



**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
March 25, 2016 - 12:00 p.m. (NOON)
Manchester Meadows Conference Room**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: George Sheppard; Kathy Pender; Doug Echols; Wes Hayes; Brian Carnes; Guynn Savage; Bill Harris; Jim Reno (Proxy); and Britt Blackwell.

ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Bill Jordan (SCDOT); Joe Cronin (Town of Fort Mill); Cliff Goolsby (City of Rock Hill); Kati Price (SCDOT); Patrick Hamilton (York County); Elizabeth Harris (Catawba Indian Nation); Julie Barker (SCDOT); Bill Meyer (City of Rock Hill); David Burgess (SCDOT); Audra Miller (York County); Vic Edwards (SCDOT); David Vehaun (City of Rock Hill); Dean Hendrix (York County); Randy Imler (CRCOG); Steve Willis (Lancaster County); Ivan McCorkle (City of Rock Hill); Bill Shanahan (York County); Chris Herrmann (RFATS); and David Hooper (RFATS)

CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT: Luther Dasher (CAC); David Keely (CAC); Frank Myers (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); Cleopatra Allen (CAC); Hisham Abdelaziz (HDR); Meredith Edwards; Marie Rainey; Diane Brooks; David Kerns; Teresa Thomas (Office of Senator Lindsey Graham); Travis Pollade (AECOM); Larry Huntley (Fort Mill Town Council); Mia Macy (CN2); David L. O'Neal (City of Tega Cay Council); and Scot Sibert (Parsons-Brinckerhoff).

1. CALL TO ORDER:

- a. **Welcome** – Chairman Sheppard called the meeting to order at 12:08 P.M. and welcomed all in attendance.
- b. **Citizen Comment Period** ó No comments were made at this time.

2. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Sheppard briefly reviewed a previous request for information regarding the Pennies for Progress referendums. The request included addressing the following questions: (1) when was each referendum scheduled to be completed; (2) when was it actually completed; (3) how much money was collected from each Pennies round; (4) what were the cost overruns on each of the projects; and (5) where did the money come from to address those cost overruns? Mr. Sheppard then asked for a summary of why this information wasn't available for inclusion in the agenda packets and when it is expected to be available?

Mr. Hooper then noted that while the county does have an audit committee that is preparing a report that will answer many of the questions that have been asked ó that Mr. Hamilton has stated that this report will not be complete until early April. Mr. Hamilton then noted that the Chair of the Pennies sub-committee, Ms. Cox would like for the report to be reviewed by the sub-committee members and then made available for distribution. Mr. Echols then asked about the scope of the request and Mr. Sheppard reviewed the five questions noted earlier in more detail. Mr. Echols then asked when the audit is due and Mr. Hamilton noted that this is expected next week. Mr. Sheppard then stated that this information should be available by the second week of April? Mr. Hamilton then responded that assuming everything is complete next week, that he should be able to send everything out that week.

Mr. Blackwell then provided an overview of the current effort to strengthen management of the Pennies program, particularly with regard to cost overruns so that the program can move forward into a fourth referendum with a clearer direction of where the program is going and what can be accomplished. With this in mind, Mr. Blackwell stated that hopefully a few weeks delay will result in cleaner and better figures for update and evaluation purposes. Ms. Savage then noted that while she certainly appreciates the effort to make the program cleaner and better, that she would not be able to support a fourth Pennies referendum until all of the projects from the previous referendums were caught up, and that she would not support progress on a Pennies IV referendum without a clear understanding on the previous projects. Mr. Sheppard then asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the February 26, 2016 meeting. Mr. Sheppard asked for a motion. Mr. Echols made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Ms. Savage seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

3. REPORTS:

- a. **State Infrastructure Bank Application** – Mr. Sheppard briefly noted that this agenda item had been withdrawn by the presenter. Mr. Echols then requested an explanation of why this item was withdrawn? Mr. Hooper then noted that the draft SIB application was updated following the February Policy Committee meeting, underwent a York County staff review and then was presented to County Council for their consideration. Mr. Hooper continued that during the most recent meeting on March 22nd, that the County Council requested some additional revisions (which are in the process of being made), resulting in this item being withdrawn for today's meeting.

Mr. Echols then noted that notwithstanding the additional changes that are being made, that his sense was that the original request was for a presentation of the overall scope of the application, and then part of the request was focused on the incorporation of exits 82A & 82B (in addition to exit 82C). Mr. Echols continued noting that the request was really to understand what is contained in the application so that all members of the Policy Committee can fully understand what is involved? Mr. Shanahan then stated that there was a desire to first respond to the requests made by the County Council before making the presentation so as to avoid giving out incorrect information. Mr. Blackwell then provided a verbal summary of what is proposed to be covered in the application (i.e., a series of interchange improvements from Carowinds Blvd to the Celanese / Cherry Road interchange).

Mr. Echols then stated that once the additional revisions are made to the SIB application, that a presentation can hopefully be made covering both the SIB application and the requested report on the Pennies referendums when the Policy Committee next meets in April. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that since the next meeting is slated to be a workshop on the Celanese Corridor study, that some adjustment to the schedule may be needed. With this in mind, Mr. Hooper noted that either additional meeting time will be needed to cover all three topics in April or perhaps the workshop could be rescheduled for May. Discussion then followed with the understanding that all three topics will be covered at the April workshop, which will expand from an hour to an hour and a half. Mr. Sheppard then requested that once the reports for both Pennies for Progress and the SIB application are completed (i.e., following the County Council meeting on April 4th), that they be promptly distributed to the Policy Committee for review.

- b. **Project Recommendations to Pennies IV Sales Tax Commission** – Mr. Hooper briefly noted that York County has initiated the process of developing a slate of projects to evaluate for potential consideration for a fourth Pennies referendum. With this in mind, Mr. Hooper noted that in addition to input that will be provided from individual jurisdictions, that RFATS has been asked to provide recommendations identifying priority segments of the transportation network that should be

considered as well as part of this evaluation and selection process. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed a comprehensive map of the projects generated from the prior three Pennies rounds, noting projects that have not been completed including Ebinport Road, Ebenezer Road, and Eden Terrace. Mr. Hooper then stated that the previous referendums have included projects on most of the arterial roadways in the RFATS Planning Area as well as at many key intersections.

Mr. Hooper then outlined the following list of project recommendations:

- **Reconfiguration of Exit 82 Interchange.** It was noted that this project is currently reflected in the LRTP as a priority location given the regional nature of travel demand along the Celanese Corridor as well as the close proximity and interconnected nature of interchange access for both Celanese and Cherry Road(s).
- **Reconfiguration of Exit 85 Interchange.** It was highlighted that this location is similarly reflected as a priority need in the LRTP; and that, it serves a regional travel demand along the SC 160 Corridor. Additionally, the development activity at the Kingsley site was noted as a significant contributor to the need to improve the operational capacity of the interchange.
- **Cel-River Road (Phase II).** A priority project also reflected in the LRTP. This phase of work would effectively complete the planned widening from the southern Eden Terrace Extension down to Dave Lyle Blvd. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted the proximity of Riverwalk and improvement activity in / around the Galleria area.
- **Exit 77 Interchange.** An identified priority in the LRTP. It was noted that there is significant back-up on the southbound ramp during the evening peak period as well as additional area development activity that warrants a commitment to improving the functional capacity of this interchange.
- **Ebinport Road.** Mr. Hooper briefly noted prior discussion about the need that this project (originally identified as part of the 2003 referendum) be brought to completion. Applicable variables include the location of two schools along the corridor as well as its operational function as a connector road between Cherry and Celanese Road (via India Hook).
- **Celanese & Cherry Road Corridor(s).** Significant operational improvements are needed at key intersections along both corridors; in particular, from India Hook to I-77 on Celanese and from Mt Gallant to the I-77 on Cherry Road.
- **Fort Mill Southern Parkway.** It is recommended that a two to five lane widening be undertaken to effectively manage projected increases in travel demand.
- **Pleasant Road.** A two to five lane widening from Carowinds Blvd to SC 160 is recommended as a needed operational improvement in this part of the network. It was noted that right-of-way constraints may be applicable along this corridor at multiple points.
- **Hubert Graham Way.** An extension of the Tega Cay Gold Hill Connector is recommended from Gold Hill Road connecting to Zoar Road. As a point of reference, the operational challenges and planned improvements at the SC 160 / Gold Hill intersection were noted as part of this item.

- **US 21.** A two to five lane widening from Catawba River Bridge to the Fort Mill Northern Bypass is recommended. As a point of reference, it was noted that US 21 is the established Locally Preferred Alternative for the eventual incorporation of a Rapid Transit Alternative.

Mr. Echols then asked about the long-term planning efforts for US 21 as the identified transit corridor. In response, Mr. Hooper reviewed the recommendations from the MIS Study completed back in 2007 regarding the preferred transit mode and routing to incorporate a viable rapid transit alternative into the network. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper then briefly discussed the role of density, coordination of land uses as well as related market variables relevant to advancing the long term vision of this corridor as an alternative transportation opportunity within RFATS. Discussion then followed regarding the previously identified cost ranges for BRT & Light Rail; coordination with the Town of Pineville, NC. Ms. Savage then stated that rapid transit planning should be pursued, and that, other corporate incentives are relevant here (i.e., the cost of parking, air quality impacts, etc). Lastly, Mr. Sheppard then ask about the potential for extending the proposed US 21 widening north all the way to Carowinds Blvd to provide a true alternative to I-77.

- **Highway 49.** Operational improvements are recommended along this corridor from the intersection of Hwy 274 / 557 / 49 to the Buster Boyd Bridge.
- **US 21 / Springdale Road.** Operational improvements are recommended at this location due to continued development activity; proximity to the interstate as well as travel demand projections along both US 21 and SC 5.
- **Sutton Road.** It is recommended that a two to five lane widening be considered from SC 160 to US 21.
- **Dobys Bridge Road.** A two to five lane widening is recommended from SC 160 to the Lancaster County line. As a point of reference, it was noted that additional follow-up beyond Pennies would be needed from the county line to US 521; and that, in terms of the two phases of work along this corridor, that the second section from Whites Road to the county line would be the higher priority.
- **Eden Terrace.** It is recommended that widening Eden Terrace from Anderson Road to Riverwalk should be considered. It was noted how this road could effectively serve as an alternative to the adjacent arterials as the build out of Riverwalk continues to progress.
- **Springfield Parkway.** It is recommended that a two to five lane widening from SC 160 to Gold Hill Road be undertaken along this corridor given projected residential and commercial development in this part of the network.
- **Catawba River Bridge.** Given the regional travel shed served by the Celanese Corridor, the close proximity and functional integration of the Celanese / Cherry Road interchange ramps, the extent of the geography between I-77 and the Buster Boyd bridge, and the increasing need for efficient and balanced connectivity with the road network ó an additional bridge crossing was noted as an operationally important project need.

Mr. Hooper then noted that the two interchange reconfigurations at Celanese / I-77 and SC 160 / I-77 are the highest priority network needs for consideration by the Sales Tax Commission. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper then noted that initial phases of project work (i.e., PE & ROW) have already received a funding commitment through RFATS as part of the joint project programming

arrangement between RFATS and the Pennies Program to sharply accelerate project implementation at these two critical locations within the transportation network.

Mr. Hooper then asked for approval from the Policy Committee to present these recommendations to the Pennies IV Sales Tax Commission. Mr. Sheppard asked for a motion. Mr. Hayes made a motion to approve the recommendations; Mr. Echols seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

4. Proposed Policy Committee Action Items:

- a. TIP Amendment** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed the SC 160 Widening Project (Phase II) from the York County Line to the Rosemont / MacMillan intersection approaching US 521. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that this project was transitioned to RFATS for implementation when the planning area boundary was expanded following the 2010 Census. Mr. Hooper also noted that \$7.0M in Guideshare funding was initially transferred, with \$2.8M subsequently added to the project (\$1.4M from CRCOG; \$1.4M from RFATS). Mr. Hooper then reviewed an updated cost estimate from SCDOT which is approximately \$1.7M above the current funding allocated to this project.

Discussion then followed regarding the nature of the projected cost range. Ms. Price noted that the updated cost estimate is focused on the construction component of the project, but that there could be movement in the utility aspect of the project at a later point. Mr. Blackwell then sought confirmation that the updated estimate reflects what is expected in anticipation of the bidding process. Ms. Price noted that it is. Mr. Sheppard then commented on the mechanics of project budgeting and the bidding process and how the sequence of planning steps correlates with bidding results. Ms. Price then briefly outlined applicable requirements associated with federally funded projects and the role that the development of reasonable project estimates can have on implementation timelines. Ms. Savage then noted the unintended effect that the applicable requirements have on ultimate project costs. Mr. Sheppard then asked for a motion. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Carnes and seconded by Mr. Hayes. The motion was passed with eight ~~yes~~ and one ~~no~~ (Mr. Sheppard opposed).

- b. TIP Amendment** – Mr. Herrmann briefly reviewed a recommendation from the Technical Team to forego an annual call for new projects and instead focus on allocating funding for existing priorities in order to expedite identified project needs. Mr. Herrmann then stated that the Technical Team has recommended that the CMAQ funding for FY 16-17 be allocated to three projects: (1) Carowinds Blvd / Pleasant Road Intersection Improvement Project; (2) India Hook / Celanese Road Intersection Improvement Project; and (3) the Lake Ridge Trail Project.

As a point of reference, Mr. Herrmann noted that the two intersection projects are highly ranked Act 114 projects and all three projects have already undergone and completed the required Air Quality Benefit Analysis. Mr. Herrmann then asked the Policy Committee to grant approval to amend the TIP to reflect a total of \$1,864,000 in CMAQ funding contingent on any comments received during the 15-day public comment period. Mr. Sheppard then asked for a motion to approve. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Echols; seconded by Ms. Savage and the motion was unanimously approved.

- c. CAC Appointment** – Mr. Herrmann briefly reviewed the role of the Citizens Advisory Committee and then summarized the application received from Quinlan Canty, who has been nominated to represent the Catawba Indian Nation. Mr. Herrmann then requested consideration to appoint Mr. Canty to the Citizens Advisory Committee. Mr. Sheppard then asked for a motion to approve. A motion to approve was made by Ms. Savage and seconded by Mr. Harris; the motion was unanimously approved.

5. Other Business:

- a. Administrative Report** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed the Administrative Report.
- b. Celanese Corridor Workshop** – Mr. Sheppard stated that the workshop is scheduled for April 22, 2016 at Manchester Meadows Conference Room.

6. Adjournment

With no further business, the motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Blackwell and seconded by Ms. Savage; the motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 1:10 P.M.