



**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
February 24, 2017 – 12:00 p.m. (NOON)
Rock Hill Operations Center – Room 132**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Echols; Brian Carnes; George Sheppard; Guynn Savage; Kathy Pender (Proxy); Britt Blackwell; Jim Reno; Michael Johnson; and Gary Simrill.

ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Greg Shaw (SCDOT); Joe Cronin (Town of Fort Mill); Keith Powell (SCDOT); Penelope Karagounis (Lancaster County); Cliff Goolsby (City of Rock Hill); Steve Allen (York County); Bill Meyer (City of Rock Hill); Allison Love (York County); Mike Sullivan (SCDOT); Terrence Neely (City of Rock Hill); Audra Miller (York County); Jimmy Bagley (City of Rock Hill); Brian Klauk (SCDOT); Bill Shanahan (York County); Rob Ruth (City of Rock Hill); Patrick Hamilton (York County); Robby Moody (CRCOG); Jeremy Winkler (City of Rock Hill); David Harmon (York County); Matt Gallman (CRCOG); Dean Hendrix (York County); Yolanda Morris (FHWA); Ron Pompey (York County); Steve Willis (Lancaster County); Chris Herrmann (RFATS); and David Hooper (RFATS).

CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT: Frank Myers (CAC); Frieda Price (CAC); Luther Dasher (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); Amy Massey (Kimley Horn); Scot Sibert (Parsons-Brinckerhoff); Mike Fry (Campco); Marie Sugar (STV, Inc.); and Kenneth Johnson (AECOM).

1. CALL TO ORDER:

a. Welcome ó Chairman Echols called the meeting to order at 12:06 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. Echols asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the January 27, 2017 meeting. Mr. Echols asked for a motion. Mr. Sheppard made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Ms. Savage seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

3. PROPOSED POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS:

a. 2045 LRTP Update ó Mr. Hooper provided a brief overview of the LRTP update process and the steps completed to date. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed socio-economic projections as well as all planned projects (from all funding sources) through 2045. Mr. Hooper then reviewed projected roadway conditions through 2045 ó which reflect both increasing levels of travel demand (consistent with projected growth rates), as well as a shift in demand levels away from I-77 and toward arterial roadways reflecting more trips that both begin and end within the regional transportation network. With this demand shift, Mr. Hooper noted that if no additional network improvements are made beyond the existing or committed projects, drivers are projected to spend approximately 80% of their time in congested conditions of LOS D or lower along arterial roadways.

Mr. Hooper then reviewed the draft Transportation Project List for the LRTP Update, noting that it covers a range of transportation system needs including road widenings, operational improvements, congestion management strategies, public transit as well as bicycle / pedestrian improvements. Mr. Hooper then reviewed the project estimates (current year and year of expenditure dollars), for those transportation improvements included on the cost constrained project list:

- Exit 82 / I-77 Interchange Reconfiguration
 - Current Cost Estimate: \$49.7 M
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$62.1 M
- Exit 85 / I-77 Interchange Reconfiguration
 - Current Cost Estimate: \$27.5 M
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$33.6 M
- SC 160 East Road Widening
 - Current Cost Estimate: \$21.7 M
 - YOE (2035) Cost Estimate: \$25.8 M
- Celriver Road Widening
 - Current Cost Estimate: \$39.8 M
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$46.2 M
- Exit 77 / I-77
 - Current Cost Estimate: \$4.5 M
 - YOE (2025) Cost Estimate: \$5.2 M

Mr. Hooper then noted that while capacity and operational improvements are significant network priorities, that congestion management strategies focused on strengthening the collector road system, traffic signal synchronization, and access management ó are also a core component to improving operating conditions throughout the transportation network. Mr. Hooper then briefly noted that the total cost estimate for these project priorities range from \$138.7 M to \$173.0 M, which at the high end of the range closely approaches the projected Guideshare total through 2045 of \$176.8 M. Lastly, Mr. Hooper noted that with the continuing development of a fourth Pennies Referendum as well as the ongoing consideration of the SIB application, a plan amendment should be expected once these initiatives come to finalization.

Mr. Hooper then asked Mr. Hamilton for his assessment regarding potential projects that appear likely for a fourth Pennies Referendum; in particular, Celriver Road and the interchange reconfigurations at Exit 82 / I-77 and Exit 85 / I-77. Mr. Hamilton responded that Celriver Road is on the short list of projects and is very likely to be reflected on the ballot referendum. With regard to the interchange projects, Mr. Hamilton noted that the Sales Tax Commission has been made aware of prior discussions at RFATS that these projects were advanced with the assumption that the construction component would be included on Pennies IV. Mr. Hooper then asked if they provided any guidance on whether either of these projects are slated to be included on the short list? In response, Mr. Hamilton said that no feedback was provided by the Sales Tax Commission. Lastly, Mr. Hamilton stated that the Pennies IV slate of projects will be presented to the York County Council in May.

Mr. Echols then asked about the approach for bringing the various funding programs and processes together. Mr. Hooper noted that following completion of the LRTP Update in June, that a plan amendment is envisioned to reflect the final result from Pennies IV and the SIB application ó effectively merging these three sources of project funding and updating network priorities. Following up on this point, Ms. Savage then asked if it was known when York County might receive a response on the SIB application? Mr. Hamilton said that the SIB evaluation committee completed a site visit in January, offering positive feedback on the project proposal; and that, a follow-up meeting is scheduled to occur in

March. Mr. Hooper then noted that in prior SIB application reviews, that the evaluation committee would generally ask for a priority order when considering multi-site project applications. With this in mind, Mr. Hooper asked whether this type of request was made? Mr. Hamilton stated that they did ask for this information and the following order was provided: 1) Exit 85, 2) Exit 90, 3) Exit 82, 4) Exit 83; noting that Exit 88 is being funded through Pennies for Progress. As a point of reference, Mr. Simrill then noted that Act 275 requires that all qualified projects from the SIB must be submitted to SCDOT for their consideration and approval.

Ms. Savage then reemphasized an earlier point regarding the complexities and challenges of the required planning process and actionable items for expediting project implementation. As a point of reference, Mr. Johnson noted the prior action taken by RFATS in programming funds to initiate preliminary engineering and right-of-way in support of the interchange reconfiguration projects at Exits 82 & 85. Mr. Hooper then noted that coordinative action to link multiple funding sources and programs is taken, though some procedural elements continue to influence the planning and implementation process as well (use of federal funding, environmental decision documents, etc), but that staff will certainly continue to explore all opportunities to further streamline the planning process to shorten overall project timelines.

Mr. Hooper then requested endorsement of the Comprehensive Project List, and briefly summarized next steps in the LRTP Update process, which includes presentation of the full draft plan at the April Policy Committee meeting. Mr. Carnes then requested that the Comprehensive Project List be amended to include one additional unfunded project need; specifically, the extension of Possum Hollow Road (Lancaster County) connecting to Old Springs Road (York County), just southeast of the Fort Mill Southern Parkway. Ms. Savage then made a motion to endorse the Comprehensive Project List, with the inclusion of the extension of Possum Hollow Road. Mr. Carnes then seconded. Mr. Simrill then recused himself from voting given his participation on the State Infrastructure Bank Board. The motion was then passed.

b. TIP Amendment (FTA 5307 Funding) ó Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed a request to program \$2.9M in FTA Section 5307 funding allocated to the City of Rock Hill as they continue their efforts to initiate a fixed route transit service. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that this funding is an urbanized area formula program allocation based on the Rock Hill Small Urbanized Area designation. Mr. Hooper then noted that as with all other federal funding sources utilized within the RFATS Study Area, these funds must be reflected in the Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Johnson then asked a broader funding question regarding the initiation of the new fixed route service; specifically, whether approval of the TIP Amendment would require any future funding from RFATS? In response, Mr. Hooper noted that no future funding comes from RFATS ó transit funding is a result of budgeting by the Federal Transit Administration and is separate and distinct from RFATS. Mr. Johnson then reconfirmed that this action reflects a dedicated source of funding that is allocated for public transit and will not result in a subsequent funding liability to RFATS. Mr. Hooper then stated that this funding has no relationship with RFATS Guideshare funding

As a point of reference, Dr. Blackwell then referenced a previous request for support regarding the Fixed-Route Service made by the City of Rock Hill to the York County Council. Dr. Blackwell then asked whether this specific TIP Amendment is entirely separate from the previous request? Mr. Hooper then responded that this TIP Amendment reflects a procedural action to reflect this funding (which has already been allocated to the City of Rock Hill by the Federal Transit Administration), in the appropriate planning documents, and does not produce any obligations from RFATS. Dr. Blackwell then noted that with this clarification, he would vote to approve the TIP Amendment.

Mr. Hooper then requested that the Policy Committee grant preliminary approval to amend the TIP to reflect \$2,902,000 in FTA 5307 funding and authorize a 21-day public comment period. A motion to grant approval was made by Mr. Sheppard; seconded by Ms. Savage and the motion was unanimously approved.

c. Metrolina Regional Model Maintenance Agreement ó Mr. Hooper briefly noted that the Metrolina Model agreement has been updated to reflect new work tasks slated for FY 16 through FY 20. Mr. Hooper then requested that the Policy Committee grant approval to the updated agreement with the City of CDOT. A motion to grant approval was made by Mr. Sheppard; seconded by Mr. Carnes and the motion was unanimously approved.

d. Title VI Plan ó Mr. Herrmann briefly summarized the update to the Title VI Plan; highlighting the additions to the Title VI Plan requested by FHWA. Mr. Herrmann then requested that the Policy Committee grant preliminary approval and authorize a 21-day public comment period. A motion to grant approval was made by Mr. Sheppard; seconded by Ms. Savage and the motion was unanimously approved.

e. FY 17-18 CMAQ Program ó Mr. Herrmann briefly summarized a recommendation from the Technical Team to continue allocating CMAQ funding to existing priorities. With this in mind, Mr. Herrmann requested \$1.2M in FY 17-18 CMAQ funds to support the planned improvements at the intersection of India Hook / Celanese; and that, a subsequent request for project funding is envisioned for the Carowinds / Pleasant Road intersection improvement project later this spring. Mr. Herrmann then asked the Policy Committee to grant preliminary approval to amend the TIP to reflect \$1.2 M in CMAQ funding and authorize a 21-day public comment period. A motion to grant approval was made by Mr. Carnes; seconded by Mr. Sheppard and the motion was unanimously approved.

4. OTHER BUSINESS:

a. Administrative Report ó Mr. Hooper briefly noted that SCDOT is currently in the process of evaluating the Guideshare program as a follow-up item from the most recent legislative audit. Mr. Hooper then noted that although SCDOT is considering various options for expediting the programming of Guideshare funding ó some of the scenarios being looked at could represent fairly notable changes in funding levels and availability. Mr. Sullivan then reemphasized that this stems from a previous legislative audit report which noted a need to find out if Guideshare funding could be used more efficiently. Mr. Sullivan noted that this is anticipated to be a lengthy process and any findings would be reviewed with the MPOs and COGs at a later point.

Mr. Hooper then briefly discussed the role of new performance measurement requirements in the planning process and an effective shift associated with them from needs based planning to performance based planning; and that what may constitute a priority need within a high growth environment like RFATS may not necessarily correspond to what is reported to USDOT. Mr. Sullivan then noted that SCDOT has developed a strategic network and how it will be utilized in reporting performance data; and that further work with relevant planning partners (MPOs, etc) will occur at a later point.

On a related item, Mr. Reno then noted the expansive nature of the LRTP project list and suggested that staff should consider options for improving how project needs are reflected (e.g., volume of entries, ranking, etc). Ms. Savage echoed this point that many projects are listed that may reflect transportation needs, but may not be likely to move forward on a short to intermediate term basis and may result in a misimpression for the public. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that in scaling back the number of projects, that an effective tradeoff would result between acknowledgement and transparency of project needs and the perception of likely project activity. Mr. Hooper then stated that staff will certainly undertake this work and report back when completed.

b. Blue Line Light Rail System ó Mr. Sheppard briefly noted prior discussion about reaching out to neighboring jurisdictions to re-engage on the discussion regarding the extension of the Blue Line Light Rail System in Pineville, and asked Mr. Hooper to provide the latest on this topic. Mr. Hooper noted that the MTC (the governing board of CATS) is seeking to initiate a Regional Transit Engagement Series (this being a follow-up to the CONNECT Initiative) with local jurisdictions about just this type of planning activity. Mr. Hooper then stated that this initiative could be an effective avenue for advancing the original request or as a supplement to an individual meeting with the adjacent North Carolina Mayors. Mr. Sheppard stated that an individual meeting should be pursued, in addition to the regional effort being initiated by CATS. Mr. Hooper noted that this will be arranged prior to the next meeting.

c. SC 160 Road Widening ó Mr. Carnes expressed his concerns about the recent delay on the SC 160 project and asked for an update from SCDOT. Mr. Klauk noted that negotiations regarding the relocation of utilities have been ongoing with Lancaster County Water & Sewer District; and that, an agreement in principle has been reached and is pending finalization. Mr. Carnes then asked why challenges with this element of the planning process are occurring now? Mr. Klauk responded that the different steps in the process are structured to minimize project timelines, but that some developments can nonetheless materialize. Mr. Carnes then sought confirmation that this process will be completed in March. In response, Mr. Klauk noted that that is absolutely our goal.

d. Next Meeting ó Mr. Hooper noted that the next Policy Committee meeting is slated for March 24, 2017 at the Manchester Meadows Conference Room.

5. ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business, the motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Sheppard and seconded by Ms. Savage; the motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 1:13 P.M.