

***Spartanburg County Transportation Committee***  
**MINUTES**  
**OCTOBER 29, 2015**  
**6:00 P.M.**  
**COUNTY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**SPARTANBURG COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE BUILDING**

A public meeting of the Spartanburg County Transportation Committee was held on Thursday, October 29, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in County Council Chambers, Spartanburg County Administrative Office Building, 366 North Church Street, Spartanburg, SC Chairman Tom Arthur presided.

The following members were present: Ernestine Anderson, W. Dean Anderson, Ron Kirby, who is substituting for Steve Belue, Ed Memmott, Hal Murphy, John Throckmorton, and Bob Walker.

In compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, notices of this meeting were mailed and e-mailed, in advance to county officials, local news media, citizens, and other interested persons.

Mr. Arthur called the meeting to order and introduced the newest member of the County Transportation Committee, W. Dean Anderson. Mr. Anderson will serve as the House District 34 appointee by Representative Mike Forrester.

Mr. Arthur commended Councilman O'Neil Mintz and soon to be County Councilman, Bob Walker for all the work each accomplished while serving on the CTC.

**Item # 1 - Approval of July 17, 2014 meeting minutes**

Mr. Throckmorton moved to approve the July 17, 2014 minutes as printed and mailed. Mr. Ed Memmott seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**Item # 2 - Financial Report – Ms. Lacey Bradey**

In the absence of Ms. Lacey Bradey, Carol Crowe reported the total available unobligated funds were \$2,542,523.45. The total estimated revenue to be received for the fiscal year is \$3,492,080.00.

Mr. Arthur explained the financial report now displays the funding amount usually allocated annually for resurfacing municipal, county and state roadways @ \$2.9M. This year the resurfacing dollars has been set up as a liability in order to better gage funds which could be allocated to other projects during the fiscal year. There will be additional funds received monthly during the fiscal year estimated at \$2,621,080 plus the Donor County funds estimated at \$871,000.00.

Mr. Throckmorton moved to approve the financial report as presented. The motion was seconded and approved.

### **Item # 3 - Update on active projects – Mr. Todd Carroll**

In the absence of Mr. Todd Carroll, Mr. Jim Nelson updated the committee on the current projects.

The encroachment permit has been received from the SCDOT for the North Blackstock Road at John Dodd Road project. Hopefully this will be the next project to go out for bids.

Final calculations are needed to be received from the engineer for the River Forest Bridge replacement project. Once the calculations are received, the project should proceed without any problems.

The Alabama Avenue drainage improvements are about 95% finished. The project would have been completed this week, but the weather did not cooperate.

Negotiations are underway for one piece of property to purchase Right-of-way for the Blalock Road Widening project.

### **Item # 4 - Recommended projects from Advisory Committee – Mr. Ron Kirby**

#### **a. Project request 1066 – Representative Brannon committed \$40,000 of his set-aside funds for Storm Drain improvements in Pierce Acres @ Lake Forest Drive and Courier Place**

Presently there is an old storm drain, located underneath one of the houses. The drainage originates from Lake Forest Street, not the property itself.

The drain is unreinforced concrete and breaking apart with sink holes forming. It is the outfall of a DOT system. The DOT has agreed to take maintenance and ownership of the new pipe to be installed with C Funds. The County C Fund engineer will oversee the project. The estimated cost is \$96,000.

Representative Brannon has requested the use of his set-asides of \$40,000 for this project.

Mr. John Throckmorton moved to approve \$40,000 for the project. Mr. Ed Memmott seconded the project. The motion carried.

**b. Project request # 1068 – Representative Eddie Tallon has committed \$40,000 of his set-aside funds for Storm Drain improvements in Pierce Acres @ Lake Forest Drive and Courier Place**

Mr. John Throckmorton moved to approve set-aside funds in the amount of \$40,000 from Representative Tallon's funds. Mr. Bob Walker seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**c. Project request # 1069 – Additional C Funds to complete the Storm Drain improvements in Pierce Acres At Lake Forest Drive and Courier Place @ \$16,000**

Mr. John Throckmorton moved to approve \$16,000 to complete the funding for the Storm Drain improvements in Pierce Acres. Ms. Ernestine Anderson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**5. Denied project requests**

**a. Project request # 1070 – Level off Ridgeville Church Road roadway**

This request came in from Senator Reese. There is a subdivision with most of the house's access directly on Ridgeville Church Road. There are a couple of hills and an intersection that makes it difficult for the residents to enter and exit their driveways. The estimate to level off two of the sight distance problems is approximately \$360,000.

The C Fund Advisory Committee has looked at the road already and is actually on our list of projects. The project has previously been reviewed by the Advisory Committee to re-do the entire Ridgeville Road, with a cost estimate of \$1.5M. It is ranked 12<sup>th</sup> on the list of projects. The consensus of the Advisory Committee is to take care of the other eleven higher ranking projects before moving on to this project.

This information was presented as information only.

**6. Develop a Policy for submitted Municipality resurfacing projects**

A letter has been written to the municipalities requesting each municipality submit a list of roads (within the municipality) they would like to have resurfaced with C Funds matching the municipality funding at 50%. A few years ago, CTC would resurface roads within the municipality and pay the entire percentage. However, a couple of years ago that was changed. Last year the consensus was to implement a 50/50 match with the municipalities. Several municipalities took that offer. The request is for the municipalities to come up with a list by October 31. Once the list is received, the county will evaluate the lists of roadways. Any road submitted with an Overall Condition Index (OCI) rate of 50 or under would be considered for resurfacing.

**7. Letter to municipalities**

Mr. Bob Walker met with all the municipalities within his upcoming County Council district, except for Wellford to discover the municipalities felt all roads within the municipality were either county or state. But yet, once a road is annexed inside the municipality, they are considered a municipal street.

Mr. Bob Walker noted if there are no county roads within a municipality, then whose responsibility is it when a County Road is annexed within a City to take those signs down.

As explained by Mr. Kirby, the County traffic division provides signs as a courtesy to the municipalities.

Mr. Walker stated about half of the streets in Landrum have a red bird on them representing a County street. Yet, some of the street signs have a State sign on one end of the street, while the other end has a County or a City sign.

A statement highlighted in the letter states “List only roads within the municipality they are currently maintaining. However, the leaders in his council district do not resurface/pave or maintain any roads within the municipality.

Mr. Walker is getting ready to go on County Council and is not sure how to approach this, but the State wants to give away state roads that are in the County and make the County keep them up. But, this information indicates we have done the same thing for cities within

Spartanburg County with roads that we should, as a County, be keeping up and at one time did. Now we have given them to the municipality to keep up.

When the letter states 'maintain' means the municipalities are going to take care of the ditches, paving, resurfacing for that street in that city. That is what they are interrupting this to mean. But, as previously stated, municipalities (except for the City of Spartanburg) do not maintain any streets within this county council district.

Mr. Walker wants to make sure all people in this county receive the services they are entitled to receive.

Mr. Arthur thinks that maybe a few words in the letter needs to be changed.

It states in the C Fund policy that 50% of the funding goes to the county and city streets. When the Road Fee was established - that offset some CTC funding and advocated if a City was holding their road fee dollars, yet asking for additional funding from C Funds is why matching dollars were established. But, if the municipalities do not have any funds, they can't match anything. Some of the cities receive such small amounts; therefore, their match will be small. The concern is their matching funds will probably require them to approach the Road Fee Committee requesting permission to use the Road Fee money. However, if the cities do not have any matching dollars, they are permitted to request a road be resurfaced through the county or C Funds. Mr. Walker wants to make sure the municipalities are supported.

Mr. Kirby has been told the historical aspect is for many years C Funds resurfaced everything in the small municipalities. Spartanburg County manages the projects through to completion via an annual agreement with C Funds. When municipalities see the County out resurfacing, they don't realize it is C Funds actually resurfacing their road, not Spartanburg County. The second aspect of it is, they see County personnel out there inside their municipality, they naturally assume they are county roads, which is not necessarily so. Another aspect is as a service to the municipalities (which are county taxpayers) Roads and Bridges have assisted the municipalities. A municipality will request the County's help with a drainage problem, etc. but it is at the municipality request. Over the last six years or so, with the downturn and the number of people Roads and Bridges has lost; and, equipment not being replaced, the maintenance for the municipalities is secondary, but if the County has the equipment and manpower available, the County will help them. It has been hit or miss during the last several years.

Mr. Kirby wants to change one sentence to 'List only roads within city boundaries'.

Somewhere along the way, the issue of ownership of roadways in the municipalities needs to be clarified.

**8. Old Business**

There was no old business discussed.

**9. New Business**

No new business was discussed.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

---

Mr. Billy Painter, Chairman

---

Carol Crowe, Attested