

# POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY MINUTES Subgress 27, 2015 - 12:00 p.m. (NOON

February 27, 2015 - 12:00 p.m. (NOON) Rock Hill Operations Center – Room 132

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** Danny Funderburk; Kathy Pender; George Sheppard; Ralph Norman; Brian Carnes; Doug Echols; Michael Johnson

#### ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Greg Shaw (SCDOT); Cliff Goolsby (Rock Hill); Brian Klauk (SCDOT); Ryan Blancke (York County); Bill Jordan (SCDOT); Bill Shanahan (York County); Darlene Broughton (SCDOT); Robby Moody (Catawba COG); Penelope Karagounis (Lancaster County); Vic Edwards (SCDOT); David Larsen (York County); Bill Meyer (Rock Hill); Allison Love (York County); David Burgess (SCDOT); Audra Miller (York County); Kevin Sheppard (SCDOT); Steve Willis (Lancaster County); and David Hooper (RFATS)

CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT: Larry Huntley (Fort Mill Town Council); Duane Christopher (Rock Hill Planning Commission); Frank Myers (CAC); Mia Macey (CN2); Andrew Kiel (WRHI); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); and John Marks (Lake Wylie Pilot)

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER:

- **a.** Welcome Chairman Funderburk called the meeting to order at 12:15 P.M. and welcomed all in attendance.
- **b.** Citizen Comment Period Mr. Huntley briefly commented on recent articles about a new crossing over the Catawba River and the prior feasibility study undertaken in 2011-2012 and the need to ensure that area modeling assumptions (i.e., number of schools, projected traffic volume from nearby developments, etc), are appropriately updated to reflect current conditions should a subsequent study and / or additional reviews be undertaken.
- Mr. Christopher then shared his assessment about the importance of public facilities such as schools and roads and how they affect every one of us, every day. Mr. Christopher then noted the amount of time a bridge crossing within the Mt Gallant to Sutton Road area was an assumed connection within the transportation network. Mr. Christopher then focused on the perennial challenges of project needs and available funding; and stated that some decisions are easy and some are right; and that, further consideration for incorporating another river crossing is needed for this region.

# 2. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Funderburk asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the January 23, 2015 meeting. Mr. G. Sheppard briefly mentioned the discussion on the transit representative and the one vote arrangement for the member that would serve in a dual capacity role – and requested that this part of the discussion be more specifically reflected in the minutes – so that it is clear that a single vote arrangement is envisioned. Mr. Hooper

confirmed that the minutes would be appropriately amended. Mr. Funderburk asked for a motion. Mr. Carnes made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; Mr. G. Sheppard seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

#### 3. PRESENTATIONS:

a. Pennies for Progress / RFATS (Joint Project Programming) – Mr. Leazer briefly spoke about the time period typically involved with project implementation and the particular challenges this represents in areas with significant traffic congestion and high growth pressures. With this in mind, Mr. Leazer then discussed two identified interchange projects in the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan; specifically, Celanese Road / I-77 and SC 160 / I-77.

Mr. Leazer then outlined a potential arrangement between Pennies and RFATS to accelerate project pre-planning. Such an approach would involve RFATS initiating preliminary engineering, design and right-of-way — with the Pennies staff encouraging the Sales Tax Commission to put the construction costs for both projects on the Pennies #4 referendum. It was then noted that there are some risks with this approach: (1) the commission may not put these two projects on the referendum; and (2) if the projects are placed on the referendum — that it may not pass.

Mr. Norman then requested that a spreadsheet be prepared reflecting the mechanics of how this joint approach would work from a budgeting and implementation standpoint. Mr. Echols then offered his assessment about the importance of thinking creatively and comprehensively to properly and effectively accelerate needed improvements within the region. Mr. Leazer then stated that this approach is indeed a reflection of the practice already utilized by RFATS to initiate project pre-planning through a combination of Guideshare and CMAQ funding at priority intersections.

Mr. G. Sheppard then explored a broader question about taking such an approach one step further by asking why we can't take our current projects and partner with Pennies now? Mr. Leazer noted that this does occur on a smaller scale and / or in a more targeted way – where project activity naturally overlaps, consistent with the approved referendum. Mr. Echols then noted that the current project on SC 160 / I-77 as reflected in the Long Range Transportation Plan (recognizing its development prior to the Kingsley announcements), is focused on SC 160 west of I-77; and that, the project area would need to be expanded to fully account for the demand variables influencing the SC 160 Corridor from both directions.

Mr. Hooper then noted that an expansion of the work on SC 160 would necessarily have cost implications and staff would need to ensure that this is properly incorporated into the requested spreadsheet. Mr. Leazer then confirmed that a broader project area would be needed; and that, if there are cost increases beyond what is contained in the LRTP – then Pennies would be responsible for meeting this need (this of course assumes that the project is passed as a part of a fourth referendum). Mr. Funderburk then summarized the process as an excellent approach toward condensing the time needed to undertake these improvement and maximizing the availability and use of the region's resources.

Mr. Echols then shared his thoughts about the importance of looking comprehensively at the issues and needs along the Celanese Corridor; specifically, current traffic volumes and travel demand projections in 2025 – and the extent to which the current interchange project can provide some relief, but doesn't appear on its own to have the capacity to

respond to the regional travel shed that the corridor serves. Mr. Echols then noted that it is important to move ahead with the concept of accelerating these projects, but that we also need to begin looking comprehensively at the data relative to the regional travel shed impacting this corridor.

As a point of reference, Mr. Echols noted that there are acres of undeveloped land on the western side of the county that are going to add traffic along the Celanese Corridor; and as such, asked staff to begin bringing forth data at the next meeting. Mr. Norman then asked whether staff will have the data for the SC 160 Corridor as well; and that, budgetary projections and a list of those projects we're already committed to be available (if possible). Mr. G. Sheppard then offered supporting comments about looking at the region comprehensively; and indeed, looking at the entire RFATS Area.

Mr. Johnson then asked about the timeframe for moving this discussion forward and the supporting requests necessary to bring things to an action item; and specifically, to the point where RFATS funding could be spent on the SC 160 Corridor as outlined by Mr. Leazer. Mr. Hooper then briefly reviewed the required procedural steps that would be involved; and that a few months would be needed. Mr. Johnson stated that it is certainly understood that such steps are required, but that he is focused on ensuring that we're not still studying things in September or later before we reach a decision point.

## 4. PROPOSED POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS:

- **a. TIP Amendment (Carowinds / Pleasant Road)** Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed the results of the small area study completed at the intersection of Carowinds / Pleasant Road (among others), as well as the Policy Committee's continued focus on expediting project implementation. With this in mind, Mr. Hooper requested that the Policy Committee consider approval of \$600,000 in Guideshare funding for preliminary engineering and right-of-way. Mr. Funderburk asked for a motion. Mr. G. Sheppard made a motion to approve the TIP amendment; Mr. Johnson seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.
- b. TIP Amendment (Princeton / Springsteen) Mr. Hooper presented a request for supplemental CMAQ funding on the Princeton / Springsteen Intersection Improvement Project (contingent on any comments being received). As a point of reference Mr. Hooper noted that this project is a traffic flow improvement effort to strengthen stacking and clearing capacity by incorporating a dedicated left turn lane and expanding lane storage. Mr. Norman then asked whether the requested funding support is associated with construction and Mr. Hooper noted that it is. Mr. Funderburk then asked for a motion. Mr. Carnes made a motion to approve the amendment; Mr. G. Sheppard seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.
- **c. CMAQ Program (FY 15-16)** Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed the projected allocation of CMAQ funding for FY 15-16 as well as prior discussions about the importance of expediting identified project needs at intersections along our most heavily congested corridors. With this in mind, Mr. Hooper requested that the Policy Committee continue its focus on advancing priority intersections from our congestion management process; specifically, India Hook / Celanese and Carowinds / Pleasant Road and requested that the respective jurisdictions proceed in preparing the required air quality benefit analysis.

As a follow-up to discussions at the January meeting, Mr. Johnson then reviewed a few examples of economic consequences associated with a non-attainment designation.

Additionally, Mr. Johnson noted that he has forwarded this information to Congressmen Mulvaney's for appropriate follow-up and / or feedback. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper then mentioned a recent inquiry from other MPO's within the state who are concerned about the current review being completed by EPA to raise the applicable standard further – and the resulting potential of having multiple non-attainment areas within the state. Mr. Funderburk asked for a motion. Mr. G. Sheppard made a motion; Mr. Johnson seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

- d. Transportation Alternatives Program (FY 15-16) –Ms. Love briefly outlined the focus of the Transportation Alternatives Program; and stated that the projected FY 15-16 allocation is \$108,666. Ms. Love then asked the Policy Committee to approve the application schedule and process, as well as the reappointment of a subcommittee to evaluate this year's applications. Mr. Funderburk asked for a motion. Mr. Carnes made a motion to approve the TAP application schedule and subcommittee; Mr. Johnson seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.
- e. MPO Transit Representative Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed discussion at the January meeting regarding the designation of an existing member serving in a dual capacity as the transit representative as required by MAP-21. Mr. Hooper then noted that although Ms. Pender has been consistently mentioned that staff is requesting that the Policy Committee specifically affirm Ms. Pender as the selected representative. Mr. G. Sheppard then requested confirmation that in performing this dual role that Ms. Pender would continue to reflect one vote on the Policy Committee. In response, Mr. Hooper confirmed that this arrangement does reflect one vote. Mr. Funderburk then asked for a motion. Mr. Carnes made a motion to approve and Mr. G. Sheppard seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

## 5. OTHER BUSINESS:

- **a. Administrative Report** Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed monthly administrative TIP adjustments on the Dave Lyle Blvd / Chamberside CMAQ project and the Guideshare funding reflected in the 2015 UPWP for supporting studies.
- **b.** Next Regular Meeting Mr. Funderburk announced that the next regular meeting will be held on Friday, March 27, 2015 at the Rock Hill Operations Center.

### 6. ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 P.M.