



**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
September 25, 2015 - 12:00 p.m. (NOON)
Manchester Meadows Conference Room**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Danny Funderburk; Doug Echols; Ann Williamson; George Sheppard; Ralph Norman; Brian Carnes; Britt Blackwell; William Harris; and Michael Johnson

ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Bill Jordan (SCDOT); Vic Edwards (SCDOT); Tommy Feemster (SCDOT); Susan Britt (City of Tega Cay); Ivan McCorkle (City of Rock Hill); Joe Cronin (Town of Fort Mill); Elizabeth Harris (Catawba Indian Nation); Penelope Karagounis (Lancaster County); David Vehaun (City of Rock Hill); Leslie Coolidge (SCDHEC-AQ); Bill Meyer (City of Rock Hill); Audra Miller (York County); Clifton Goolsby (City of Rock Hill); Ryan Blancke (York County); Darlene Broughton (SCDOT); Allison Love (York County); Jessica Hekter (FHWA); Ron Pompey (York County); Chris Herrmann (RFATS); and David Hooper (RFATS)

CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT: Larry Huntley (Fort Mill Town Council); Frank Myers (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); David F. Keely (CAC); Hisham Abdelaziz (HDR Engineering); James Dowdy (HDR Engineering); Marie Sugar (STV, Inc.); Cole McKinney (Catawba COG); Chris Moody (Town of Fort Mill); Mike Fry (Campco Engineering); and James Traynor (Clear Springs Realty, LLC).

1. CALL TO ORDER:

a. Welcome – Chairman Funderburk called the meeting to order at 12:12 P.M. and welcomed all in attendance.

b. Citizen Comment Period – No comments were made at this time.

2. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Funderburk asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the June 26, 2015 meeting. Mr. Funderburk asked for a motion. Mr. Sheppard made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Mr. Harris seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

3. UPDATE ON CURRENT PROJECTS:

a. SCDOT Project Status Report – Ms. Broughton presented an update on the following projects:

- SC-160 Phase II Widening Project – schedule has been shifted out five months due to additional time needed for ROW acquisition; a bid opening is projected for spring / summer 2016.
- Carowinds / Pleasant Road Intersection Improvement Project – project scoping is currently underway and a bid date is currently estimated for summer of 2018.

- Riverview / Riverchase Intersection Improvement Project – final design has been completed; a few utility relocation items remain active. Construction is estimated to begin in early 2016.
- Dave Lyle Blvd / Chamberside Drive Intersection Improvement Project – is in final stages of implementation and completion is slated for October 2015.
- SC 160 / Gold Hill Road Intersection Improvement Project – utility relocation is active; construction phase is scheduled to begin fall 2015.
- Lake Ridge Trail Project – is being rebid using bituminous surface treatment in lieu of Hot Asphalt Mix; rebid is projected for winter 2015.
- Springfield Parkway Bicycle / Pedestrian Improvement Project – is currently being re-scoped; construction is estimated to begin in spring of 2018.
- Red River Road Bridge over Manchester Creek – has completed the design phase, outstanding utility agreement is pending resolution, letting is estimated for November 2015 with construction is expected to begin in early 2016.
- Projects currently in the design stage include: East White Street / SC-72, Clebourne / N. White Street Intersection Improvement, S-654 (Church Road) Bridge over Burgis Creek, S-655 (Auten Road) Bridge over Fishing Creek, US-21 Business (Old Nation Road) Bridge over Steele Creek, SC-72 (Saluda Road) Bridge over Stony Fork, SC-5 (West Main Street) Bridge over Tools Fork Creek, and S-81 (Adnah Church Road) Bridge over Tools Fork Creek.
- Projects currently under construction include: S-101 (Ogden Road) Bridge over Wildcat Creek and SC-72 (Saluda Road) Bridge over Fishing Creek.

4. Reports:

- a. **Air Quality Update** – Ms. Coolidge provided an overview of the recommendation by EPA to re-classify the RFATS area to attainment for the 2008 Ozone standard. Although this action formally changes the non-attainment classification, Ms. Coolidge noted that the vast majority of planning activities such as transportation conformity will continue to apply. Ms. Coolidge then noted that the CMAQ apportionment will not change as a result of the re-classification.

As a point of reference, Ms. Coolidge then stated that the proposed range for the 2015 Ozone standard is 65-70 parts per billion (ppb) and the highest 2015 design value in the Charlotte area is 68 ppb. Ms. Coolidge then noted that if the new standard is set below this point, then it is expected that Chester, Lancaster and York would likely be included in EPA's presumed boundary for a non-attainment classification based on the new standard.

- b. **Regional Transit Study** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed the primary recommendations from the Urbanized Area Transit Study. Principal points of discussion included the recommended initiation of a base level of demand response service in the Tega Cay and Fort Mill areas as well as consideration of the phased implementation of a fixed route option along the SC 160 Corridor; the initiation of a small scale system in the expanded downtown area of Rock Hill; and the continued implementation of the LARS service in Lancaster County.

Mr. Hooper then reviewed the applicable funding variables with a particular focus on the implications of the Charlotte Large Urbanized Area north of the Catawba River. Mr. Hooper then reviewed some of the primary benefits of initiating demand response as including lower start-up costs; an ability to cover a broader geographic area than a fixed route would permit, as well as not having to make capital or facility related investments.

Essentially, it was noted that the initiation of demand response would be a prudent, incremental manner in which to gauge the level of ridership interest and generate initial operating results prior to making a more involved budgetary commitment.

Mr. Funderburk then inquired about the potential cost range for implementing such an approach? In response, Mr. Hooper referenced a scenario based on the financial and operating structure of York County Access. For example, Mr. Hooper stated that if 30,000 passenger miles were budgeted for service implementation – this would equate to a range of \$9,000 to \$11,000 for each of the respective jurisdictions in the service area. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that when York County Access was initiated in the Rock Hill Urbanized Area, a comparable level of funding was able to meet area needs during the early years of operation.

Discussion then followed regarding the potential for the York County Council on Aging to initiate a small scale fixed route option in the Rock Hill area. Mr. Hooper noted that this could potentially represent one option for incorporating a fixed route component to existing transit services. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper also noted that there is some discussion in Lancaster County about CATS potentially adjusting one of their existing express bus routes (i.e., the CATS 43X that serves the Ballantyne area), and establishing a park-n-ride location near the intersection of SC 160 / US 521.

Mr. Hooper then transitioned to discussing the procedural and practical steps needed to access South Carolina's portion of transit funding that is based on the Charlotte Large Urbanized Area designation. Specifically, Mr. Hooper noted that the City of Charlotte has requested that a "direct recipient" be named to receive and oversee the use of these funds within the RFATS Study Area. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper stated that in consultation and coordination with SCDOT, FTA, the City of Charlotte as well as area transit stakeholders – that it is recommended that RFATS be named as the direct recipient for this purpose.

It was then noted that such an action would allow RFATS to have a direct relationship with FTA, meaning that grant applications submitted for funding would not have to be coordinated through the City of Charlotte. Mr. Hooper then explained that being designated as the direct recipient also brings several responsibilities with it as well which include: grant management, plan and program coordination with the RFATS planning process as well as compliance with all the rules, requirements and procedures associated with being a recipient of federal transit funding.

Mr. Echols then asked about the specific coordination that this designation would entail? Mr. Hooper noted that RFATS staff would assume responsibility for such things as service recommendations, contractual matters, and required performance monitoring oversight, etc. – with the mechanics of administration (grant mgmt, processing monthly invoices, etc.) performed by city staff typically working in these areas. Lastly, Mr. Hooper noted that planning and budgetary decisions would be undertaken by the Policy Committee.

Mr. Echols then asked if staff would need to be added as a result of taking on these responsibilities? Mr. Hooper stated that in the early stages of incorporating a base level of demand response service in the Fort Mill & Tega Cay areas, that things are probably manageable in the short term – but that the expansion of this service and / or implementation of a fixed route option would involve the need for additional staff.

In terms of next steps for this process as a whole, Mr. Hooper explained that the first step to be taken should be the direct recipient designation. Although this action is principally associated with the longer term consideration of a fixed route option, it would nonetheless be advisable to initiate this process now given that such a designation involves a fairly extensive review and approval process that includes FTA, SCDOT and the City of Charlotte.

With respect to the initiation of demand response service north of the Catawba river, Mr. Hooper noted that the local jurisdictions would need to consider planning and budgetary matters and provide guidance on how they would like to proceed. Mr. Hooper then noted that he is certainly available to assist in this evaluation in whatever way might be helpful. Mr. Funderburk then requested that he make a presentation to the Fort Mill Town Council; Mr. Sheppard also made a similar request for the City of Tega Cay.

5. Proposed Policy Committee Action Items:

- a. Direct Recipient Designation** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed a proposed resolution naming RFATS as the direct recipient for the South Carolina portion of federal funding associated with the Charlotte Urbanized Area. Mr. Hooper then reiterated that the staff level work would be handled by RFATS staff and that all planning and budgetary decisions would be a function of the Policy Committee. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Sheppard and seconded by Mr. Carnes; the motion was unanimously approved.
- b. Corridor / Small Area Studies** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed a number of priority intersections where the Policy Committee has been focusing their efforts to improve the level of operating efficiency, particularly during the peak driving periods. Named examples include the intersections of SC 160 / Gold Hill Road; Dave Lyle Blvd / Chamberside Dr; Clebourne / N. White Street; India Hook / Celanese Road; Carowinds / Pleasant Road, among many others.

Mr. Hooper then noted that the intersection of US 521 / Marvin Road is another location where operational improvements are needed. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that this intersection has undergone ACT 114 ranking and is our next intersection in-line for project planning. Mr. Hooper then stated that staff would like to undertake a small area study in preparation for project scope development and cost estimation.

As a follow-up to the recently completed I-77 Corridor Analysis, Mr. Hooper then noted that staff would also like to undertake an operational evaluation along the Celanese Corridor in an effort to identify those areas where further improvements can be made that will provide operational benefits that are both site specific and contribute to improved functionality along the corridor so as to extract as much efficiency as possible. A motion to approve both requests was made by Mr. Sheppard and seconded by Ms. Williamson; the motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Echols then made an inquiry regarding how the study results would be processed once completed; specifically, would they be presented to the Citizens Advisory Committee as well as the Policy Committee? Mr. Hooper stated that this sequence of review is envisioned.

- c. TIP Amendment** – Mr. Herrmann briefly reviewed the TIP Amendment for the York County Board of Disability and Special Needs to receive \$48,000 in FTA Section 5310 funding; noting that while there is no RFATS funding included, it would need to be

reflected in the RFATS TIP. Mr. Herrmann then requested final approval of the amendment from the Policy Committee. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Echols and seconded by Mr. Sheppard; the motion was unanimously approved.

- d. **CAC Appointments** – Mr. Herrmann briefly reviewed the role of the Citizens Advisory Committee and then summarized the application received from Mr. Mychal Frost, who has been nominated by the City of Rock Hill. Mr. Herrmann then requested consideration to re-appoint Mr. Luther Dasher for an additional term. A motion to approve the appointment of Mychal Frost to the CAC was made by Mr. Sheppard and seconded by Mr. Harris; the motion was unanimously approved. A motion to reappoint Luther Dasher to the CAC was made by Mr. Sheppard and seconded by Mr. Blackwell; the motion was also unanimously approved.

6. **Other Business:**

- a. **Administrative Report** – Mr. Hooper briefly noted that the fourth Park-N-Ride lot on the CATS 82X has been re-established along Cabelas Drive; passenger pick-ups will begin on October 5th. Mr. Hooper then thanked Mr. Norman for his time and assistance in re-establishing a PNR at this location.

Mr. Hooper then briefly summarized contact he has had with representatives of the Lash Group and their interest in additional public transit options that would include service at the Kingsley site. Mr. Hooper noted that potential options discussed have included a shuttle that would operate from the light rail station in Pineville (which has an estimated cost range of \$60,000 to \$90,000 depending on the number of service intervals) as well as a vanpool option. Conversations regarding both possibilities remain active at this time.

- b. **Next Regular Meeting – November 20, 2015**

7. **Adjournment**

With no further business, the motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Sheppard and seconded by Mr. Blackwell; the motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 1:12 P.M.