



Please See Addendum For Verbatim
Transcript of Agenda Item 4A.

Catawba River Bridge –
Motion on Draft Feasibility Study

**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
May 19, 2017 – 12:00 p.m. (NOON)
Manchester Meadows Conference Room**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: George Sheppard (proxy); Guynn Savage; Kathy Pender; Bill Harris; Brian Carnes; Doug Echols (proxy); Jim Reno; Britt Blackwell (proxy); Michael Johnson (proxy); Wes Climer; Gary Simrill; and Gene Branham (proxy).

ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT: Vic Edwards (SCDOT); Joe Cronin (Town of Fort Mill); Cliff Goolsby (City of Rock Hill); Joshua Meetze (SCDOT); Allison Love (York County); Ivan McCorkle (City of Rock Hill); Keith Powell (SCDOT); Patrick Hamilton (York County); Susan Britt (City of Tega Cay); Rob Ruth (City of Rock Hill); Steve Allen (York County); Mike Sullivan (SCDOT); Penelope Karagounis (Lancaster County); Jeremy Winkler (City of Rock Hill); Ron Pompey (York County); Barry Mattox (SCDOT); Bill Meyer (City of Rock Hill); Bill Shanahan (York County); Jimmy Bagley (City of Rock Hill); David Burgess (SCDOT); David Harmon (York County); Robby Moody (CRCOG); Steve Willis (Lancaster County); John Boylston (SCDOT); Dean Hendrix (York County); Chris Herrmann (RFATS); and David Hooper (RFATS).

CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT: Frank Myers (CAC); Cleopatra Allen (CAC); Jeanne Stevens (WSP/Parsons-Brinckerhoff); Scot Sibert (WSP/Parsons-Brinckerhoff); Larry Huntley (Town of Fort Mill); Luther Dasher (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); Dr. David Keely (CAC); Ralph Norman; and Kenneth Johnson (AECOM).

1. CALL TO ORDER:

a. Welcome – Vice-Chairman Carnes called the meeting to order at 12:05 P.M. and welcomed all in attendance.

b. Citizen Comment Period – Mr. Huntley (Fort Mill Town Council) voiced concern regarding the feasibility study of the Catawba River Bridge; specifically highlighting the need for updated traffic projections from recent developments and the potential increase of congestion on Sutton Road.

2. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Carnes asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the April 21, 2017 meeting. Hearing none, Mr. Carnes then asked for a motion. Ms. Savage made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Ms. Pender seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

3. UPDATE ON CURRENT PROJECTS:

a. York County Local Option Sales Tax Program – Mr. Hamilton presented an update on Hubert Graham Way, noting that the new road was opened to traffic on May 12th with an estimated completion cost of \$10M. Mr. Hamilton then provided a financial status update for the projects included in the Pennies 3 Referendum; highlighting the difference between the referendum amounts and total expected cost for each project. Mr. Hamilton then presented the commission approved list of projects for the Pennies 4 Referendum, noting five projects from Pennies 3 that will receive a total of \$60M from Pennies

4 (SC 557, SC 160 East, Riverview Road, Mt Gallant Road, SC 72). Specific projects for Pennies 4 include:

- Resurfacing projects: \$50M
- Cel River Road: \$40.51M
- Fort Mill Southern Bypass: \$23.13M
- SC 557: \$25.52M
- Hubert Graham Way Extension: \$2.83M
- SC 49 / SC 274 / SC 557: \$7.30M
- US 321 / Kings Mountain Road: \$1.94M
- US 21 / Springdale Road: \$6.82M
- Sutton Road Left Turns: \$3.00M
- Flint Hill Street Drainage: \$4.57M
- Celanese / US 21: \$1.59M
- US 21 Turn Lanes: \$1.03M
- Bate Harvey Shoulder Widening: \$2.95M
- US 21 N: \$35.88M
- Neely Road: \$10.85M

Mr. Hamilton then noted that the Pennies 4 project list is set to undergo three separate readings with final reading expected on July 17th.

4. REPORTS:

a. 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Update – Ms. Stevens provided a brief summary of the LRTP update process and the steps completed to date, noting changes in the planning process required by the FAST Act which include new planning goals and a transition to performance-based planning.

Ms. Stevens then reviewed the project estimates for those key transportation improvements included on the cost constrained project list:

- SC 160 East Road Widening
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$25.8 M
- Celriver Road Widening
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$46.2 M
- Exit 82 / I-77 Interchange Reconfiguration
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$62.1 M
- Exit 85 / I-77 Interchange Reconfiguration (includes 4 to 6 lane widening from Sutton to US 21)
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$33.6 M
- Exit 77 / I-77
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$5.2 M

Mr. Hooper then noted that inclusion of Celriver Road in the Pennies 4 Referendum would negate the funding allocation on that project.

Ms. Stevens then briefly reviewed policy recommendations included in the LRTP related to roadways and provided an overall summary of transportation funding sources. Mr. Hooper then briefly summarized public comments received, which included a concern about the allocation of resources in the planning area (i.e., York versus Lancaster County)? As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that this comment referenced why no non-federal funding was programmed in Lancaster County. Mr. Hooper stated that he assumes that the writer was referencing Pennies for Progress funding which is raised and required to be spent in York County consistent with the empowering referendum. That said, Mr. Hooper noted that he has reached out to this individual to further review other relevant funding variables. Additionally, Mr. Hooper reported that comments were also received supporting a continued focus on strengthening the bicycle / pedestrian component of the transportation system as well as support for realizing further progress on improving transit service options.

Mr. Climer then asked for clarification on what would be entailed in a regional Complete Streets Policy. Mr. Hooper noted that the Plan recommendation for adoption of such a policy is intended to recognize that roadways should be designed to accommodate all users of the transportation system (i.e., vehicles, walkers, bicyclists, etc.) as appropriate. Mr. Climer then asked if this policy would encumber future project work to always accommodate bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Mr. Hooper responded in the negative that such a policy would not, but would recommend that such facilities be incorporated where appropriate and feasible based on location specific variables (i.e., spacing, sight distance, etc). Mr. Climer then asked what would be the effect if this was removed from the LRTP. In response, Mr. Hooper noted that this recommendation is ultimately advisory, not binding on the decisions local jurisdictions may choose to make.

Mr. Hooper then briefly explained that the LRTP update process also requires air quality testing be completed to ensure continued compliance with established air quality standards. Mr. Simrill then asked how air quality in Charlotte affects the RFATS Study Area. In response, Mr. Hooper noted that when EPA evaluates a particular area like Charlotte, which is a center city with traffic flowing inward from adjacent jurisdictions, that they generally include neighboring planning areas in any resulting air quality designations. That said, while current designations have both Charlotte and RFATS as "maintenance areas" indicating that things are moving in the right direction, if air quality readings in Charlotte began to violate applicable standards again, then RFATS would be subject to subsequent evaluation and possibly the application of additional regulatory requirements that may have both planning and economic development implications.

Mr. Hooper then requested that the Policy Committee consider adoption of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan, FY 17-22 Transportation Improvement Program and Air Quality Conformity Determination. Mr. Reno then made a motion to defer the vote of adoption to the June meeting. Mr. Reno then explained that he is suggesting the deferral in order to allow staff appropriate time to examine what steps would be required to complete the feasibility study of an additional Catawba River Bridge which was previously halted in 2012. Specifically, Mr. Reno noted that he would like staff to provide information on what associated cost would be involved, the timeframe needed to complete the feasibility study, and what additional data sampling / model updating would be needed. This information could then be considered to determine whether the Policy Committee wants to take action to include the Catawba River Bridge in the cost constrained section of the 2045 LRTP.

Ms. Savage then asked how much money has been spent to date on studying the Catawba River Bridge. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper briefly summarized the evolution of this project which dates back to 2002. Specifically, Mr. Hooper noted that this project was included in the LRTP Updates of 2002, 2005 and 2009; an SCDOT Advanced Planning Project Report; the 2011-12 Feasibility Study; and four to five separate analyses since 2012 (i.e., I-77 Corridor Study; Celanese / Cherry Road Study; impact of widening US 21, and follow-up work on updated modeling information on network travel demand with

the incorporation of an additional bridge crossing). Ms. Savage then specifically asked for the cost of studying the Catawba River Bridge from 2002 to 2017. Mr. Hooper then responded that the associated cost of the feasibility study was approximately \$170,000; but that he would be reluctant to try and guess what the cost of staff time might be since 2002.

Ms. Savage then stated that if the Catawba River Bridge had been an optimal solution then she believes the Policy Committee would have recognized this and voted to include the Catawba River Bridge in the LRTP. Ms. Savage also stated that she believes that it would be a misuse of funding to continue further study on a proposed solution that has been rejected on more than one occasion by the Policy Committee. Ms. Savage then stated that she would instead support a study to examine an alternative to the Catawba River Bridge. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that before a feasibility study is undertaken, all lesser options are examined from both a cost and operational standpoint – which is a fairly typical approach prior to considering a new network connection. With this in mind, Mr. Hooper then stated that the Policy Committee may want to make a judgment on how the network is functioning and which parts of the transportation network warrant additional funding attention.

Ms. Savage then stated that while she supports a resolution being explored, she cannot support the Catawba River Bridge; noting that a five-lane bridge from Mt Gallant Road connecting to a two-lane Sutton Road would only create further congestion in the Fort Mill area. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that whenever a significant improvement is undertaken within the network, that adjacent facilities are appropriately upgraded to ensure operational compatibility. Mr. Climer then asked whether this motion is only being offered to allow staff appropriate time to evaluate what would be required to complete the feasibility study? Mr. Reno responded in the affirmative. Mr. Harris then asked whether this would allow staff enough time to provide this information? Mr. Hooper noted that this should be able to be completed prior to the June meeting.

Mr. Carnes then asked if the Policy Committee decided that they wanted to complete the feasibility study, what impact would that have on the process of updating the LRTP. Mr. Hooper noted that while the completion of the LRTP should be finalized in June, any requested follow-up activity on the feasibility study should occur subsequent to that action. That said, on a more immediate basis, Mr. Hooper noted the importance of making sure that SCDOT does not put the planned interchange reconfiguration of Exit 82 “on the street” until the Policy Committee provides further direction following review of the feedback on the feasibility study. A motion to defer the vote of adoption until the June 23rd Policy Committee meeting was made by Mr. Reno and seconded by Ms. Pender. The motion was then passed with a vote of 7-5 (Mr. Carnes, Ms. Savage with proxies for Mr. Johnson and Mr. Sheppard, and Mr. Harris dissenting).

b. FY 17-19 UPWP – Mr. Hooper briefly summarized principal planning activities outlined in the FY 17-19 UPWP, which includes implementation of the LRTP, recommendations from the greater Charlotte Regional Freight Study, the Collector Road Study, targeted intersection analyses, transit service planning as well as a range of routine activities including grant administration and travel demand modeling. Mr. Hooper then requested preliminary approval of the draft FY 17-19 UPWP and authorization of a 30-day public comment period. A motion to grant approval was made by Ms. Pender; seconded by Mr. Harris and the motion was unanimously approved.

c. CMAQ Reallocation Request – Mr. Herrmann briefly reviewed a request to reallocate \$900,000 from the Sidetrack Extension project to support the initiation of a fixed route transit service. As a point of reference, Mr. Herrmann noted that the Sidetrack Extension project was previously allocated approximately \$3.5M to reduce extended vehicle idling in downtown Rock Hill, and while a subsequent request to reallocate the remainder of this funding is expected in June, it will not utilize the full amount of the original allocation. Mr. Climer then asked what the typical process is for considering reallocation requests? Mr. Hooper noted that when a project is revised and/or otherwise undergoes a notable change,

that a request is then presented to the Policy Committee for their review and approval to ensure that the revised project activity is consistent with the programmatic requirements of the funding program.

As a point of reference, Mr. Winkler then provided background information on why Sidetrack Extension project is not proceeding as originally structured (i.e., agreement was not able to be reached with the railroad to further advance the project). With this in mind, a coordinated signal system is being proposed to effectively achieve a comparable operational outcome. Mr. Climer then asked if the City of Rock Hill would be willing to defer this reallocation request to the June Policy Committee so that both requests can be considered at once? Mr. Winkler affirmed this. Mr. Climer then made a motion to table this agenda item to the June meeting; seconded by Ms. Savage and the motion was unanimously approved.

d. TIP Amendment – Mr. Herrmann briefly summarized the TIP Amendment for the York County Board of Disability and Special Needs to receive \$50,000 in FTA Section 5310 funding and the City of Rock Hill to receive \$228,780 in FTA Section 5307 funding for the Express Bus Route Service and York County Access. Mr. Herrmann noted that while there is no RFATS funding included, it would be need to be reflected in the TIP. Mr. Herrmann then requested preliminary approval of the amendment and authorization of a 21-day public comment period. A motion to grant approval was made by Mr. Reno; seconded by Ms. Savage and the motion was unanimously approved.

e. FY 15-17 UPWP Amendment – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed a proposed amendment to the current UPWP to add \$30,000 in existing planning funds to be utilized in completing existing work activities. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that this funding was budgeted last year, and a larger proportion of invoicing was received and processed during this fiscal year. Lastly, it was noted that this request does not change the total budgetary commitment during this two year planning period. Mr. Hooper then requested approval of the amendment to the FY 15-17 UPWP and authorization of a 21-day public comment period. A motion to grant approval was made by Mr. Harris; seconded by Mr. Reno and the motion was unanimously approved.

5. OTHER BUSINESS:

a. Administrative Report – Mr. Hooper briefly noted that the TIP has been amended administratively to reflect FTA funding apportionments recently approved by the SCDOT Commission.

b. Recognition of Mr. Norman – Mr. Carnes presented a plaque recognizing Mr. Norman for his 7 years of service. Mr. Norman then thanked all associated with this process and noted the importance of the work that RFATS carries out.

c. Next Meeting – Mr. Carnes noted that the next Policy Committee meeting will be held on June 23, 2017 at the Rock Hill Operations Center.

6. ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business, the motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Savage and seconded by Ms. Pender; the motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 1:25 P.M.



ADDENDUM I

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

Verbatim Transcript

(Agenda Item – LRTP Update & Motion on Bridge Feasibility Study)

May 19, 2017 – 12:00 p.m. (NOON)

Manchester Meadows Conference Room

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: George Sheppard (proxy); Guynn Savage; Kathy Pender; Bill Harris; Brian Carnes; Doug Echols (proxy); Jim Reno; Britt Blackwell (proxy); Michael Johnson (proxy); Wes Climer; Gary Simrill; and Gene Branham (proxy).

ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Vic Edwards (SCDOT); Joe Cronin (Town of Fort Mill); Cliff Goolsby (City of Rock Hill); Joshua Meetze (SCDOT); Allison Love (York County); Ivan McCorkle (City of Rock Hill); Keith Powell (SCDOT); Patrick Hamilton (York County); Susan Britt (City of Tega Cay); Rob Ruth (City of Rock Hill); Steve Allen (York County); Mike Sullivan (SCDOT); Penelope Karagounis (Lancaster County); Jeremy Winkler (City of Rock Hill); Ron Pompey (York County); Barry Mattox (SCDOT); Bill Meyer (City of Rock Hill); Bill Shanahan (York County); Jimmy Bagley (City of Rock Hill); David Burgess (SCDOT); David Harmon (York County); Robby Moody (CRCOG); Steve Willis (Lancaster County); John Boylston (SCDOT); Dean Hendrix (York County); Chris Herrmann (REATS); and David Hooper (REATS).

CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT: Frank Myers (CAC); Cleopatra Allen (CAC); Jeanne Stevens (Parsons-Brinckerhoff); Scot Sibert (Parsons-Brinckerhoff); Larry Huntley (Town of Fort Mill); Luther Dasher (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); Dr. David Keely (CAC); Ralph Norman; and Kenneth Johnson (AECOM).

1. CALL TO ORDER:

b. Citizen Comment Period –

Mr. Huntley: “My name is Larry Huntley and I am from the other side of the river. I understand we’re going to bring up the bridge again. It seems like maybe we’ve been talking about this bridge from the turn of the century and I don’t mean from 1999 to 2000, I mean from 1899 to 1900. The last time we brought it up there was a supposedly traffic study made and there was some horrible, horrible mistakes in the traffic study. And if we bring this thing up again and spend a bunch of taxpayers money on restudying it, we need to make sure we do it right. One of the mistakes was in Fort Mill there is a subdivision known as Massey, and at build-out Massey will have at least 3,000 homes. The transportation study showed 200 automobiles a day coming out of there. That’s just not right. And since we’ve started discussing it there’s a lot of things happened on Sutton Road,

we've got Mason's Bend there, we've got the new Fort Mill Bypass or freeway, I guess they are calling it. And it all pours into that intersection so we really, really need to think about dumping Rock Hill's problems over on Fort Mill, which is what we are talking about doing. That's all we are talking about doing. Thank you."

4. REPORTS:

a. 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Update –

Mr. Hooper: "Over the last year you have heard me talk about the update to our Long Range Plan and I've went over a lot of the different steps. Today we are here to kind of bring everything together and summarize that process, provide you with feedback that we have received during that process, and some of the key milestones in it. Jeanne Stevens from WSP is going to be our presenter today, so Jeanne if I can ask you to come up please."

Ms. Stevens: "Thanks David. Happy Friday everyone! We won't spend a lot of time on these initial slides because you all do work with the Long Range Plan, you all have worked with Long Range Plans before. This thing is updated every four to five years. So you are familiar with this, but I think it is worth just a refresher on the components. It's from this 20 to 25 year plan that your TIP projects are drawn, which is the near term funded stuff, and then finally that is how we actually get there to where you can ride on them. That was a pretty road that Patrick (Hamilton) showed."

"You will also remember when I was here in October of last year, that there are several things that have changed since the last plan was adopted. There are a lot of things that didn't change, but the things that did included an expanded RFATS boundary to include the Lancaster County panhandle. We also have a number of new studies that were done, that have been completed in such a schedule that they were able to be incorporated into this Long Range Plan; which is exactly how you want these things to work out. One of the first ones was the Urbanized Area Transit Study, we can talk in a few minutes, in fact I think on your agenda today you have one of the results of that study. You also had the update or the creation of the region's first Bicycle and Pedestrian Connectivity Plan. You have the Regional Freight Mobility Study which was an endeavor that was undertaken with the entire Greater Charlotte Region; and you have a Collector Street Plan, which I think you got an update on in the last month or so. Which is going to I think, do quite a bit to resolve traffic issues, or at least address them in some of the fast growing areas of the region."

"The other thing that happened that was not at the local or regional level, but at the federal level. You all may remember that Congress has passed new

transportation legislation. It's not so new as I suppose it was in December of 2016. FAST stands for Fixing America's Surface Transportation System, and we hope it will eventually lead to the 2% annual increase in funding that was promised through that Act."

"You all remember the plan is multi-modal, it covers all aspects of surface transportation. These are the chapters that are in the plan, and I think you all have an Executive Summary from that document."

"Public involvement for the plan started specifically back in last summer with community meetings, and there has been a series of efforts all along during the development of the plan to maintain ongoing public input into it. A lot of folks also showed up at public meetings that were held in association with the various studies that I just mentioned. So we weren't just asking people to show up at two sets of meetings or three or four. Input that was received at one has been incorporated into the whole, which is great. And then of course we had the public hearing this morning that David will summarize the comments that have been received."

"You all remember this slide likely from October. Every MPO is required to follow the same general planning framework for its Long Range Transportation Plan. USDOT provides these goals. I don't think they are hard to disagree with. We want our transportation system to promote economic prosperity. We want it to be safe and secure. We don't want it to have adverse environmental impacts. We want it to be connected between modes, so that if you have a transit system with a bus stop, you have a sidewalk that connects to it so those modes should connect. We want to maintain what we have, resurfacing is something not to be sacrificed for road widening; it all needs to be balanced."

"And then we have the two highlighted goals at the bottom. These were actually added in the FAST Act. The first one is about system resiliency and reliability. You may remember we talked a little bit about travel time reliability. When they do surveys they find that the public doesn't mind, they recognize that as an area grows their commute might get 5 or 10 minutes longer, they can deal with that. What they can't deal with is when some days it is 10 minutes longer and another day it is 45 and the unpredictability of that because if you are trying to pick up your kid from daycare before the deadline where you pay a penalty, it's very frustrating never knowing how long it's going to take. So they are asking us from the federal level, at the regional level then to find ways to make systems more reliable and to make them more resilient. I think after 9/11 we all realized that it's important to have more than one way to get around. I think the train industries or trains saw a sort of a resurgence after 9/11 because we realized that our aviation system wasn't, you know, couldn't be our only option. So that's part of where that goal came from."

“The other goal that was added was to reduce and mitigate stormwater impacts on the system, and I think this region has not too long ago seen some real flooding issues. We don’t necessarily receive more precipitation than we used to, but it’s coming all at once and our drainage systems just aren’t designed for that. So, one of the ideas as we do transportation planning is to find ways to better accommodate stormwater. That could be through a variety of design factors, things that can be incorporated into projects as they come up.”

“Congress has asked RFATS and other Metropolitan Planning Organizations to use performance-based planning. It’s not a new idea; it was a management technique introduced to companies in the 1980’s and 1990’s. The idea is that you measure how you are doing. When you don’t just set the goals, like the goals we just discussed, those are pretty abstract. You think about, ‘okay how can we quantify that outcome so that I can measure whether this goal is actually happening?’ So we set performance measures and targets and that helps us actually make those goals tangible. If we use them as part of a Long Range Plan, which is updated every 4 to 5 years, we have the opportunity to actually track our progress and see whether the investments that have been made since the last plan are reaching us toward that goal that was set.”

“The performance measures that were defined for this plan to be used moving forward hit several different areas: congestion management, air quality, and safety. In congestion management, the performance measures that are shown here are things that the MPO can produce using its Regional Travel Demand Model and other data that is already being collected, which is a plus because you can’t measure everything. You don’t have enough time to get all that data. So what we are measuring here with congestion management is the annual hours of traffic delay on the roads, the travel times on some of the key corridors, and the road connectivity index. Again, getting back to that idea that we need more than one route to get somewhere just from a safety and security standpoint; and also from efficiency, because if one route is backed up, we would like to be able to distribute traffic along more options.”

“In terms of air quality, that’s not a hard one, we know what the air quality standards are for ozone, that’s been an issue in the past. So the measurement, and this is actually a federally suggested measurement, is the projects that are funded with CMAQ funds, which are specifically geared to improve air quality. How many tons of pollutants that contribute to ozone, how many tons were reduced through those projects. There is estimation methods, it is actually something that RFATS has to report as part of the CMAQ expenditure.”

“Safety performance measures have actually been set up by USDOT, every Metropolitan Planning Area is supposed to use the same ones; and again, they are not too surprising. It’s how many fatalities and how many serious injuries occurred during the last five years. And also to kind of help to level the field in

measure between larger cities and smaller cities, we look at the rate of fatalities or the rate of injuries per 100 M vehicle miles traveled, and that's kind of a common denominator. The other emphasis this time around, this comes from the federal level, is to look more at non-motorized users of the transportation system and actually separately track fatalities and serious injuries for bicyclists and pedestrians."

"You all are probably familiar with these projects, I think they have been on the list a while. They are still in the plan. Progress is still recommended to continue, I don't know David (Hooper) if you want to spend much time on these, we do have the board..."

Mr. Hooper:

"Well I would just highlight that our focus continues to be our two strategic interchanges, there at Exit 85 as well as Exit 82. We've got our highest volume levels within the network moving through those two points, and that continues to be our focus. We've got the other road expansions at where we consider to be key critical points that connect the panhandle and Fort Mill, and we see that as critical of being able to go all the way to five lanes, all the way through. And then the completion of Cel-River Road, but having seen Patrick's (Hamilton) screen it sounds like that project will likely get pulled if County Council decides to go forward to that. So that will free up some money to all of you. And then of course we have one additional interchange we would like to focus on down at Exit 77. Let me go ahead and stop there and see if there are any questions."

Ms. Stevens:

"Thanks. We are about to move to a different segment of the presentation to talk about policies. And I want to just quickly digress and give you a metaphor because it helps me kind of organize all the information that comes at me. We talk sometimes about spaghetti when we look at these road maps, we talk about the tomato map where it looks like you just splattered spaghetti sauce on the map to look at where things are showing up as red or congested. When I look at this map and other maps of the transportation system for the region, I see blood vessels. And I actually had a chance 20 years ago to go to Scotland, which is where planning was supposedly founded. Modern urban planning was founded in Scotland in the late 1800's by a gentleman who built a tall tower where people could come up and he had new technology back in the late 1800's, not that exciting technology. But it allowed people to get an aerial view of their city using a complicated system of lenses and mirrors. That guy was a doctor and what he tried to sell people on was the idea that cities and regions are organic, they are like bodies. And because he was a medical doctor, I think he started looking at planning as a way to use preventative measures to protect health. And when you think of this as a blood vessel system, think about traffic as circulation. In order to keep the organism healthy, we need the vessels to be clear. You can put a stint in your aorta or one of your major arteries, and you can take some medication for your blood pressure, but you can't stop doing other things. You've got to continue to exercise and eat well, there are preventative things that

you can do as well. And I think what you are seeing in planning, and I think this Long Range Plan perhaps is a sort of harbinger of that, is that we can't just keep adding road lanes. It's an important part of what needs to be done for congestion, but we also have to start adding some preventative measures; eating healthier, building roads a little differently. And I think you will see that repeated in some of these policies."

"With limited funds, one of the most cost-effective ways to deal with roadway congestion, at least luckily for this region right now, is to really target intersections. There has been quite a bit of money spent, I think several of the Pennies projects are intersection focused, and some of the previously federally funded projects that RFATS has done are intersection focused. Based on the congestion and travel time studies we did, we are still seeing that intersections is mainly where the breakdown is. So the recommendation policy-wise, is to continue to study and then address those intersections that really are creating most of the delay."

"We also are recommending improved access management measures. You can actually pull data that shows that the number of crashes goes up and the travel times go down when you have a greater number of driveways per mile. So staying with that functional classification system where you have arterials that are meant to carry a lot of the blood, they don't have a lot of access. As your streets get lower and smaller vessels, you have more access. If you follow that design, the major roads flow a lot better and there is opportunities as redevelopment happens to put those practices in place."

"We mentioned the Collector Street Plan earlier. We have a lot of areas especially in fast-growing parts of the region where there are clusters of development, sort of pods if you will. And the only way to get between pods right now is to go out of the pod on to the major highway and down a mile and then back into the next one. And so everyone is using the highway between those two points, and cluttering it up when other people are just trying to go through. So the idea of the Collector Street would be to connect some of those pods. In addition we want to improve overall network connectivity, through that more preventative measure. As new development occurs it can be more grid-street pattern not creating those isolating cul-de-sacs but actually having the connections made up front; because it is so much less expensive to purchase that right-of-way up front than it is to have to do it afterward."

"Rock Hill already has some great examples of way-finding, given the number of visitors, and visitor related traffic for this region. Continuing to use things that are pretty inexpensive, like signage to guide people, can help a lot with that reoccurring congestion that you see, especially during special events."

"We want to encourage ridesharing where possible; it's environmentally beneficial, it's good for the pocket book. And we want to continue some of the

programs that the state DOT currently operates that manage incidents by quickly moving them off the road when they occur, hopefully quickly, I know that hasn't always been able to be the case. And also providing real-time traffic information so that people can plan their trips. If you have a discretionary trip that you can put off for 30 minutes, if you have a chance to look at a website and see where the traffic is, you might shift your trip."

"The plan goes into a good bit of detail on some of the tools in these strategies that I have mentioned. The Bicycle-Pedestrian Connectivity Study, which I think had some very active public participation, has recommended quite an extensive set of projects. But the focus really, especially short term is recommended to be on safety focused projects and those that are serving really active centers of development within the region. Their recommendation is also to adopt a Complete Streets Policy, some jurisdictions already have it, but to have a consistent one region wide, so that there is a certain amount of predictability in the network, something doesn't stop at the city line. Again as projects are implemented, focus first on things that are safety; again that goes back to USDOT's goal. Make sure they are incorporated into other projects. I believe York County's Pennies projects all incorporate sidewalks, that's a great example of how that can be done as part of new construction. Then finally emphasize connectivity, filling in the gaps where we already have sidewalks, except for some small sections."

"There are some great opportunities emerging for public transportation in this area. I think again on your agenda in just a few minutes you have a TIP Amendment related to an exciting new project for the Rock Hill Urbanized Area. The plan recommends to continue to evaluate ways to initiate Dial-A-Ride service for Fort Mill and Tega Cay, as well as in Lancaster County's panhandle. And again, to look at that more preventative measure, look at land use patterns, and while all areas of the region don't need to be dense, there needs to be options. People who do want to have a transit-centered lifestyle, if development can be more clustered on the corridors where Fixed-Route Transit Service will be provided, those people then have the option to live in an area where transit service is available. This is a map that I am sure most of you have seen, the proposed local bus service for the Rock Hill Urbanized Area. The headways would be anywhere from 30 minutes to an hour depending on the route. It hits a lot of the major attractions, likely to attract students, visitors, and hopefully residents who are looking to get to community services."

"We mentioned earlier that RFATS participated with the Greater Charlotte Region on a Regional Freight Mobility Study. Again as with the intersection focus, the recommendations here are to look for those freight bottlenecks and tackle those with funding that is available. To continue to cooperate, recognizing that I-77 is a big example of a shared regional arterial interstate facility that needs to be managed cooperatively. And then to remember that when you get off the

interstate that you've still got that first or last mile to get to your actual manufacturing center or your intermodal hub. So continuing to look at local road design and make sure that it's adequate."

"Although aviation is not surface transportation, it is important to look at it as part of this plan because it has surface transportation connections. You all are well aware I think that the Rock Hill – York County Airport is a reliever and is officially designated in the state's Aviation Plan as a reliever for Charlotte-Douglas. As that airport gets busier, there is a real opportunity to attract corporate jets that are looking for a less busy place to land. Because of that, some of those jets are getting larger and a lot of general aviation airports are finding they need to extend the runway for those heavier aircraft. So that is part of the York County Airport's plan. Hanger space needs to be added to accommodate some of those new aircraft. And obviously it's important, because Charlotte-Douglas is so close, to remain involved in their activities because of the potential impact on airspace."

"It's interesting some of the routes that are needing to be improved because of traffic are also the evacuation routes related to the Catawba Nuclear Plant. So with that dual purpose, it's all the more important to prioritize improvements on those facilities, and it might be another source of funding if it's a Homeland Security issue."

"Intersections are where a lot of safety funding can be focused in cooperation with the state, looking at higher crash areas. And again, hitting that non-motorized user group, not hitting them (laughter), but preventing them from being hit (laughter). That was an unfortunate choice of words, wasn't it? Yes that wasn't a Freudian slip I promise. I want to point out the picture in the...it woke you up, didn't it? I want to point out the picture in the lower right corner. I don't think I discussed it when I was here in October. That is called 'Safety Edge', it is a new paving technique recommended by the Federal Highway Administration. The states that they have worked with to implement this have seen a significant reduction in run-off the road crashes. And that is more than 50% of the crash types in this area is run-off the road. This benefits because they create a 30 degree bevel on the edge of the road so if your tire drops off you don't over-correct when you get back on. It provides more of a gradual slope for you to regain your lane without over-correcting. That is something that is not some big stand-alone expensive project, it can be incorporated into a resurfacing program. That's the plug"

"All of the projects in the plan have been evaluated at a high level for potential environmental impact. Clearly the most important environmental impact that this region's transportation system has is on air quality. We have been very fortunate as of late to be doing much better in air quality readings, and the goal of this plan

would be for that to continue; even though you are expanding roadways, to make sure to monitor what the effects of that would be.”

“Money. I think you all are pretty familiar with the sources of transportation funding that come up at your various meetings. As you all are aware, at the top there are the federal sources, you have the Guideshare funds; which is your portion, your discretionary portion of the federal funds that come to the state. As well as CMAQ and Transportation Alternatives, which many of you probably remember as Transportation Enhancements. There will be FTA funds through the Section 5307 Program, which are an important part of implementing that local bus service. And then there are the federal funds managed for this region, spent in this region; that are managed by the State DOT. Under State sources we have SIB and obviously we also have a State Mass Transit fund which helps provide some match for the federal transit funds that are available to the region. And then under local, obviously everyone is aware of the Pennies program and the tremendous impact that it has had. And it’s important not to forget there are private investors as well. Sometimes when government doesn’t get there fast enough, it’s worth it to people who invest a little bit themselves.”

“The plan does have to be fiscally constrained. In other words, we can’t include more projects in it than what we estimate the revenue stream is going to be to pay for it. So we have done that analysis based on the updated project costs. The revenue assumptions are based on the idea that funding will continue under the same eligibilities as before. That is important to mention because as this area reaches air-quality attainment status, it’s not clear whether you will continue to receive as much CMAQ funding. So the plan does assume that things continue as they are, but that’s something that will have to be re-evaluated.”

“The other thing that I want to be sure to point out is that this revenue doesn’t all come at once. That is what that red note at the bottom says. It’s not like you have got \$218 M suddenly in the bank to spend on roads, it will come in over time. And so in the project list, you will recall in the plan, has projects that are slated to be completed by 2020, by 2030, and by 2040; reflecting the fact that that phasing of funding does occur.”

“Okay, at this point if there are any questions or comments, I would be glad to take those.”

Mr. Carnes: “Are there any questions for Ms. Stevens?”

Ms. Savage: “That was an excellent presentation and very understandable. Thank you.”

Ms. Stevens: “Thank you very much, my pleasure. I always appreciate the opportunity to work with my colleague Scot (Sibert), who is here in the Carolinas. I’m from Nashville and I am always happy to get back over here because I have family.

Now I guess David (Hooper) is going to summarize the comments on the plan that were received.”

Mr. Carnes: “Thank you Ms. Stevens.”

Mr. Hooper: “Well with that, let me go ahead and just touch on a couple of the more recent comments that we have received. I won’t go through the long list that I have already reviewed with you back in October. But since we have put these documents out for public comment, we did get a few. We received a couple on Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning. Essentially asking about specific locations, asking whether these are getting attention, whether they can be higher. They were just simply general observations of ‘We understand the importance on roads, we understand why the focus is there, but we would like for the Policy Committee and the planning process to reflect the need to highlight bicycle and pedestrian components in your project activity.’ And as Jeanne just outlined, that is certainly done in a number of areas.”

“In addition to that I received one public comment from a resident in the panhandle, who was concerned about the allocation of resources and that a large number of resources were spent in York County. I did try to reach out to this individual because he asked about why no non-federal money was spent in the panhandle, and I think if we kind of think through that, that is the Pennies money, and so it obviously has to remain in York County. But nonetheless I did want to share that with you.”

“There was also a comment from earlier today during our public hearing regarding rapid transit, and the emphasis on trying to further that discussion on trying to see some meaningful movement along US-21, our endorsed rapid transit corridor. And saying I think what a lot of us see, which is you know ‘vehicles dominate now and we may not have the densities at all points to move as forcibly as we would all like. But 15-20 years from now, if we don’t make progress, 20 years looking back it is going to feel very different than what it does now.’ And he just wanted to highlight that point as well. Let me go ahead and stop and see if there are any questions.”

Mr. Climer: “I had one on the bicycle and pedestrian network, the middle bullet point on that page.”

Mr. Hooper: “Yes sir.”

Mr. Climer: “Well it’s about the regional Complete Streets Policy.”

Mr. Hooper: “Yes sir.”

Mr. Climer: “Could you please help me to understand and go into a little bit of depth on what that would entail?”

Mr. Hooper: "Certainly. Complete Streets is really the recognition that when you do work it is not just the roadway and you are not just designing that improvement based on only vehicles will use it. But that you are incorporating sidewalks, bike lanes, and other things that complete streets, so that all users of the transportation system can be accommodated."

Mr. Climer: "So would this encumber future project work with the requirement that it always accommodates users?"

Mr. Hooper: "Well it doesn't have to. Complete Streets doesn't have one standard that says 'you must do X on every street, at every location.' You want it tailored to local conditions because you recognize that there may be geometric constraints, there may be other variables where you can't have a complete sidewalk or a complete bike lane at every place and on every side. So you are allowed to tailor that where appropriate."

Mr. Climer: "What would be the effect if we took that out of the long term plan?"

Mr. Hooper: "Took out the Complete Streets component? I mean the Complete Streets component is simply a recommendation to it. So I don't know, if you took it out, it doesn't, there is nothing binding."

Mr. Climer: "Okay."

Mr. Hooper: "There is nothing binding, this is ultimately, everything that comes from, anything that RFATS does ultimately goes back to the local jurisdictions' governing boards and they decide on their own whether they want to do it or not."

Mr. Climer: "Okay, thank you."

Mr. Hooper: "Yes sir. Okay if there are no other questions, I would go down to part three of this item. Which is the adoption, or consider adoption of this plan, the updated Transportation Improvement Program, and then the Air Quality Conformity Report, which is as Jeanne had mentioned earlier; all of these projects have to go through an air quality analysis. So when we take them in the aggregate, we don't violate the motor vehicle emissions budgets for our area. Our plan has passed conformity. It is cleared to go forward for your consideration and with that, staff is asking for your approval of the Long Range Plan, the TIP, and the Conformity Report. And I will answer any additional questions you might have."

Mr. Simrill: "Mr. Chairman?"

Mr. Carnes: "Yes sir."

Mr. Simrill: "Mr. Hooper, on the conformity determination, I know you said it meets the requirements for that. Where we are located, next to Charlotte, we have run into

this before in the attainment side of it. Can you go into a little depth? Are we held to a higher standard because of the Charlotte Metro region?"

Mr. Hooper:

"Let me go ahead and pull up one map to help us there. There we go, okay. Quick primer on this, back in 2004 EPA basically looked at the Greater Charlotte area and said 'you are not attaining' for the relative standards at that point, 'and you are in non-attainment.' EPA uses a term, they call it, they refer to it as the 'presumptive boundary.' Which means, if you have got a center city that all the other cities that have a certain number of their traffic going into that city are to some extent responsible for that and therefore when they make a non-attainment designation, they draw a pretty broad area to include all of them. We had been in non-attainment for about 13 years and then last year in 2016, EPA officially recognized that we were obtaining the relevant standards at this point; and this includes Charlotte. What they did is they said 'you are no longer in non-attainment', we are now in something that's called 'maintenance'; which is basically their way of saying, 'you are going in the right direction but you still have to go through the required air-quality testing to continue to demonstrate that you are not going to start backsliding.' And that is where we stand now. So in answer to your question, you know, RFATS and our counterparts in Charlotte, Gaston, Cabbarus-Rowan, we are all in 'maintenance' right now. We are all going in the right direction, so there is no adverse impact right now. If there were a split that occurred, where say, Charlotte dipped back into non-attainment and we remained going in the right path, we could have some adverse impact; because there is a concern, and this came out previously. That if you designate one area as non-attainment, let's say it is much more concentrated in Charlotte going north toward Concord, away from RFATS. That might make them relatively less competitive from an economic development standpoint, when you have businesses coming down here where they don't have the additional regulatory requirements. If we start to go in that direction then there could be an adverse impact, where they would lobby EPA and basically say 'draw that broad line again.' But we are not there yet, obviously."

"Any other questions?"

Mr. Carnes:

"Do we have a motion to adopt the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan, do we need to split those two up or do they need to go all together?"

Mr. Hooper:

"All of them, all at once, yes sir."

Mr. Carnes:

"As well as FY 17-22 Transportation Improvement Program and the Air Quality Conformity Determination?"

Mr. Reno:

"I'm actually going to make a motion to defer the vote on that for one month, and I'll give just a little background and we can dive into it a little more if needed. It goes back even to the gentleman who came and made comments at the beginning. What I would like is for staff to be able to look at over the next

month, what would be necessary to go back to the feasibility study that was suspended at about 90% completion on the Catawba River Bridge Project that occurred in May of 2012. And what that would involve as far as what sort of cost might be necessary, what sort of time frame, should there be additional data sampling. Just give us as a Policy Committee a good understanding of what would be necessary to finish that so we can make a decision on whether we want to complete the feasibility study and factor it in.”

“And my rationale there is when the, again the feasibility study was never completed; and we never as a Policy Committee looked at all the information from that study. And we left there looking for smaller projects to alleviate congestion concerns; and since that time period, since May of 2012 we have not found any solutions. And as we saw in this plan, the Exit 82, I believe it is, the cost estimates on that are in the \$60 M range, which is where we were at on the Catawba Bridge and Sutton Road interchange back at that time period. So what has, the mindset of leaving 2012 was smaller projects, but now that interchange, and we have even looked at diverging roadways along Celanese Road.”

“I think, you know, the gentleman talks about dumping traffic into Fort Mill, well again we are a regional committee and we need to look at any sort of study like that on a regional basis. I hold the opinion that as we deal with traffic concerns, we need to look as a region. Some of that flavor came out in the report today, we need to look and make sure where are our bottlenecks and malfunction points, because I think that our citizens, and it was pointed out in a study, they will expect reasonable growth but once they become a certain length, you start negatively impacting them, and it can cause issues in your economic viability. If you have major malfunction points, those are issues. So I don’t, I’m not of the view that we solve a Rock Hill problem, that we look at this regionally, and I feel like that study needs to be completed so that we can put that on the table.”

“As to the gentleman’s point, if there are, again specific data within the report that is questionable, again we have got to get to a completed study before we can start making questions into the underlying data. So that is what I would like to ask us to do, is to take a pause for one month, see what would be required, you know, like our work cost to complete the feasibility study on the Catawba River Bridge.”

Mr. Carnes: “We have a motion to defer the approval of this to next month, is there a second?”

Ms. Pender: “Second.”

Ms. Savage: “I’ve got a comment after that second please.”

Mr. Carnes: “Okay.”

Ms. Savage: "David (Hooper), can you tell me how much money has been spent to date, in your time, studying this particular resolution?"

Mr. Hooper: "Thinking back to the feasibility study,"

Ms. Savage: "Before that even, because that wasn't the first one, was it?"

Mr. Hooper: "Well there was an internal report by the DOT done, which is called the APPR, that, which obviously you have got cost there. You've got an analysis that dates back to 2002, where that project was first identified. So you have got the staff time for that update, in 2005, 2009, and the feasibility study."

Ms. Savage: "So let's arbitrarily choose 2002 until today, how much money has been spent studying this solution?"

Mr. Hooper: "I can tell you with the greatest confidence that the money related to the feasibility study was about \$170,000. I would be reluctant to try to guess what the staff estimates are over 12 years."

Ms. Savage: "And how many times has this RFATS Committee voted against that solution?"

Mr. Hooper: "Well, let's see. You've got, you have kind of seen an evolution. You had three updates where it was affirmed and then you had a vote to end the feasibility study in 2012 and move in a different direction in 2013. Then there have been about four to five different targeted analysis essentially where we looked along the I-77 Corridor, we looked at a follow-up at the bridge itself in looking at volumes if you built a bridge and if you didn't build a bridge, I think we looked at the Celanese / Cherry Road study; that's at least three. I think at the end of those meetings the sense was that we didn't go further from that point."

Ms. Savage: "If it had been truly an optimal solution, I do believe in my colleagues' ability to recognize that and to have voted on that prior to my coming on to this RFATS Committee. I also believe that is a misuse of tax payer's dollars to continue to study a solution that has been rejected more than once. We have had multiple changes occur on both sides of the river that have not helped this to be a better solution. So I would like to make a motion that we put this particular solution to bed and that we advance a study to look for an alternative that is truly a solution rather than a movement of the issue."

Mr. Hooper: "I guess one thing that I might say just very briefly in reply is that...and I hope this is taken in the spirit that it is offered, its, I don't know that there is an alternative solution. I think that the Policy Committee may want to just, you may want to make a judgment about how the network functions, and where you want to place your emphasis points. Before you undertake a feasibility study, you look at all the lesser options from both a cost standpoint and an operational standpoint. And so, you may just want to, as a body, decide what direction we want to go, what are the types of improvements that we wish to make."

Ms. Savage: "And I think that with this particular solution that has been taken up more than once."

Mr. Reno: "I would just ask that regarding the postponement of the feasibility study so late in its maturity, it was pointed out in that May meeting of 2012, that once the feasibility study came back to this body that they could accept it, they could reject it, they could ask for further study. And so again, as David (Hooper) just read off the history, from 2002 to 2012 this Policy Committee was affirming that plan. The Catawba River Bridge idea and concept started in 2002 and was continued to be in Long Range Plans until our feasibility study was stopped. So my thought is, I'm asking for David (Hooper) to understand what it would take to complete it and then we could have a discussion of what the mechanics of that are and what new data may be necessary to be brought in because as we have heard there is new development and that is going to impact some of the variables within it."

Ms. Savage: "Absolutely."

Mr. Reno: "So I think asking those questions over the next month will give us a good sense of what that would entail, and then we may have a good planning document at that point in time to either, again, say we affirm it, we vote against it, we don't affirm it, we want further study in this direction...It gives us a good planning document to try and evaluate this issue for the region."

Ms. Savage: "And not to make this into a seminar on, on studies and...and I feel for the issue. I have said that openly. I feel for the issue. But the term 'affirmation' tends to say that you agree with something, and I have been on the Fort Mill Town Council since 2003. So I was only a year late to the table, and I have not once seen an affirmation by this committee that that was a good solution. I haven't seen that. So I can't use the word affirmation. I have only seen resistance on our part, on that side of the river, that a five lane road being connected to a two lane road is a good solution. I use an analogy in my own neck of the woods, it's like fire ants. If you don't want fire ants in your yard, and you put Andro on it; it doesn't kill them, it just moves them to your neighbor's yard."

Chief Harris: "Right."

Ms. Savage: "I don't see that as something to eliminate a problem. I don't see it, I think it's going to create another problem; and if you were in my shoes you would have the same feelings, I feel certain. As a regional concept and as a regional partner to you, I think we definitely have to find a solution. There needs to be a solution. It is a safety issue on I-77. I am absolutely supportive of that. But I cannot support something that is mathematically simple. It is mathematically simple. It is not emotional. It is absolute. Five lanes on to two lanes in a growing populous does not equal a solution; and continued tax payer dollars poured into a study to come up with that solution is irresponsible in my opinion."

Mr. Hooper: "If I could, and this is just an observation. As you have this discussion, one thing that I would highlight just as a point of reference, is that whenever you undertake any significant additions to a network, whether it's a bridge or a new roadway or anything; that you...It's sort of like the ripple effect. When you throw a stone it kind of moves...When you do one project, it's based with the understanding that everything that is adjacent to it is upgraded to accommodate that. So that if you build a five lane, a three lane, that the receiving end as well as the generating end are both of similar lanes."

Ms. Savage: "So this study included taking Sutton Road up to five lanes?"

Mr. Hooper: "The study itself looked at all of the variables if you constructed a bridge over a water body. There was a particular concern about the Catawba Indian Nation; and then what types of property impacts there would be. During the study, it did not get in to, I think, a lot of the supporting improvements because a feasibility study, just as a general proposition focuses on the one thing being studied. At RFATS, you had already had roadways identified for widening, which is in this particular case you were to widen Sutton if a bridge came through there, down to the interchange. You would have to widen India Hook Road, Mt. Gallant Road, and you would have to upgrade the Sutton Road interchange. One thing that I would say here is that an upgrade to the Sutton Road interchange was not reflected initially. Joe (Cronin) has highlighted the importance of this and that was ultimately folded into the numbers later in the study. But initially it was not identified."

Ms. Savage: "So your comments David (Hooper), lead me to believe that you are in full support of the motion to continue this study. Is that correct?"

Mr. Hooper: "That would not be correct. I do not have a position either for or against it. My role is to..."

Ms. Savage: "I'm aware."

Mr. Hooper: "My role is to basically say this is how the network is functioning, this is the impact if you do A, or if you don't do A."

"Yes sir?"

Mr. Climer: "This is kind of a elementary question so forgive me. But what are we voting on right now? Are we voting on, are we just voting on giving staff the opportunity to figure out how much time and cost would be involved in bringing this study back up later? Or are we voting to continue the discussion?"

Mr. Reno: "The motion was for to defer the adoption of the Long Range Plan, and my rationale was for to allow staff to provide information on the feasibility study."

Mr. Climer: "Okay, so we are just voting on willingness to give staff time to come up with an answer about how much it would cost.

Mr. Reno: "Until the June meeting."

Mr. Climer: "Okay."

Chief Harris: "David (Hooper), will your staff have enough time to actually bring back that information?"

Ms. Savage: "Again."

Mr. Hooper: "I mean bringing back the basics of what would be involved, let's see you've got the cost component, and the cost component is really a function of some of the things that Mayor Savage talked about. Which is, you've had some things change, in the development with Mason's Bend, you've got, I believe a hotel that has been approved in the general area of where, near the interstate and you would have to take that..."

"Yes ma'am?"

Ms. Savage: "Would you also include, because I have heard multiple times that Mason's Bend, Mason's Bend. The opening of Hubert Graham (Way) also allows people from the Lake Ridge subdivision and all the area in Baxter (Village) to access Sutton Road to try to get to I-77 and avoid the congestion on SC-160. This is not an issue about one neighborhood. It is an issue about traffic flow and the limited resource that Sutton Road provides."

Mr. Hooper: "Absolutely. Absolutely, and please, please, if I gave you the wrong impression, what I am saying is that is the most obvious when you look at the four alternatives that were identified. Staff would have to go back and cite those and 'here, this is what's changed' so as you conceptualize to where something would go you would have to take account of 'this'. You would have to take a look at a lot of the developments like the Spratt property, Waterside, Massey, and others where the numbers are appreciably higher so that you can take account of what is coming from the other side. You would also have to go north. So if you've got increased demand coming down Sutton, you have to take that into account as well. Absolutely."

"So we would be looking at what had changed, what would have to be elevated for it to be valid and reliable for you to consider; and then try to cost that out and then give you some sense of the time frame in order for this work to actually be undertaken. So could those basic questions be answered? They can be answered, it's not that involved per se, undertaking the work obviously would be a little longer than that, if you decide to go in that direction."

Chief Harris: "Right."

Mr. Carnes: “If delaying the vote today until next month, if this comes back and says we want to do this study and we want to continue and it’s going to be six or eight months to do this study...what’s the difference between voting on this now and voting on it in a month when we are still probably going to have to revise it at some point if we decide to continue the study?”

Mr. Hooper: “I mean there’s a couple of ways if you want to go in this direction. I mean, ultimately the plan is going to have to be amended. I’ll just touch on that, which is, you know, when Patrick (Hamilton) talked about what is on Pennies shortlist. If they pull one of your key projects off, that is going to change things. So you have got a Plan Amendment coming in probably the later part of this year. So in answer to your question, if you vote to postpone, you’ve got staff coming back to amend the plan and then you’ve got the months to get it done. I mean, I suppose you could try to approach it either way. The only thing that would concern me is how we are communicating with the Department of Transportation, because they have been working on releasing the two interchange reconfiguration projects I believe as a group, and if you are considering altering one of your priorities, they need to know that so they don’t put those, quote ‘on the street’. That would have to be clearly understood by SCDOT.”

Mr. Carnes: “And you are talking about the I-77 interchanges?”

Mr. Hooper: “Yes sir. These two right here (Exit 82 and Exit 85). They are trying to put these out as a group and so I wouldn’t want to hold up, if (Exit) 85 is ready, that needs to go. But if you are going to consider a change we would have to tell them, ‘hold, don’t do anything’.”

Mr. Carnes: “Essentially when we talked about this before, the need to upgrade Exit 82 was still something that needed to be done, even if you had this additional crossing here.”

Mr. Hooper: “Correct, if memory serves when we did the Celanese / Cherry study, I believe we had talked about this, whether it was one or the other, and I think there was a sense of, the optimal outcome would be both. That’s what I remember from that. Yes sir.”

Mr. Carnes: “Any additional comments?”

“Okay we have a motion on the floor with a second. We also have a motion by Mayor Savage which has not received a second.”

Mr. Reno: “We have to vote on the first one.”

Chief Harris: “Yeah we have to vote on the one thing, we can’t introduce both for a vote.”

Mr. Carnes: “Alright. All those in favor of Mr. Reno’s motion please signify by saying ‘aye’ and I know this is going to be a little complicated because we have people that

have proxies voting. So, would it be better to vote by show of hands so we can calculate the proxies?"

Mr. Hooper: "That would probably help, yes sir." (Laughter)

Ms. Savage: "But I don't have three hands." (Laughter)

Mr. Carnes: "All those in favor would you please show by raising your hand?" "We have one, two, three, four." (Mr. Simrill, Ms. Pender, Mr. Climer, and Mr. Reno)

Mr. Hooper: "Okay so we have got four in the room, and then two of the members have proxies."

Mr. Carnes: "He's (Mr. Reno) got one proxy and Mr. Simrill has two proxies."

Mr. Hooper: "Okay so that brings you to seven. Okay."

Mr. Carnes: "All those opposed?" (Mr. Carnes, Ms. Savage, and Chief Harris)

Mr. Hooper: "Okay so you've got one, two, and Mayor Savage has two proxies. So your vote is seven to five."

Mr. Carnes: "Okay we have a seven to five vote, this will be delayed ending next month with a request to bring the updated information on the study for an additional crossing over the Catawba River."