



Richland County Council  
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
**MINUTES**  
May 21, 2024 – 4:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Don Weaver, and Jesica Mackey.

Not Present: Yvonne McBride and Overture Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio, Chakisse Newton, Cheryl English, Derrek Pugh, Jason Branham, Gretchen Barron, Michelle Onley, Michael Maloney, Angela Weathersby, Anette Kirylo, Patrick Wright, Ashiya Myers, Susan O’Cain, Tamar Black, Lori Thomas, Kyle Holsclaw, Leonardo Brown, Jackie Hancock, Jennifer Wladischkin, Aric Jensen, and John Thompson

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Councilman Paul Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. May 7, 2024 – Mr. Weaver moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: McBride and Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Mackey moved to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Mr. Weaver.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: McBride and Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEM FOR DISCUSSION/ACTION**

a. Polo Road – Windsor Lake Greenway Project – The Interim Transportation Director, Michael Maloney, stated staff recommends canceling the project due to security and safety concerns. The Columbia Mall/Jackson Creek will use the project budget amount of \$1,770,700.88 Greenway that appears to be low on available funding.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we have received any feedback from the individuals that would be affected by this change.

Mr. Maloney indicated there was a community meeting late last year. The community noted concerns regarding minor encampments in the area, and this project would cause additional concerns.

Mr. Weaver moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve staff’s recommendation to cancel the project due to security and safety concerns and to use the project budget of \$1,770,700.88 for the Columbia Mall/Jackson Creek Greenway project, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: McBride and Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

b. Transportation Penny Update – Mr. Maloney gave a brief update on the Transportation Penny Projects:

- Sunset Drive Sidewalk Project construction has begun
- Blythewood Road Widening Project is approximately halfway through construction
- Dirt Road Package “O” is in construction

- All resurfacing projects have been completed
- Funding is available in the Resurfacing Program for one large project (Package “U,” which will go out for bid in the summer)
- Atlas Road – Phase I is being rebid
- In 6-8 months, Atlas Road – Phase I street construction will go out for bid; utility construction will be done in three phases
- Percival Road Sidewalk construction is in Procurement for bidding
- Broad River Road Widening, Pineview Road Widening, Crane Creek Greenway, and Smith Rocky Branch Greenway are in right-of-way acquisition

Ms. Mackey inquired where this information can be found on the website.

Mr. Maloney stated the information would be placed on the website at [www.richlandpenny.com](http://www.richlandpenny.com). He also noted there will be a ribbon cutting for the Bull St./Elmwood Ave. Project on Wednesday, June 29<sup>th</sup> at 11:00 AM.

Mr. Ray Jones, Parker Poe, noted the Transportation Penny Advisory Committee met on Monday, May 20<sup>th</sup>. They have two more meetings before they finish their work relative to what Council has tasked it to do. The idea is that TPAC would deliver a report and some suggestions/recommendations regarding its role with the Transportation Penny going forward. We hope this document will come to the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee at its June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting for review and approval. Council would then discuss the document at the June 25<sup>th</sup> work session. The Public Hearing for the Penny Ordinance is scheduled for July 9<sup>th</sup>, and the final reading of the ordinance and the resolution approving the principles is planned for July 16<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Jones stated that TPAC's goal has been to take the Transportation Needs List and boil it down through the application principles to enable the Transportation Department to turn the needs into actionable projects. At their May 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, they were advised that Council had voted to split the funding, with 30% going to Community Investment Projects, 50% going to County Advancement Projects, and 20% going to COMET Enhancement Projects, with a duration of 25 years, and the \$20M set aside per Council district.

TPAC suggested taking Stantec's needs list and folding in other identified needs. Stantec is seeking direction from Council on when the final list needs to be presented. Mr. Jones noted the City of Columbia's request would be modified after they met with the Department of Revenue, and it was determined that some of their projects may not be appropriate for the Transportation Penny.

Mr. Weaver inquired about the ideal date for the list to be finalized.

Mr. Jones responded prior to TPAC's next meeting on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. For clarification, finalizing the list entails getting everything in one place that has been on the table and that people want to see go forward. This would enable Stantec to give us a revised inflation-adjusted cost.

Ms. Mackey inquired what it is that Stantec will be able to deliver before June 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Jones indicated, that it is his understanding, Stantec needs direction about what additional needs should be added so that they can provide the best number possible.

Ms. Mackey said from her perspective, the list should have been cut off two weeks ago. She maintained we can accept the City of Columbia's updates since they have already provided us with their needs.

Mr. Livingston acknowledged Ms. Mackey's concerns but did not believe it would be fair to cut it off immediately since we did not set a submission deadline.

Ms. Newton inquired if we are closing the needs list to external stakeholders, Council, or everyone. While we have been discussing this for some time, June 3<sup>rd</sup> is the next Council meeting, so in terms of the body ratifying something, she is not sure that is something we could do before the next TPAC meeting. Therefore, she inquired about the 2<sup>nd</sup> best date for submitting a final list.

Mr. Jones responded as soon as possible. He indicated that Council would need to determine to whom the submission deadline would apply.

Ms. Mackey asserted that when she spoke of the list being closed, she was referring to Stantec's ability to calculate and present an updated list to TPAC for them to forward to us.

Mr. Weaver inquired how the \$20M set aside for each district would be shown on the ballot. In addition, do we take that amount off the top when planning the project?

Mr. Jones responded the concept of \$20M per district now lives within the Project Principles document. Including it in the ordinance is not required, but we may determine it best for communicating with the voters. It would not be on the ballot that way. It is more programmatic in how we manage it versus a ballot matter.

Mr. Weaver asked if we would be reserving the \$220M or if it would be included in the grand total.

Mr. Jones envisioned it would be included in the total, with the understanding that at least \$20M was spent in each Council district.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there would be any objection to having the final list by Tuesday, May 28<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Mackey moved to designate Tuesday, May 28<sup>th</sup>, at 5:00 PM as the cut-off date for Stantec to receive any additional needs, except the City of Columbia. The City of Columbia will be allowed to provide an updated list based on the feedback from the Department of Revenue. Mr. Weaver seconded the motion.

Mr. Weaver requested the current list be provided to Council before May 28<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Newton inquired, if you are voting on this in committee, would it not require a Council vote, and, if so, when would that happen?

County Attorney Patrick Wright responded that the committee cannot bind Council but can vote to forward its recommendation to Council. Stantec can do whatever prep is needed until Council takes action on the committee's recommendation.

Mr. Livingston maintained the committee is making a recommendation. It makes sense for Stantec to move forward, even though the recommendation will not receive final approval until it comes before Council.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: McBride and Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Jones introduced the concept of project scoring, which is being added to the Project Principles. Six principles are being added to the document.

- Additional Funding (up to 10 points)
- Overall Impact and Cost Ratio (up to 20 points)
- Safety (up to 25 points)
- Improvement of Overall Condition (up to 10 points)
- Economic Development (up to 20 points)
- Public Support (up to 15 points)

TPAC is considering whether this is the final list of principles, whether the point assignment is appropriate, or whether it should be revised. Based on the available points, the idea is that each time the Transportation Department looks at a need and tries to determine which need to address, they deploy the scoring mechanism. They come up with a score, and the project that scores the highest is the project that will get funding initially. It is safety heavy. It is economic development heavy. Grant dollars available to support the project are incorporated. There is a measurement of public support for a project. The overall impact and cost ratio is another principle. The overall improvement of conditions is also a principle that TPAC has put forward. Currently, there is not a principle that would acknowledge a project has been carried over from the 2012 Penny.

Mr. Weaver inquired if it was deliberate on TPAC's part or if they forgot to score it that way.

Mr. Jones replied that it was part of what the committee initially discussed and that it was ultimately removed.

Mr. Livingston indicated he thought there was a statement in the ordinance.

Mr. Jones stated he does not recall it being in the ordinance.

Ms. Newton pointed out it is one of the important principles discussed. When she looks at areas like her district, there are several projects that were not able to be completed. She is unclear on the format for adding that principle. She noted there was strong Council support for including that.

Mr. Wright emphasized that TPAC is an advisory committee, so you can adjust their recommendations.

Ms. Newton inquired if the idea is we are that we are receiving the principles as information or that they will be forwarded to Council for a vote.

Mr. Jones stated that in accordance with the road map, the idea is that on June 18<sup>th</sup>, this committee would be in a position to say they are comfortable with where things are. We would then go to a work session and present the Transportation Ad Hoc's recommendation to the body.

Mr. Wright stressed that TPAC makes its recommendations to the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee, and the ad hoc committee makes its recommendations to the Council.

Mr. Jones noted we view this as an iterative process. Each time we meet, we take feedback from the bodies. If this committee wishes to provide feedback, it will be relayed to TPAC.

Ms. Mackey asked if there were no matching state or federal funds available at the time of the ranking, but funding was then received; how do we go back and add those points to the project score?

Mr. Jones responded that under the emerging needs section, there will be a conversation about how a new fact or need is incorporated.

Mr. Weaver thinks, in all fairness, we need to request that TPAC revisit the formula to give weight to those projects that were not completed under the 2012 Penny.

Ms. Mackey maintained that she did not think it needed to return to TPAC. She believes the ad hoc committee feels strongly about it. We have set it as a priority, and it should be addressed before we even get to the scoring.

Mr. Jones stated this needs to be incorporated in the principles document.

Ms. Newton noted that even after revisiting the 2012 Penny projects, we still need to flesh out some extra stuff.

Mr. Weaver inquired if we have a dollar figure of what has not been completed with the 2012 Penny.

Mr. Maloney replied there would be approximately \$110M in projects that could not be completed.

Ms. Barron believes it is important that the 2012 Penny projects are included in the principles document.

Mr. Maloney proclaimed if a dirt road was on the consent/denial list, it was not included on the list that was not completed.

Ms. Mackey asked when you think about projects that would improve travel time, where is that accounted for.

Mr. Jones contended it would be in the overall impact. Transportation infrastructure that serves residents is where it would be dealt with.

Ms. Newton stated that when we look at the overall impact, we consider the number of county residents per week and the cost per person. One of the points she previously brought up is that there may be an area with only one exit, such as Garners Ferry Road, which is the primary road for certain communities. It might not affect the most number of residents, as a ratio to county residents, but for this area, without it functioning well, life would become extremely difficult. She would like to see "community importance" considered as a principle.

Ms. Mackey inquired if there had been any discussion in TPAC about assigning a range of points instead of a set number for the project scoring.

Mr. Jones replied there was a discussion about additional metrics for each principle.

Ms. Mackey moved to forward the principles document to Council for their review and feedback, seconded by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Livingston made a friendly amendment to include the uncompleted projects from the 2012 Penny as a principle.

Ms. Mackey accepted the friendly amendment.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: McBride and Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Mackey moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Weaver.

In Favor: Livingston, Weaver, and Mackey

Not Present: McBride and Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:54 PM.