



## POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

### SUMMARY MINUTES

June 24, 2016 - 12:00 p.m. (NOON)

Rock Hill Operations Center Room 132

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Sheppard; Kathy Pender (Proxy); Doug Echols; Brian Carnes; Gwynn Savage; Bill Harris; Jim Reno; Ralph Norman; Britt Blackwell; Wes Hayes; and Michael Johnson.

**ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

Bill Jordan (SCDOT); Joe Cronin (Town of Fort Mill); Kati Price (SCDOT); Cliff Goolsby (City of Rock Hill); Audra Miller (York County); Vic Edwards (SCDOT); Bill Meyer (City of Rock Hill); Allison Love (York County); David Vehaun (City of Rock Hill); Darlene Broughton (SCDOT); Jimmy Bagley (City of Rock Hill); Tommy Feemster (SCDOT); Jeremy Winkler (City of Rock Hill); Yolanda Morris (FHWA); Stephen Allen (York County); Steve Willis (Lancaster County); Ron Pompey (York County); Dean Hendrix (York County); Chris Herrmann (RFATS); and David Hooper (RFATS).

**CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT:** Cleopatra Allen (CAC); Quinlan Canty (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); Hisham Abdelaziz (HDR); Amy Massey (Kimley Horn); Larry Huntley (Fort Mill Town Council); James Martin (Crescent Communities); Ben Johnson; James Traynor (Clear Springs); and Scot Sibert (Parsons-Brinckerhoff).

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

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

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

**2. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Sheppard asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the May 20, 2016 meeting. Mr. Sheppard asked for a motion. Ms. Savage made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Mr. Carnes seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

**3. REPORTS:**

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

- US 521 / Marvin Road (S-54) Intersection – this project was recently scoped, ROW is planned for FY 17 and construction is planned for FY 18, project schedule and budget will be updated once preliminary design is complete.
- Celanese Road (SC 161) at India Hook Road (S-30) Intersection Improvement – consultant contract negotiations are currently underway, ROW is planned for FY 18 and construction is planned for FY 19, the project budget will be updated once preliminary design is complete.
- Celanese Road (SC 161) at Riverview / Riverchase Intersection Improvement – ROW and final design are complete, utility coordination efforts are being finalized, bid opening is planned for fall 2016, the project budget may change depending on prior rights.

- S-22 (Pleasant Road) at S-1441 (Carowinds Blvd) Intersection Improvement – this project was scoped in February 2016, utility coordination and traffic study are both currently underway, ROW planned for FY 17 and construction obligation is planned for FY 18.
- East White Street / Firetower Road / E. Main Street – ROW is nearing completion, final plans are being developed, utility coordination efforts are being finalized, bid opening is planned for early FY 17, costs may change as coordination is not complete.
- Clebourne Street at N. White Street Intersection Improvement – preliminary design is currently underway, recently identified impacts on a historic house have caused a delay in project schedule, ROW is planned for late 2016 or early 2017 and construction is planned for late 2017 or early 2018.
- SC 160 at Gold Hill Road (S-98) – this project is currently under construction and completion is planned for late fall 2016.
- S-50 (Cel-River Road) Widening (Phase I) – construction is scheduled for completion in late 2017 or early 2018.
- SC 160 Phase 2 Widening Project – ROW is nearing completion, construction obligation is planned for fall 2016, bid opening is planned for late 2016 to allow ROW and utility coordination to clear up, construction is estimated to last 3 years, the Calvin Hall intersection is to be constructed and operational early on in construction schedule.
- Celanese Road (and Cherry Road) / I-77 Interchange Reconfiguration – scoping will begin once consultant contract is executed, ROW obligation planned for FY 18, construction obligation is planned for FY 19 or FY 20 depending on ROW needed, this project has been recommended for inclusion in the Pennies IV Referendum and is also included in the York County SIB Application.
- SC 160 / I-77 Interchange Reconfiguration – scoping will begin once consultant contract is executed, ROW obligation planned for FY 18, Construction obligation planned for FY 19 or FY 20 depending on amount of ROW needed, this project has been recommended for inclusion in the Pennies IV Referendum and is also included in the York County SIB Application.
- Lake Ridge Trail – this project is currently under construction and completion is planned for late 2016 or early 2017.
- Springfield Parkway Bicycle / Pedestrian Improvements – project is currently being re-scoped by the Town of Fort Mill.

Ms. Price then gave brief updates on RFATS-Area Federal-Aid Bridge Projects including: S-101; SC 72; SC 5; S-81; S-50; S-654; S-655; US-21 BUS; and SC 72.

#### **4. PROPOSED POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS:**

- a. **LRTP / TIP Amendment** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed that at the May Policy Committee meeting preliminary approval was granted for the LRTP / TIP Amendment which would reflect all elements of Exit 82 (82A, 82B, & 82C), as part of the planned interchange reconfiguration work. Mr. Hooper then stated that the planning documents will be updated to reflect planned improvements and supporting funding as the PE, ROW, and alternatives analysis is initiated. Mr. Hooper then stated that a 30-day public comment period was initiated and will be completed on July 1, 2016. Mr. Hooper then requested that the Policy Committee grant final approval to amend the LRTP & TIP to support this action (Guideshare funding commitment is \$3.0M) contingent upon any comments received. Mr. Carnes made a motion to approve; Mr. Echols seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.
- b. **2017 Long Range Plan Update** – Mr. Hooper briefly noted that as a Maintenance Area for ground level ozone, it is required that RFATS update the Long Range Plan every four years. Mr. Hooper then reviewed topics of prior discussion regarding the initiation of this process as well as requested follow-up regarding the evaluation of an additional bridge connection – this included right-of-way

and utility cost estimates and overall funding availability. Mr. Hooper then provided a more detailed summary for each of the alignment options as noted below:

- Alt I (Mt Gallant to Sutton Road Interchange): Utility = \$3,559,570 and ROW = \$1,721,235
- Alt II (Mt Gallant / India Hook to Harris Road): Utility = \$6,321,560 and ROW = \$2,074,777
- Alt III (Mt Gallant / India Hook to Sutton Road: Utility = \$3,541,580 and ROW = \$1,634,552
- Alt IV (Mt Gallant to Harris Road): Utility = \$6,171,830 and ROW = \$2,049,231

Mr. Hooper then stated that these figures reflect a 40% contingency component consistent with the total project cost estimates completed during the 2012 feasibility study. Lastly, Mr. Hooper noted that the above estimates do not reflect any costs associated with potential impacts to the Masons Bend Development. As a point of reference, Mr Hooper then provided a brief review of each of the potential alignment options and noted that the recommended alignment (Alternative #1), reflects a connection point near Dalehurst Road off of Mt Gallant and a connection point at Sutton Road approximately 500 feet from Exit 83.

Mr. Blackwell then noted his concern about a connection point near the Sutton Road interchange, taking account of additional area development that has recently been approved on the eastern side of I-77, and whether such a crossing point might tend to work against improving overall network operations. With this in mind, Mr. Blackwell then asked whether widening US 21 from the Catawba River Bridge to Carowinds Blvd might be a more practical and lower cost approach to improving network operations? In response, Mr. Hooper noted that the widening of US 21 certainly has a basis all on its own given announced and projected development and demand activity along this corridor. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper then provided a brief overview of past analysis efforts – both those associated with the 2012 feasibility study as well as prior analysis work regarding network operations that recommended the incorporation of an additional bridge crossing.

Ms. Savage then noted that given that the US 21 Corridor runs parallel to I-77 – whether it could provide some relief along the Celanese Corridor and serve as an additional route for north-south travel demand? In response, Mr. Hooper noted that approximately 30% of demand that currently utilizes the Celanese / Cherry Interchange is being generated from Cherry Road, and that augmenting service capacity along US 21 could attract some level of driver demand consistent with destination points that could be equally served (without a delay in driver travel time) by US 21, though this benefit may moderate over time with additional demand from western York County. Lastly, Mr. Hooper noted that some follow-up modeling work would be advisable at this point in providing a more detailed response to considering this expectation.

Discussion then followed regarding how network operations might be impacted by travel demand from a bridge connection point at Sutton Road if drivers were to turn left to enter I-77. Mr. Hooper then noted that such a concern is certainly very valid and that the analysis associated with the 2012 feasibility study reflected a right turning movement for accessing I-77. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper then noted that a representative from the Masons Bend Development has reached out to highlight the progress of their project, underlying assumptions, and the level of investment that has been made at this point, as the Policy Committee continues their evaluation of an alternate crossing.

For the benefit of those who were not involved in the original evaluation of a bridge crossing, Ms. Savage then asked if staff would provide a brief summary of the historical evolution of this analysis effort and how the 2012 feasibility study was brought to a stopping point. Mr. Hooper then noted that the identification of an alternate crossing was originally identified back in 2002, concurrently with the identification of the Fort Mill Southern Bypass. These two projects were designed as coordinated

additions to the transportation network to effectively provide relief to SC 160 by managing expected growth south of Fort Mill, and by providing improved access to I-77 (and similar growth management on the western side of RFATS south of Lake Wylie), through the incorporation of an additional crossing point that would enable travel demand to move towards the interstate without having to utilize the Celanese Corridor.

Mr. Hooper then noted that during the 2012 feasibility study, concerns were raised by members of the Policy Committee regarding adjustments to the distribution of travel flow, the amount of funding that would be committed to one project as well as broader concerns about the scale of improvements that should be undertaken (i.e., should there be a focus on implementing a few large projects or making a number of smaller scale improvements at multiple points within the transportation network, etc). Mr. Norman then stated that he remains concerned about the project cost associated with a bridge crossing. Mr. Echols then noted his continued concern about the importance of the Celanese Corridor within the transportation system and additional growth pressures expected from western York County. Mr. Echols then referenced recent input provided by the Citizens Advisory Committee indicating their support for the incorporation of an additional bridge crossing.

Mr. Hayes then asked what affect would keeping an alternate crossing in the Long Range Plan have as a practical matter? In response, Mr. Hooper noted that reflecting the project in the Long Range Plan provides the Policy Committee with the latitude to undertake further analysis of this project, though the presence of any project in the Long Range Plan does not obligate the Policy Committee to move forward without formal action to complete required procedural steps and / or make an appropriate funding commitment depending on the specifics involved. Mr. Hayes then stated that his assessment is that a combination of widening US 21 and upgrading the Celanese / Cherry Interchange would appear to be a more viable approach to improving network operations; and that, he would not be supportive of incorporating an alternate crossing where it is fully funded by RFATS alone.

Mr. Sheppard then asked whether the Policy Committee could approve the initiation of the Long Range Plan Update and defer this item to allow time for staff to review modeling data assessing the impact of widening US 21 as well as all other options aside from an alternate crossing. Mr. Hooper then stated that this can be incorporated into the planned October Workshop on the Long Range Plan Update. As a point of reference, Mr. Johnson then asked whether the Policy Committee voted to not include an alternate crossing in the Long Range Plan in 2012. Mr. Hooper noted that in 2012 that the Policy Committee did two things: (1) to bring the bridge feasibility study to a stopping point; and (2) retained a bridge crossing as a potential option in the Long Range Plan, but at a different location (i.e., at the time there was a conceptual project under consideration referred to as the East-West Connector).

Mr. Reno then stated that an alternate crossing needs to be included in the Long Range Plan so that the analysis process to effectively address network operations can be furthered. Mr. Hayes then made a motion to approve the initiation of the Long Range Plan Update and table the discussion of the alternate crossing to provide staff with sufficient time to provide realistic cost estimates and modeling updates for the widening of US 21 and reconfiguration improvements at the Celanese / Cherry Road interchange; Mr. Echols seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

- c. **Transportation Alternatives Program** – Mr. Herrmann briefly reviewed the Transportation Alternatives Program and the application submitted by the City of Rock Hill for the Columbia Avenue Pedestrian Improvements Project; noting that a 15-day public comment period had been completed and no comments were received. Mr. Herrmann then requested final approval to amend the TIP to reflect \$110,833 in TAP funding and for authorization for staff to forward to SCDOT for

processing. Mr. Norman made a motion to approve; Ms. Savage seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

- d. **Public Participation Plan** – Mr. Herrmann briefly reviewed the Public Participation Plan, noting that this Plan is updated every three years to ensure its continued effectiveness and compliance with applicable federal guidance. Additionally, Mr. Herrmann noted that a 45-day public comment period is not yet complete and no comments had been received to date; explaining that one agency comment was received from SCDOT regarding the extension of the minimum public comment period.

Mr. Herrmann then identified areas in the Plan that are being recommended for updating: (1) extension of the minimum public comment period from 15 days to 21 days; (2) inclusion of references to the FAST Act; (3) the interactive mapping now available through ArcGIS Online; (4) adding the tracking of issues or concerns voiced by the Citizens Advisory Committee; (5) reflecting a specific reference to the names of newspapers where ads and notices are published; (6) that the sign-in sheet for Policy Committee meetings is being adjusted so that attendees can easily add their contact information so they can be added to the regular distribution list for future announcements; and (7) tracking news articles and media stories on the planning process and / or related activities.

Mr. Herrmann then requested that the Policy Committee grant final approval to the amended Public Participation Plan, contingent upon any comments received. Mr. Norman made a motion to approve; Ms. Savage seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

- e. **TIP Amendment** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed a request to program \$1.5 M in FTA Section 5307 funding (Small Urbanized Area funds) from the City of Rock Hill in efforts to expand area transit services to include a fixed route option that will operate within the Rock Hill Small Urbanized Area to supplement the CATS 82X and York County Access in providing a route based structure for intra-area trip demand; noting that the establishment of this route will include clean fuel vehicle acquisition, charging stations, and the construction of supporting bus stop facilities. Mr. Hooper then requested that the Policy Committee grant approval for a TIP Amendment reflecting \$1.5M in FTA Section 5307 funds and authorize a 21-day public comment period. Mr. Carnes made a motion to approve; Ms. Savage seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.
- f. **TIP Update** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed a recommendation from SCDOT to update the Transportation Improvement Program to reflect the same planning period as the State Transportation Improvement Program to cover FY 17-22. Mr. Hooper then asked the Policy Committee to grant approval to a TIP Update to complete this process and authorize a 30-day public comment period. Mr. Norman made a motion to approve; Ms. Savage seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

5. **Other Business:**

- a. **Administrative Report** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed the Administrative Report.
- b. **Next regular meeting** – Mr. Hooper noted that the next regular meeting will be held at the Manchester Meadows Conference Room on September 23, 2016 at 12:00 P.M.

6. **Adjournment**

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