2,246,160.00
Gills Creek A				Construction	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 820,068.62	
Gills Creek B	Greenway	Design	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 64,481.23			\$ 2,785,897.00
Gills Creek B				Construction	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 564,481.23	
Gills Creek North Greenway	Greenway	Design	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 6,120.00			\$ 344,667.00
Gills Creek North Greenway				Construction	\$ 252,000.00	\$ 258,120.00	
Grand St Shealy St Hydrick St	Sidewalk	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 6,000.00			\$ 714,622.00
Grand St Shealy St Hydrick St				Construction	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	
Hampton St Pickens St Harden S	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			
Hampton St Pickens St Harden S				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Hampton St Pickens St Harden S				Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Harrison Road Harrison Rd Harr	Sidewalk	CO	Acquisition	\$ 61,675.00			\$ 600,000.00
Harrison Road Harrison Rd Harr				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 166,637.29		
Harrison Road Harrison Rd Harr				Construction	\$ 1,027,795.66	\$ 1,256,107.95	
Huger St Blossom St Gervais St	Sidewalk	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			\$ 256,861.00
Huger St Blossom St Gervais St				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Huger St Blossom St Gervais St				Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Jefferson St Sumter St Bull St				Construction	\$ 45,867.88	\$ 45,867.88	
Koon Malinda Road Farmview Str	Sidewalk	CO	Acquisition	\$ -			\$ 92,981.00
Koon Malinda Road Farmview Str				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ -		
Koon Malinda Road Farmview Str				Construction	\$ -	\$ -	
Leesburg Rd Garners Ferry Rd S	Sidewalk	CO	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			\$ 475,200.00
Leesburg Rd Garners Ferry Rd S				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Leesburg Rd Garners Ferry Rd S				Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Lincoln St Blossom St Lady St	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			Remove SCDOT
Lincoln St Blossom St Lady St				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Lincoln St Blossom St Lady St				Construction	\$ 157,178.78	\$ 194,968.50	
Magnolia St Two Notch Rd Pineh	Sidewalk	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 3,000.00			\$ 828,458.00
Magnolia St Two Notch Rd Pineh				Construction	\$ 508,397.87	\$ 511,397.87	
Main St and Calhoun St	PIP		Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29			
Main St and Calhoun St				Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Pelham Gills Creek Parkway Gar	Sidewalk	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ -			\$ 346,774.00
Pelham Gills Creek Parkway Gar				Construction	\$ -	\$ -	
Pendleton St Lincoln St Marion	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			
Pendleton St Lincoln St Marion				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58	\$ 37,789.72	
Pendleton St Lincoln St Marion				Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 169,660.96	
Percival Road Forest Dr Decker	Sidewalk	RW	Acquisition	\$ 5,790.00			\$ 700,000.00
Percival Road Forest Dr Decker				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 128,768.06		
Percival Road Forest Dr Decker				Construction	\$ 1,987,200.01	\$ 2,121,758.07	
Pickens St Washington St Rosew	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			
Pickens St Washington St Rosew				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Pickens St Washington St Rosew				Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Pickens St/Washington St/Wayne	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14			
Pickens St/Washington St/Wayne				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Pickens St/Washington St/Wayne				Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Polo Rd Mallet Hill Rd Alpine	Sidewalk	CO	Acquisition	\$ 30,550.35			\$ 403,444.00
Polo Rd Mallet Hill Rd Alpine				Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 213,778.58		
Polo Rd Mallet Hill Rd Alpine				Construction	\$ 927,436.56	\$ 1,171,765.49	
Polo/Windsor Lake Connector	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 20,000.00			\$ 385,545.00

Polo/Windsor Lake Connector			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 151,000.00	\$ 171,000.00	
Rosewood Dr and Beltline Blvd	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Rosewood Dr and Beltline Blvd			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Rosewood Dr and Harden St	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Rosewood Dr and Harden St			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Rosewood Dr and Holly St	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Rosewood Dr and Holly St			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Rosewood Dr and Kilbourne Rd	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Rosewood Dr and Kilbourne Rd			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Rosewood Dr and Marion St	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Rosewood Dr and Marion St			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Rosewood Dr and Ott Rd	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Rosewood Dr and Ott Rd			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Rosewood Dr and Pickens St	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Rosewood Dr and Pickens St			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Rosewood Dr Bluff Rd Garners F	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Rosewood Dr Bluff Rd Garners F			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 22,218.79		
Rosewood Dr Bluff Rd Garners F			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 204,820.89	
Royster St Mitchell St Superio	Sidewalk	CO	Construction	\$ 471,840.77	\$ 471,840.77	\$ 95,357.00
School House Rd Two Notch Rd E	Sidewalk	CO	Acquisition	\$ 1,300.00		\$ 482,882.00
School House Rd Two Notch Rd E			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 12,562.68		
School House Rd Two Notch Rd E			Construction	\$ 1,401.81	\$ 15,264.49	
Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway A	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 15,000.00		\$ 431,183.00
Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway A			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 16,400.00	\$ 31,400.00	
Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway B	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 1,415,316.00
Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway A			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 231,400.00	\$ 331,400.00	
Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway C	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 96,916.97		\$ 901,122.00
Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway C			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 253,224.28	\$ 350,141.25	
Sumter St Washington St Senate	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Sumter St Washington St Senate			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Sumter St Washington St Senate			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Sunset Elmhurst Road River Dri	Sidewalk	RW	Acquisition	\$ 111,049.75		\$ 364,522.00
Sunset Elmhurst Road River Dri			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 242,219.56		
Sunset Elmhurst Road River Dri			Construction	\$ 480,426.93	\$ 833,696.24	
Superior St Whaley St Airport	Sidewalk	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 3,000.00		\$ 778,852.00
Superior St Whaley St Airport			Construction	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 13,000.00	
Three Rivers Greenway Extension 1	Greenway	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 57,274.89		\$ 7,902,242.00
Three Rivers Greenway Extension 1			Construction	\$ 1,224,206.27	\$ 1,281,481.16	
Tryon St Catawba St Heyward St	Sidewalk	CO	Acquisition	\$ 1,700.00		\$ 354,446.00
Tryon St Catawba St Heyward St			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 3,000.00		
Tryon St Catawba St Heyward St			Construction	\$ 44,617.16	\$ 49,317.16	
Two Notch Rd and Brickyard Rd	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Two Notch Rd and Brickyard Rd			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Two Notch Rd and Maingate Dr/W	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Two Notch Rd and Maingate Dr/W			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Two Notch Rd and Sparkleberry	PIP	CO	Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 1,335.29		
Two Notch Rd and Sparkleberry			Construction	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 16,335.29	
Two Notch Rd Beltline Blvd Par	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		
Two Notch Rd Beltline Blvd Par			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Two Notch Rd Beltline Blvd Par			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Whaley St Lincoln St Pickens S	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		
Whaley St Lincoln St Pickens S			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Whaley St Lincoln St Pickens S			Construction	\$ 169,660.96	\$ 207,450.68	
Wheat St Harden St King St	Bike	Design	Acquisition	\$ 12,941.14		Remove SCDOT
Wheat St Harden St King St			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 24,848.58		
Wheat St Harden St King St			Construction	\$ 119,660.96	\$ 157,450.68	
Woodbury/Old Leesburg Greenway	Greenway	Design	Acquisition	\$ 5,000.00		\$ 116,217.00
Woodbury/Old Leesburg Greenway			Professional Svcs - Capl Exp	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 13,000.00	
				\$ 18,294,094.68	\$ 100,717,846.00	

Scoped, Active Desing, or on Hold
In active Right of Way or on Hold
In procurement, on hold, active construcion, or completed

Will be removed in next FY

Some bikeways were budgeted that were removed per SCDOT



Agenda Briefing

To: Chair of the Committee and the Honorable Members of the Committee
Prepared by: Michael A. Niermeier, Director
Department: Richland County Transportation
Date Prepared: November 15, 2019 **Meeting Date:** December 3, 2019

Legal Review	N/A	Date:	
Budget Review	N/A	Date:	
Finance Review	N/a	Date:	
Other Review:	Procurement	Date:	11/25/2019
Approved for Council consideration:			

Committee

Subject: Transportation Project in Acquisition and Under Contract

Background Information:

All Transportation Penny projects not currently in active construction (contractor performing work on site) are on hold. There are four projects that fall into unique circumstances that require a decision in order to move forward.

Greene Street Phase II is under contract with a pre-construction meeting scheduled for December 4, 2019. Construction mobilization is anticipated to begin in January/ February 2020. The Notice to Proceed would be issued at the pre-construction meeting.

N. Springs/ Harrington Intersection project is under contract with a notice-to-proceed (NTP) issued. Construction anticipated to begin in November/ December 2019.

Sidewalk Package S12- Harrison Road was evaluated and a bid results summary sent to the Transportation Department for an award recommendation. \$600,000 was allocated for this project in the referendum. The lowest bid received was well over this amount. However, as a category of the approved 50 of 56 sidewalk projects (Special Called Meeting on August 1, 2019) this project fits into the overall available funding of \$21,002,370.

Sidewalk Package S13- Polo Road SUP was evaluated and a bid results summary sent to the Transportation Department for an awards recommendation. \$403,444 was allocated for this project in the referendum. The lowest bid received was well over this amount. However, as a category of the approved 50 of 56 sidewalk projects (Special Called Meeting on August 1, 2019) this project fits into the overall available funding of \$21,002,370.

Recommended Action:

Staff recommends allowing Innovista/Greene Street Phase II and N. Spring/ Harrington Intersection projects to move forward as they are under contract.

Staff recommends moving forward for approval, award and contracting for Sidewalk Packages S12 and S13 as Council has elected to move forward with the to 50 of 56 sidewalks and there is money in this project category type to complete the remaining approved sidewalk projects.

Motion Requested:

Move to approve staff recommendations to proceed with the four (4) projects.

Request for Council Reconsideration: Yes

Fiscal Impact: None

Motion of Origin:

This request did not result from a Council motion.

Council Member	N/A
Meeting	N/A
Date	N/A

Discussion:

Greene Street Phase II is under contract with a pre-construction meeting scheduled for December 4, 2019. Construction mobilization is anticipated to begin in January/ February 2020. Greene Street Phase II is part of the Special, Innovista Transportation-Related Projects with a specific project description and a specified referendum amount of \$50,000,000. Innovista/ Greene Street Phase I was completed in May 2017 for \$17,897,970.34 leaving \$ 32,102,029.66. County Council approved the construction contract on October 1, 2019 for \$16,046,190.35 with a 10% contingency of \$1,604,619.04 and an 8% utility contingency of \$1,283,695.23. The total amounts to \$ 18,934,504.62. Remaining money for Phase III is \$ 13, 167,525.04. The project was ranked 4 of 9 in the Council approved rankings of Special Projects on October 7, 2014.

N. Springs/ Harrington Intersection is under contract with a notice-to-proceed (NTP) issued. Construction is anticipated to begin in November/ December 2019. County Council approved the construction contract on August 1, 2019 for \$960,931.00 with a 10% contingency of \$96,093.10 for a total of \$1,057,0241.10. This project has \$2,000,000 allotted in the referendum. This project is ranked 7 of 8 of the non-quick start intersection projects.

Sidewalk Package S12- Harrison Road was evaluated and a bid results summary sent to the Transportation Department for an award recommendation. The Harrison Road Sidewalk project was ranked 11 of 56 for sidewalks listed in the referendum. On August 1, 2019, County Council approved to move forward with the top 50 of 56 sidewalks as presented in the July 2019 Sidewalk Status document. Of the 50 approved sidewalks, \$21,002,370 in penny and outside funding was available for sidewalk projects. Anticipated costs for the 50 sidewalks is estimated at \$18,124,907. The lowest responsive and responsible bidder was well below the project cost estimate. This project was prioritized as HIGH in accordance with the October 7, 2014 Council approved Bikeway and Sidewalk Point System and Prioritization document.

Sidewalk Package S13- Polo Road SUP was evaluated and a bid results summary sent to the Transportation Department for an awards recommendation. The Polo Road Sidewalk project was ranked 17 of 56 for sidewalks listed in the referendum. On August 1, 2019, County Council approved to move forward with the top 50 of 56 sidewalks as presented in the July 2019 Sidewalk Status document. Of the 50 approved sidewalks, \$21,002,370 in penny and outside funding was available. Anticipated costs for the 50 sidewalks is estimated at \$18,124,907. The lowest responsive and responsible bidder

was well below the project cost estimate. This project was prioritized as HIGH in accordance with the October 7, 2014 Council approved Bikeway and Sidewalk Point System and Prioritization document.

Attachments:

1. August 1, 2019 Council Special Called Meeting – Sidewalk Decision and N. Springs/ Harrington Contract approval.
2. October 1, 2019 Meeting- Greene Phase II contract approval
3. October 7, 2014: Council approved Bikeway and Sidewalk Point System and Prioritization document
4. July 2019 Sidewalk Status Document as presented at August 1, 2019 Council meeting and approved.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

16. **REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

- a. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of an infrastructure credit agreement to provide for infrastructure credits; and other related matters [FIRST READING] – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

17. **REPORT OF THE RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE**

- a. Township Auditorium Board – Two (2) Vacancies – Ms. Newton stated the committee recommended re-appointing Ms. Abigail Rogers and appointing Mr. Harold Ward.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

18. **REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. Items for Information:

1. Approval of Letters of Recommendation to Award Bid:

- a. Resurfacing Package Q – Mr. Jackson stated the package includes 52 roads and a length of approximately 16.4 miles. The proposed bids were opened in July, and reviewed, according to the appropriate procurement process. The committee recommends the awarding of the letter of recommendation for the bid.

Ms. Myers stated, at the committee meeting, a request was made for a list of roads in each of the packages.

Mr. Niermeier stated they could get the list for Council. The list is also included in the monthly report.

Mr. Malinowski suggested deferring this item until the end of the Report of the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee to allow staff time to provide the requested information.

Mr. Jackson stated he does not object to deferring the item. The only objection he has is that it has been handed out on more than one occasion. This is not a new report. It has been distributed more than once.

Ms. Dickerson stated she is sure that she has the list, but she expects it to be in front of her. She does not expect to have to “fish” to get it. As evidenced earlier, things can change between meetings and she wants to ensure what she is voting for/against has not changed.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Walker, Dickerson and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. North Springs/Harrington Intersection – Mr. Jackson stated the bids were opened on July 17th. The proposed scope recommends that North Spring Road be widened, and also provide an additional widening along Harrington Road. These fall within the referendum amount and the committee recommends approval.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson and Livingston

Abstain: McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous with Ms. McBride abstaining from the vote.

2. Approval to Increase Construction Contingency Amount: -- Mr. Jackson stated the request is to increase the construction contingency amount beyond the original approved amount of 10% due to changes in site conditions and modifications of the projects to minimize impacts to utilities. Increases will occur the Koon/Fairview Sidewalk and the Magnolia/Schoolhouse Road projects.
- a. Koon/Fairview Sidewalk Project (10%)
b. Magnolia/Schoolhouse Road Project (10%)

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Kennedy, Livingston and McBride

Abstain: Myers and Dickerson

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous with Ms. Myers and Ms. Dickerson abstaining from the vote.

3. Approval of Penny Project Features Inside SCDOT Right of Way – Mr. Jackson stated there were several projects discussed at the work session regarding shared-use paths, landscaped medians, mast arms and street lighting. The committee recommends the removal of these items from future designs.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if these are the ones that had tremendous annual costs.

Mr. Jackson stated some of the costs would not be annual. The mast arms would only have to be replaced if they were damaged. The annual costs would be for the landscaping.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the ordinance that said we would not put street lights anywhere unless they could be put everywhere.

Mr. Niermeier stated that was an exhibit in the committee packet. The recommendation from the committee is to remove these items from current designs. There are a couple of designs being held up pending inclusion/non-inclusion.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Kennedy, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Myers, Walker and Dickerson

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. Approval of moving forward with 50 of the 56 Sidewalk projects in the Ordinance Referendum – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended moving forward with the 50 of the 56 sidewalk projects in the ordinance referendum. These are sidewalks that have been discussed, and recognized, that could be completed given the current dollars available.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there was public input on these.

Mr. Jackson stated Mr. Beaty indicated there was public input.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Kennedy, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Abstain: Newton and Myers

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous with Ms. Newton and Ms. Myers abstaining from the vote.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Ms. McBride stated she has spoken with the Administrator, but she wants to make it known publicly that they are still having problems with the sidewalks on Magnolia and Schoolhouse Road. There is no construction taking place. She has been promised by the Transportation Department Director that he would keep her abreast of what is going on, but she does not know what is going on. Her constituents have been calling her and she has been by both projects. There are 2 houses, where senior citizens are residing, in which they cannot use their front door and the mail carrier cannot deliver mail. If we need to fire the contractors and hire new contractors, that is what needs to be done.

Mr. Niermeier responded that he has a signed letter that will be mailed out tomorrow to the residents. In preparation of them beginning work, the contractor deployed equipment to their holding area off of Magnolia yesterday. He has been working with Procurement on how to address this contractually.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Public Works is now under the Transportation Department.

Mr. Niermeier responded that Public Works and Transportation are 2 separate departments.

19. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. Residential Utilities Assistance Program – Mr. Malinowski requested an explanation regarding the following statement: “The fund will be subject to County Council’s annual appropriations...” as he was not aware Council would be appropriating funding.

Attachment 2. October 1, 2019 Meeting- Greene Street Phase II Contract Approval

Ms. Terracio stated, having had many conversations about greenways, bikeways and sidewalks, she would suggest, because the greenways are such a special category, they get their own three readings and public hearing. Then, maybe we treat different categories separately.

Mr. Manning stated Mr. Smith said there were several times in the past that we were looking at making some changes, and there was a discussion about three readings and a public hearing. We have never done that yet, so he is hopeful that we can go back and get a list of every time there was discussion, over the past 5 years, about whether something took three readings and public hearing, and we make all those null and void. He would like to have that list by the end of the week.

Mr. Malinowski stated he is still not sure about the properness of the motion. We have already voted on this matter, and now we are bringing something back that we have already voted on.

In Favor: Terracio, Newton, Myers, Walker, Dickerson and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson, Kennedy and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote was in favor.

3. Approval of Letter Recommending to Award bid for Greene Street Phase 2 – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Newton and Manning

Opposed: Walker

Abstain: Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

4. Recommendation for Remaining Years 3 & 4 Redesign of certain Years 1 – 2 Roads – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval.

Ms. Myers stated her concern is that we have this list of roads that have been dropped by staff, or otherwise dropped, but we have not gone back and notified the property owners. She would be reluctant to move to redesign roads and leaving other roads without understanding whether these are the roads that ought to be in Years 1 and 2. For her, she is surprised that one has been dropped from the list. It is the one road, with the 96-year old lady, she has heard about almost every week since she came onto Council. She does not think the list, as it stands, ought to be let.

Mr. Jackson stated, for clarification, according to staff, all members of the community have been notified.

Mr. Niermeier stated at some point along the process everyone has been notified. It might have been 2 – 3 years ago.



Definition and Weighting of Criteria for Prioritization of Transportation Penny Projects:

Bikeway and Sidewalk Point System and Prioritization

The bikeway and sidewalk ranking and validation process was carried out primarily within a GIS environment, data collected from local agencies, as well as by field observations to confirm existing conditions. The respective weights of each criterion were determined and refined with input from Richland County Council Transportation Ad Hoc Committee, the County Transportation Director and analysis of other recent and comparable programs in the region. Projects that will be built as part of a road widening were not prioritized, but were included for validation and confirmation.

To optimize flexibility and grouping variety, projects were prioritized into a high, medium or low category based on culminated point totals. The augmented point system for all criteria is as follows:

20 points – Existing concept plans or designs for the project are in position or are under development. Up to 20 points were given to a project that had a completed master plan document and/or was ready for construction commencement.

25 points - Connectivity to existing public trails, greenways and public lands such as national, state or county parks. Connectivity offers more public use and enables a single project to link to a broader local or regional network of new or existing infrastructure.

2 points - Acquisition, construction and maintenance costs based on updated route and design information. Projects that had undergone a re-assessment of unit costs, professional design fees, construction engineering inspection costs, utility relocation cost assumptions, right-of-way cost assumptions and contingency factors received 2 points. Costs were compared against recent SCDOT standards and local construction cost factors. To ensure all projects were considered objectively and equitably, these criteria were not given high maximum points.

20 points – Connectivity to schools within a ½ mile or less. Up to 20 points were awarded for this criteria.

10 points – Connectivity to major business centers within a ½ mile or less. Up to 10 points were given for this criteria.

10 points – Connectivity to a transit facility (bus station, bus route or bus stop) within ½ mile or less. Up to 10 points were given to a project that meets these criteria.

15 points – No (or partial) existing sidewalk or bikeway exists. Up to 15 points were given to a project that meets this criteria.

A total of up to 102 points is the maximum achievable score, however, no sidewalk or bikeway exceeded 82 points. Total points were used to determine priority level.

Prioritization levels:

82 to 68 – High priority

67 to 56 – Medium priority

55 to 0 – Low priority



SIDEWALK PROJECTS

Attachment 4. July 2019 Sidewalk Status Document as presented at August 1, 2019 Council meeting and approved

Priority	Rank	Council District	Project Names	Begin Location	End Location	Existing Concept Plans	Connectivity to Greenway	Acquisition, Construction/Maintenance Costs Determined	Connectivity to Schools	Connectivity to Business	Connectivity to transit	Partial to No Sidewalk/Bike way	Total Points	Comments	
			Sidewalks			0-20 pts	10-25 pts	0-2 pts	10-20 pts	5-10 pts	5-10 pts	5-15 pts	102 pts		
Completed Projects	*	5	Blossom St	Williams St	Huger St									Traveling toward Huger St. - Sidewalk on Both Sides - Begin to End (Complete)///Connectivity to City/County SIB///High volume of development in area///Part of Bike/Ped Master Plan	
	*	5	Gervais St	450' west of Gist St	Gist St									Traveling toward Gist St. - Sidewalk on Both Sides- From Begin to End (Complete)	
	*	5	Gervais St	Gist St	Huger St									Traveling toward Huger St. - Sidewalk on Both Sides- From Begin to End (Complete)	
High Priority Projects	High	5	Shandon St	Rosewood Dr	Heyward St	0	22	2	20	10	10	15	79	No Sidewalk at Present	
	High	4	Jefferson St	Sumter St	Bull St	0	20	2	20	10	10	15	77	No Sidewalk at Present	
	High	8	Polo Rd	Mallet Hill Rd	Alpine Rd	0	25	2	20	10	10	10	77	None (Partial Right Sidewalk in front of apartment complex)	
	High	5,6	Senate St	Gladden St	Kings St	0	25	2	20	5	10	15	77	No sidewalk at present///street passes a park	
	High	10	Wiley St	Superior St	Edisto Ave	0	22	2	20	5	10	15	74	No sidewalk at present///Connects to neighborhood park that is not park of greenway system	
	High		Harrison Road	Two Notch Rd	Forest Drive	0	20	2	15	10	10	15	72	No Sidewalk at Present	
	High	6	Maple St	Kirby St	Gervais St	0	20	2	20	5	10	15	72	No Sidewalk at Present	
	High	4	Mildred Ave	Westwood Ave	Duke Ave	0	20	2	20	5	10	15	72	No Sidewalk at Present	
	High	4	Wildwood Ave	Monticello Rd	Ridgewood Ave	0	20	2	20	5	10	15	72	No sidewalk at present///Leads to neighborhood park on other side of Monticello Rd that is not part of greenway system	
	High	3	Windover St	Two Notch Rd	Belvedere Dr	0	20	2	15	10	10	15	72	No Sidewalk at Present	
Medium Priority Projects	High	11	Leesburg Rd	Garners Ferry Rd	Semmes Rd	0	20	2	20	10	10	10	72	Traveling toward Semmes Rd. - Sidewalk on Left until Green Lawn Dr. - Sidewalks on Both Sides until Eugene St. - Sidewalk on Left until Twin Lakes Rd- None until End	
	High	11	Lower Richland Blvd	Rabbit Run Rd	Garners Ferry Rd	0	20	2	20	7	5	15	69	No Sidewalk at Present	
	High	3	Magnolia St	Two Notch Rd	Pinehurst Rd	0	20	2	15	7	10	15	69	No Sidewalk at Present	
	Medium	9, 10	Clemson Rd	Two Notch Rd	Percival Rd	0	20	2	15	10	5	15	67	No Sidewalk at Present	
	Medium	4	Franklin St	Sumter St	Bull St	0	20	2	15	5	10	15	67	No Sidewalk at Present	
	Medium	5	Huger St	Blossom St	Gervais St	0	25	2	15	10	10	5	67	Traveling toward Gervais- Sidewalk on Both Sides until Devine St. - Sidewalk on Left side until Building corner- None until Senate St. - Sidewalk on Both Sides until End	
	Medium	3, 8, 10	Alpine Rd	Two Notch Rd	Percival Rd	0	25	2	10	10	10	5	62	Traveling toward Two Notch - Sidewalk Existing on Right Side -Starting from Gardenia Dr. to Two Notch Rd. (Sidewalk and Bikeway shall be combined, thus lower costs)	
	Medium	5,10	Heyward St/Marion St/Superior/Holt St	Whaley St	Airport Blvd.	0	10	2	20	10	10	7	59	Entire length, sidewalk is primarily on one side of the street.	
	Medium	10	Royster St	Mitchell St	Superior St	0	10	2	15	7	10	15	59	No Sidewalk at Present	
	Medium	3	School House Rd	Two Notch Rd	Ervin St	0	10	2	10	10	10	15	57	No Sidewalk at Present	
	Medium	6	Pelham	Gills Creek Parkway	Garners Ferry Road	0	20	2	10	10	10	5	57	City priority list///Project complete, funds need to be redirected to Assembly Street Improvements to avoid losing existing earmark.	
	Medium	4	Calhoun St	Gadsden St	Wayne St	0	25	2	10	10	5	5	57	Traveling toward Wayne St. - Sidewalk On Both Sides- From Begin to End	
	Medium	6	Percival Road	Forest Dr	Decker Blvd	0	10	2	20	10	10	5	57	Traveling toward Decker Blvd. - Sidewalk on Right Side for 500' - None until Northshore Rd. - Left Side until End///Part of Bike/Ped Master Plan	
	Medium	5	Prospect	Wilmot Avenue	Yale	0	10	2	20	5	5	15	57	No Sidewalk at Present	
	Medium	5	Shandon St	Wilmot St	Wheat St	0	10	2	20	5	5	15	57	No Sidewalk at Present	
	Low Priority Projects	Low	5, 10	Assembly St/Shop Rd	Whaley St	Beltline Blvd	0	15	2	10	10	10	5	52	Traveling toward Beltline Blvd. - Sidewalk on Left Side for 350'- None until End
		Low	5	Bratton St	King St	Maple St	0	10	2	20	5	10	5	52	Traveling toward Maple St. - Sidewalk on Left Side for 100' - None until End
Low		8, 9, 10	Polo Rd.	Two Noth Rd.	Mallet Hill Rd.	0	20	2	20	5	5	5	52	Will be completed part of the Polo Rd. Widening Project	
Low		4	Broad River Rd	Greystone Blvd	Broad River Bridge	0	20	2	10	10	10		52	Bike/Ped Master Plan	
Low		4, 5	Laurel St	Gadsden St	Pulaski St	0	25	2	10	5	5	5	52	Traveling towards Gadsden, sidewalk on both sides	
Low		7, 8, 9	Clemson Rd	Longwood Rd.	Two Notch Rd	0	10	2	20	10	5	5	52	/// Traveling toward Two Notch Rd. - Sidewalk on Right Side - From N. Springs to Town Center Place. Total road length is 4.48 miles, but only 1 mile of sidewalk in plan.	
Low		3	Koon	Malinda Road	Farmview Street	0	10	2	20	5	10	5	52	Traveling toward Farmview St. - Sidewalk on Left Side Until 500' after Prescott Rd. - None at Present until End	
Low		3, 7, 8, 9	Two Notch Rd	Alpine Rd	Spears Creek Church Rd	0	10	2	15	10	10	5	52	Traveling toward Spears Creek Church - Sidewalk Exists on Both Sides Until Rabon Rd - Sidewalk on Left until Lionsgate Dr. - None until End	
Low		4, 5	Wayne St	Calhoun St	Laurel St	0	25	2	10	5	5	5	52	Traveling toward Laurel St. - None until Richland St. - Sidewalk on Left side until End	
Low		5	Lincoln St	Heyward St	Whaley St	0	10	2	10	7	10	10	49	Traveling toward Whaley St., no sidewalk on either side.	
Low		3	Pinehurst	Harrison Road	Forest Drive	0		2	20	10		5	47	Traveling toward Forest Drive - Sidewalk On Right Side Until End - (Left Sidewalk exists for a short amount distance before Forest Drive)///Portion complete, need to finish route to enhance safety///Park of Bike/Ped Master Plan	
Low		10	Bluff Rd.	Rosewood Dr.	Beltline Blvd.	0	15	2	10	10	10		47	Will be completed as part of the Bluff Rd. Widening Project	
Low		1	Broad River Rd.	Royal Tower Rd.	Woodrow St.	0	10	2	15	10	10		47	Will be completed as part of the US 176 Widening Project	
Low		2	Broad River Rd	Harbison Blvd	Bush River Rd	0	10	2	10	10	10	5	47	Bike/Ped Master Plan	
Low		6	Fort Jackson Blvd	Wildcat Rd	I-77	0	20	2	10	10	5	0	47	Traveling toward I-77 - Sidewalk on Both Sides - From Begin to End (Complete)	
Low		5	Tryon St	Catawba St	Heyward St	0	15	2	15	5	5	5	47	Traveling toward Heyward St. - Sidewalk On Both Sides until End	
Low		2	Broad River Rd/Lake Murray Blvd	I-26	Harbison Blvd	0	10	2	10	10	10	5	47	Traveling toward Harbison - Sidewalk Exists on Both Sides - From I-26 to Kinley Rd.	
Low		2	Columbiana Dr	Lexington County Line	Lake Murray Blvd	0	10	2	10	10	10	5	47	Traveling toward Lexington County Line - Sidewalk on Right Side - From Begin to End /// Sidewalk on Left Side at Begin, but not to the end.	
Low		4	Grand St	Shealy St	Hydrick St	0	10	2	20		10	5	47	Traveling toward Hydrick St. - Sidewalk on Right Side for 350' before Academy St. - None until Liberty St. - Sidewalk on the Right until Dead End	
Low		5	Lyon St	Gervais St	Washington St	0	10	2	20		10	5	47	Traveling toward Washington St. - Sidewalk on the Right Side until End	
Low	5	Park St	Gervais St	Senate St	0	10	2	10	10	10	5	47	Traveling toward Senate St. - Sidewalk on Left Side until End		
Low	11	Veterans	Garners Ferry Road	Wormwood Drive	0	10	2	10	10	10	5	47	Traveling toward Wormwood Drive - Sidewalk on Right Side until End		
Low	11	Atlas Rd	Fountain Lake Way	Garners Ferry Rd.	0	10	2	10	10	10	10	42	Will be completed as part of the Atlas Rd. Widening Project		
Low	2	Broad River Rd.	Lake Murray Blvd.	Western Ln.	0	10	2	10	10	10	10	42	Will be completed as part of the US 176 Widening Project		
Low	2	Blythewood Rd	I-77	Main St	0	10	2	10	10	5	0	37	Traveling toward Main St. - Sidewalk on Both Sides - Begin to End (Complete)		
Low	4	Colonial Dr/Farrow Rd	Harden St	Academy St	0	10	2	10	10		5	37	Traveling down Colonial Dr. toward Academy St. - Sidewalk on Both Sides- From Begin to End /// Traveling down Farrow Rd. toward Academy St. - Sidewalk on Right Side, except after Booker St.- Sidewalk on Both Sides		
Low	6,11	Veterans	Coachmaker Road	Coatsdale Road	0	10	2	10	5	5	5	37	Traveling toward Coastdale Rd. - Sidewalk on Left Side until End		



**Richland Penny Transportation Program
July 2019 Sidewalk Status**

ACTIVE / COMPLETED REFERENDUM PROJECTS (50)

2015 PRIORITY	DISTRICT	PROJECT NAME	TERMINI	TERMINI	LENGTH (MILES)	COMMENTS	REFERENDUM AMOUNT	*PROGRAMMED COST
Complete	5	Blossom St.	Williams St.	Huger St.	.1 (460')	Complete	\$41,564	\$0
Complete	5	Gervais St.	Gist St.	450' w Gist	0.1 (450')	Complete	\$8,638	\$0
Complete	5	Gervais St.	Gist St.	Huger St.	0.18	Complete	\$84,100	\$0
High	4	Jefferson St. (S-363)	Sumter St.	Bull St. (SC 277)	0.13	Complete	\$381,242	\$166,448
High	6	Maple St. (City)	Kirby St. (City)	Gervais St. (US 1)	0.1 (346')	Complete	\$132,502	\$94,308
High	4	Mildred Ave. (S-797)	Westwood Ave. (S-860)	Duke Ave. (S-126)	0.1 (430')	Complete	\$151,536	\$94,308
High	5, 6	Senate St. (S-351)	Gladden St. (S-351)	King St. (S-142)	0.26	Complete	\$476,230	\$142,718
High	4	Wildwood Ave. (S-203)	Monticello Rd. (S-215)	Ridgewood Ave. (S-76)	0.14	Complete	\$264,449	\$72,867
High	10	Wiley St. (S-1093)	Superior St. (S-448)	Edisto Ave. (City)	0.15	Complete	\$280,896	\$95,892
High	3	Windover St. (S-1372)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Belvedere Dr. (S-1358)	0.1 (546')	Complete	\$187,942	\$72,867
High	3	Harrison Rd. (S-93)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Forest Dr. (SC 12)	1.17	Available to construct.	\$600,000	\$1,951,365
High	3	Magnolia St. (S-94, City)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Pinehurst Rd. (S-943)	0.44	In Construction. 2019 completion.	\$828,458	\$509,862
High	5	Shandon St. (City)	Rosewood Dr. (SC 16)	Heyward St. (City)	0.14	Deferred by Council based on public input.	\$268,514	\$0
High	4	Sunset Dr. (SC 16)	Elmhurst Rd. (S-1405)	River Dr. (US 176)	0.74	Design underway. 2020 Construction.	\$364,522	\$2,490,208
High	11	Lower Richland	Rabbit Run Rd. (S-2089)	Garners Ferry Rd. (US 76)	0.55	To be constructed with the widening project.	\$260,077	\$0
High	11	Leesburg Rd.	Garners Ferry Rd. (US 76)	Semmes Rd. (City)	4	2019 Construction (Part of SCDOT Widening)	\$475,200	\$0
High	8, 9, 10	Polo Rd. (S-2214)	Mallet Hill Rd. (City)	Alpine Rd. (S-63)	1.69	Available to construct	\$403,444	\$2,935,771
Medium	4	Calhoun St. (City)	Gadsden St. (City)	Wayne St. (City)	0.1 (518')	Complete	\$91,106	\$0
Medium	4	Franklin St. (S-165)	Sumter St.	Bull St. (SC 277)	0.29	Complete	\$785,585	\$166,448
Medium	10	Royster St. (Capers)	Mitchell St. (S-1989)	Superior St. (S-448)	0.1 (428')	Complete	\$95,357	\$124,409
Medium	5,10	Superior St. (City) (Marion)	Whaley St. (City)	Airport Blvd. (City)	0.18	Complete	\$778,852	\$83,807
Medium	9, 10	Clemson Rd. (S-52)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Percival Rd. (SC 12)	3.39	Available to construct.	\$564,728	\$413,086
Medium	6	Pelham Dr. (City)	Gills Creek Pkwy (City)	Garners Ferry Rd. (US 76)	1.52	Complete	\$346,774	\$65,415
Medium	3	School House Rd. (S-1350)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Ervin St. (S-1350)	0.26	In Construction. 2019 completion.	\$482,882	\$509,862
Medium	5	Prospect Rd. (S-357)	Wilmot Ave. (City)	Yale St. (S-360)	0.28	Deferred by Council based on public input.	\$137,938	\$0
Medium	5	Shandon St. (City)	Wilmot Ave. (City)	Wheat St. (City)	0.1 (426')	Deferred by Council based on public input.	\$179,071	\$0
Medium	3, 8, 10	Alpine Rd. (S-63)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Percival Rd. (SC 12)	2.41	Late 2019 construction	\$452,075	\$4,431,225
Medium	6	Percival Rd. (SC 12)	Forest Dr. (SC 12)	Decker Blvd. (S-151)	1.52	2020 construction	\$700,000	\$2,547,062
Low	2	Blythewood Rd. (S-59)	I-77	Main St. (S-21)	0.54	Complete	\$191,601	\$0
Low	5	Bratton St. (S-139)	King St. (S-142)	Maple St. (City)	0.21	Complete	\$386,602	\$83,807
Low	4, 5	Broad River Rd. (US 176)	Greystone Blvd. (S-3020)	Broad River Bridge	0.48	Complete	\$109,367	\$0
Low	4	Colonial Dr. (S-228)	Harden St. (SC 555)	Academy St. (SC 16)	0.37	Complete	\$1,012,704	\$0
Low	2	Columbiana Dr. (City)	Lex. Co. Line	Lake Murray Blvd. (SC 60)	0.98	Complete	\$486,272	\$0
Low	4	Grand St. (S-809/S-1502)	Shealy St. (City)	Hydrick St. (S-1422)	0.45	Complete	\$714,622	\$83,807
Low	4, 5	Laurel St. (S-337)	Gadsden St. (City)	Pulaski St. (City)	0.19	Complete	\$359,066	\$0
Low	5	Lincoln St. (City)	Heyward St. (City)	Whaley St. (City)	0.1 (553')	Complete	\$198,475	\$0
Low	5	Lyon St. (S-821)	Gervais St. (US 1)	Washington St. (City)	0.21	Complete	\$194,410	\$0
Low	3	Pinehurst Rd. (S-943)	Harrison Rd. (S-93)	Forest Dr. (SC 12)	0.7	Complete	\$1,649,672	\$0
Low	11	Veterans St. (S-1534)	Garners Ferry Rd. (US 76)	Wormwood Dr. (city)	0.34	Complete	\$171,602	\$0
Low	6, 11	Veterans St. (S-1534)	Coachmaker Rd. (City)	Coatsdale Rd. (City)	0.1 (336')	Complete	\$45,915	\$0
Low	4, 5	Wayne St. (City)	Calhoun St. (City)	Laurel St. (S-337)	0.2	Complete	\$366,828	\$0
Low	3	Koon Rd. (S-456)	Malinda Rd. (City)	Farmview St. (City)	0.16	In Construction. 2019 Completion.	\$92,891	\$283,137
Low	5	Tryon St. (City)	Catawba Ave. (City)	Heyward St. (City)	0.19	Complete	\$354,446	\$65,415
Low	6	Fort Jackson Blvd (SC 760)	Wildcat Rd. (US 76)	I-77	0.53	Design pending approval	\$343,543	\$470,245
Low	5	Park St. (City)	Gervais St. (US 1)	Senate St. (S-351)	0.1 (504')	Assigned to City	\$170,570	\$170,570
Low	11	Atlas Rd. (S-50)	Fountain Lake Way (city)	Garners Ferry Rd. (US 76)	0.54	To be completed as part of Atlas Rd. widening	\$0	\$0
Low	10	Bluff Rd. (SC 48)	Rosewood Dr. (SC 16)	Beltline Blvd. (SC 16)	2.5	To be completed as part of Bluff Rd. widening	\$0	\$0
Low	1	Broad River Rd. (US 176)	Royal Tower Rd. (S-1862)	Woodrow St. (City)	0.77	To be completed as part of US 176 widening	\$0	\$0
Low	8, 9, 10	Polo Rd. (S-2214)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Mallet Hill Rd.	1.89	Available to construct	\$0	\$0
Low	1	Broad River Rd. (US 176)	Lake Murray Blvd. (SC 60)	Western Ln. (S-2894)	1.6	No funding included in the Referendum. Beyond limits of Broad River Road included in Widening Category.	\$0	\$0
Total Referendum							\$16,672,268	
<i>Percival SCDOT CTC</i>							<i>\$1,811,423</i>	
<i>Alpine Bikeway (Referendum) Transfer</i>							<i>\$1,536,100</i>	
<i>Alpine SCDOT Federal Resurfacing</i>							<i>\$802,579</i>	
<i>Alpine TAP Grant</i>							<i>\$180,000</i>	
Total Active / Completed							\$21,002,370	\$18,124,907
Remaining funds:							\$2,877,464	

REMAINING REFERENDUM PROJECTS (6)

2015 PRIORITY	DISTRICT	PROJECT NAME	TERMINI	TERMINI	LENGTH (MILES)	COMMENTS	REFERENDUM AMOUNT	ESTIMATED COST
Medium	5	Huger St. (US 21)	Blossom St. (US 21)	Gervais St. (US 1)	0.6	Sidewalk exists from Blossom to College and from Senate to Gervais. Construct sidewalk from College to Senate.	\$256,861	\$849,259
Low	5, 10	Assembly St. (SC 48)	Whaley St. (City)	Beltline Blvd. (SC 16)	3.3	Construct sidewalk path from Whaley to Rosewood. Construct sidewalk adjacent to fairgrounds from Rosewood to George Rogers. Remainder to be constructed with Shop Road Widening.	\$1,920,257	\$2,315,019
Low	2, 4, 5	Broad River Rd. (US 176)	Harbison Blvd. (S-757)	Bush River Rd. (S-31)	5.1	Existing sidewalk from Piney Grove Rd. to Bush River Rd. Construct sidewalk from Harbison Blvd. to Piney Grove Rd.	\$2,408,361	\$2,986,582
Low	2	Broad River/LMB (US 176)	I-26	Harbison Blvd. (S-757)	1.24	Construction sidewalk.	\$2,499,420	\$2,466,907
Low	7, 8, 9	Clemson Rd. (S-52)	Longtown Rd (S-1051)	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	4.46	Existing sidewalk from Longtown Rd. to Market Place Commons. Construct sidewalk from Market Place Commons to Old Clemson Rd.	\$465,696	\$2,383,452
Low	3, 7, 8, 9	Two Notch Rd. (US 1)	Alpine Rd. (S-63)	Spears Creek Church (S-53)	5.67	Sidewalk exists from Alpine to Lionsgate Dr. Construct sidewalk from Sesqui to Spears Creek Church.	\$2,703,507	\$7,187,113
Total Remaining							\$10,254,102	\$18,188,332
Funding Shortfall:							-\$7,934,230	
TOTAL							\$26,926,370	\$31,983,136
OUTSIDE FUNDING							\$4,330,102	\$4,330,102
GRAND TOTAL ALL							\$31,256,472	\$36,313,239
Total Funding Shortfall:							-\$5,056,766	

*Programmed = Spent or Committed