



**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING  
SUMMARY MINUTES  
May 19, 2023 – 12:00 p.m.  
Rock Hill Operations Center – Room 132**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Audette; Brian Carnes; Kathy Pender; Chris Gray; Heath Sessions; Christi Cox; Jim Reno; Michael Johnson; Guynn Savage; Bill Harris; and John Gettys.

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

Jim Walden (SCDOT); Berry Mattox (SCDOT); Patrick Hamilton (York County); Penelope Karagounis (Town of Fort Mill); Josh Meetze (SCDOT); David Vehaun (City of Rock Hill); Michael Moore (York County); Jason Johnston (SCDOT); Jonathan Buono (York County); Chris Herrmann (City of Rock Hill); Diane Dil (York County); Cliff Goolsby (City of Rock Hill); Stephen Allen (CRCOG); Vic Edwards (SCDOT); Isabel Dayrit (City of Rock Hill); Katie Compton (City of Rock Hill); and David Hooper (RFATS).

**CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT:** John Marks (Herald); Cleopatra Allen (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); Brett Harrelson (Consultant); Frieda Price (CAC); Zack Zapack (Pennies Sales Tax Commission); Frank Myers (CAC); Liz Duda (City of Tega Cay); Stephen Comer (Lancaster County); Luther Dasher (CAC); Phil Leazer (KCI); and Tyler Cupp (WRHI).

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

- a. **Welcome** – Chair Audette called the meeting to order at 12:00 P.M. and welcomed all in attendance.
- b. **Citizen Comment Period** – There were no comments received.

**2. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Audette asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the April 28, 2023 meeting. Mr. Audette then made a motion to approve; this was seconded by Ms. Pender and unanimously approved.

**3. REPORTS:**

a. **SC 160 / I-77 Interchange Reconfiguration Project** – Mr. Mattox provided a status update on this project, and noted that the latest internal construction engineer's estimate reflects an additional \$23.5M in funding is expected to be needed. Discussion then followed among members regarding the need for a more detailed budgetary breakdown (i.e., changes in asphalt costs; design refinements; contractor mobilization; scheduling, etc). Ms. Savage then noted that while cost adjustments are not unexpected as a project naturally matures – a \$23.5M increase against the background of a prior \$27M increase less than 18 months ago, raises legitimate questions about the project development process, range of available cost mitigation tools; as well as the budgetary impacts on other network priorities.

Mr. Gettys then asked whether this cost increase may impact our ability to avoid any budgetary backsliding on other project priorities. In response, Mr. Hooper noted that this may indeed require additional flexibility from SCDOT in structuring a Guideshare advance given expected cash flow levels; and that, some measure of partnership with SCDOT on completing these network priorities may make a

material difference as well given the elevated planning area growth characteristics. As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted SCDOT's own assessment in the Statewide Mgmt Plan that the most congested points along I-77 in South Carolina reflect these same project locations and / or area (i.e., Exits 90, 88, 85, 82, etc). Mr. Gray then asked about the procurement / selection process for this work effort (i.e., design build versus design bid build, etc). Mr. Mattox then discussed the relevant characteristics that broadly supported the approach ultimately selected. Lastly, Mr. Mattox noted that he will prepare a more detailed budgetary summary and forward that to RFATS for review / dissemination with the Policy Committee. highlight this same general area.

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

**a. MPO Bylaws & Planning Area Boundary (2020 Census)** – Mr. Hooper briefly noted that with the approved adjustment to the voting structure and membership of the Policy Committee, we now need to update our bylaws and planning area boundary bringing all of our planning documents into alignment with the principal outputs from the 2020 Census. Discussion then followed regarding the appropriate language covering membership selection among county members (i.e., district specific references versus a more generalized reference that members must be from within the MPO planning area boundary), as those members serve a geography that extends beyond the MPO boundary.

Additionally, given the rotational structure of the legislative members Mr. Johnson then stated that the Senate (Districts 15 and 16) and House member (currently District 46) shall not be from the same geography at the same time (i.e., both members north or south of the Catawba River). Mr. Carnes then offered an amended motion reflecting this input; seconded by Mr. Gettys and approved 10-0; with Ms. Cox abstaining.

**b. FY 23-25 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** – Mr. Hooper briefly noted that the role and purpose of the FY 23-25 UPWP is to convey expected work tasks and associated funding amounts covering a broad range of planning areas. Discussion then followed regarding the generalized references made in the document (i.e., such as congestion monitoring; public transit; intermodal planning; and travel demand modeling, etc.); and that these planning categories do not connote approval and / or endorsement on a project specific basis; and that, it is understood that study or project specific work would be presented to the Policy Committee for review / guidance as a general matter. Mr. Hooper then requested final approval of the FY 23-25 UPWP. Motion to approve was made by Mr. Audette; seconded by Ms. Pender and unanimously approved.

**c. FY 21-27 TIP Amendment (Exit 77)** – Mr. Hooper provide a brief overview of the planned work at this location; and then requested approval to program \$17.7M in Guideshare as previously discussed earlier this year and authorization of a 21-day public comment period. Motion to approve made by Mr. Carnes; seconded by Ms. Savage and unanimously approved.

**d. 2050 LRTP Amendment (SCDOT System Performance Report)** – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed the principal points of discussion during the April meeting; and then stated that a 30-day public comment period had been completed and no comments were received. Mr. Hooper then requested final approval of this amendment. A motion was then made by Mr. Audette; seconded by Ms. Savage and unanimously approved.

#### **5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**a. Next Meeting** – Mr. Audette noted that the next Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for September 22, 2023.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:**

The motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Audette and seconded by Ms. Savage; the motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 1:06 P.M.