

Spartanburg County Transportation Committee
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 5:00 P.M.
COUNTY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SPARTANBURG COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE BUILDING

A public meeting of the Spartanburg County Transportation Committee was held on Thursday September 17, 2015, at 5:00 p.m. in County Council Chambers, Spartanburg County Administrative Office Building. Chairman Tom Arthur presided. The following members were present: Ms. Ernestine Anderson, Mr. Dean Anderson, Mr. Tom Arthur, Mr. Travis Brown, Mr. Foster Chapman, Mr. Will Gramling, Mr. Tony Gillespie, Mr. Billy Painter, and Mr. John Throckmorton.

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

1. Call the meeting to order

Mr. Tom Arthur called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of the July 16, 2015 meeting minutes

Mr. Arthur asked if there were any corrections to the proposed Minutes of the July CTC meeting as time was not available to mail out the agenda and minutes for members to review before the meeting.

Mr. Throckmorton noted on page 3, it states the Cambridge Road bridge project is indicated as a 2015/2016 set-aside project. However, as explained by Mr. Ron Kirby, Representative Forrester's 2014 fiscal year monies were allocated for FEMA to inspect, evaluate, and make recommendations for the Cambridge road bridge project. Once the study was completed, Representative Forrester's 2015 set-aside funds were approved to pay for the precast concrete portion to help build the county bridge as recommended by FEMA. Therefore, both 2014 and 2015 set-aside monies are being used to complete the project.

Mr. Painter moved to approve the July, 2015 CTC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. Ms. Lacey Bradey – Financial Report

Since the plans are to have an October meeting, and Lacey is not with us tonight, an in-depth financial report was presented by Mr. Arthur.

As of July 1, the \$1,945,000.00 balance includes the \$884,385 dollars received for the Donor County funds from the State. Normally, the CTC receives the donor county funds in August or September, but it reflects in the July 1 balance as that is money based on the last fiscal year.

There have been some closed county projects that came in under the cost estimate allocated toward projects which has had \$95,534.81 returned to the CTC funds. The annual administrative fund and other projects had been approved in a previous meeting which leaves a balance of \$170,230.59 of funding through August 31st. Two month of funding has been subtracted of the Administrative contract which leaves a liability for the remainder of the year of \$228,047.00.

As for the Set-Aside funding projects for the Delegation projects, once the \$87,313 is approved that will leave them \$163,000. The County has been identifying projects for delegation member's use of their set-asides. Some of those projects will be coming thru to be considered in the October meeting.

As of August 31, the CTC had \$1,391,328.55 of unobligated funds. Funds are being accrued so that when January 15 rolls around, the CTC will be able to give County, State, and Municipalities funding for their resurfacing program. As it stands in the January meeting, the technical committee should have approved the submitted resurfacing lists for the county, city, and the municipalities. The accrued funds will be used for such this spring. Then, once those are approved, the CTC will have to wait on other projects in order to accrue more funding until June 30th.

Mr. Arthur explained it was discovered, before the end of the fiscal year, that the year the CTC accepted a match with the state of some \$800 to \$900,000 - it was thought the CTC did not have to spend that money with the state until the following year. However, when the State looked back three years and found the CTC would be under the required 25% average for the three years. Therefore, the CTC had to allocate funding to state projects to meet the agreed funding as required on state roads. Mr. Arthur is thinking this will not happen again.

On the second page, the estimated revenue for fiscal year 2016 is at \$3.2M. Next August/September the CTC should get \$848,000 in Donor County Funds. The two numbers listed below on the financial sheet (the \$3.1 and 6.5 are special one-time appropriations).

The CTC has received the \$3.16M just last week and should get the balance by the end of November, but was asked by the delegation and the Highway commissioner, Woody Willard, as well as Herb Cooper with the DOT, that the delegation and the Legislature wanted the CTC to get this money out as soon as possible. The CTC Technical Committee has worked very hard to try to come up with what will be presented later on in the meeting. Whatever is approved in this meeting today needs to be made subject to funds on hand. As of today, the CTC does not have the total non-recurring funds available. As the funding comes in, we may or may not have another meeting until we get some of the additional non-recurring funds before the next meeting. Mr. Arthur knows the CTC wants to get projects out to bid that could possibly be completed before the winter weather hits.

Mr. Throckmorton questioned the \$263,624 is the amount which has not been allocated, so the difference between the two numbers is what has been allocated and approved in the July meeting; i.e., Representatives Brannon, Hicks, Tallon, and Forrester's set-aside projects. Therefore, as the funding comes in, the CTC may not have a meeting in October until the additional funds have been distributed.

Mr. Arthur announced that Todd Carroll, our CTC Engineer, has taken a position with the DOT, therefore Mr. Kirby will be handling the status report.

4. Mr. Ron Kirby – Project status report

Mr. Kirby reported the Blalock Road widening is scheduled to begin in October. A purchase Order was submitted the other day. There are a couple of utilities that need to be moved, but basically the project is ready to begin.

Construction is ready to begin on the Lake Forest Drive drainage improvements project. The purchase order has been released this week.

The Vineyard road realignment bids have been received. The bid came in a little over \$115,000 and some change. It is well within the budget. The project cost was split 50/50 with the school. The school general contractor won the bid. Since they are already on site, they are ready to move on the project quickly.

Mr. Kirby is not sure where the North Spartanburg Area Fire Department signalization project stands.

The Boiling Springs Welcome sign contract is out and there are some issues on getting an approval. At the moment, it is in the Building Codes Department being reviewed. That should begin in the next few weeks.

The US 221 widening signal is to be installed toward the end of October. The bid has already been awarded. It is on the state contract – altogether prices are set. They still have a lot of work to do at the intersection as they are building a retaining wall which has not been approved yet. They are waiting on the Rite-Aid Johnson Development contractor.

5. Mr. Ron Kirby – Recommended projects from Advisory Committee

It is well known that over the summer, the legislature found approximately \$216M in their budget that had not been allocated. A decision was made to allocate the funds towards a onetime distribution to be used toward state secondary road resurfacing. The allocations had many restrictions. Spartanburg CTC is to receive approximately \$9.7M . Todd Carroll did an outstanding job of going thru the list of 650 miles of roadways as suggested by DOT with the highest ADT (Average Daily Traffic) and the worst pavement quality index. At that point, the top 70 miles of roadways with the highest traffic and the worst quality were re-considered . 7 The CTC also concentrated on two lane and the arterial, collector type roads. Of that, 70 miles were re- evaluated and corroborated with (the DOTs numbers. It was then eliminated down to approximately 33 Road miles. A second list (if there are additional monies received) has also been arranged for next year.

However, the engineers are requesting approval of the roadways chosen of about 32.63 miles as highlighted in green and shown on the map of daily high traveled roads with low pavement quality. (See Map) The roads are highlighted in green.(See exhibit 1 of 1.) At the bottom of the map are the listed roads including the mileage. The five listed on the bottom of the map are not in any particular order.

New Cut Road from inside the interstates and then the other part of New Cut Road starts just short of John Dodd road and goes all the way to Hwy 11. John Dodd Road crosses New Cut Road and goes across the interstate (that very heavily traveled road between the interstate and HWY 176.

Mr. Throckmorton asked if the John Dodd Road bridge (that goes over the interstate) would be included as the bridge is in bad shape. Mr. Kirby stated that repairs to the structure as well as resurfacing the bridge portion could be completed as it is a resurfacing contract. So as part of what is anticipated is to grind off the old surface and resurface the bridge with an asphalt overlay from highway 176 WEST. This is part of the list identified as the top 33 miles.

Anderson Mill Road would start at Reidville Road and go south to the new bridge, then skip across the new bridge and begin again at the end of the new bridge and go all the way down to the South Tyger River Bridge. There are actually two sections of Anderson Mill Road.

Parris Bridge Road would start at Highway 9 and go north all the way to Old Furnace – which is an interesting project with a new school going in there. That portion of Parris Bridge Road is needed to be completed before the school does their paving. That would probably be included in the next project list to get it done before the school is built.

The Duncan Reidville Road project would start at 358/357 go across 29 (Pine Ridge Road) and then go all the way to Reidville@7.8 miles.

The total is 32.63 MILES would be the recommendation from the Technical Committee for the first installment towards the \$ 9.7M State Secondary Road Resurfacing program.

Some of the issues we are having are just timing. It was mentioned to piggy back this project with the county resurfacing project. However, the county has a \$2.5M project and was thought the CTC could really get good prices and were hoping to use the same contractor – going ahead and let the project tomorrow, but in talking with the DOT, we are not able to piggy back on a contract of more than \$150,000. Mr. Kirby Ron expects the first one that is expected to be worked on is Anderson Mill Road and he feels that is in the \$800 to 900 thousand dollar range. So it is too big to piggy back on a county contract. We will have to let this one separately. We will get the contract documents together; four weeks for bid, a week for award, which puts us to the 1st of November, and then we would have to get a special exemption to resurface after November 15. We are running into timing problems with the weather and the money is just now arriving as we are heading into colder weather.

Mr. Kirby plans to discuss these issues with a couple of local contractors just to see if how much of this they can get done before bad weather hits or it might be better to start it in February or March.

Mr. Arthur asked Mr. Kirby (if the committee approves the list as presented tonight) if it would be possible to go ahead and get this list of projects out on the street for bids- then prepare to award the contract which would give time for the state to send us the remaining funds to do the work. From the conversations with the DOT and with Commissioner Willard, that the sooner the projects are put out for bid, the pricing could possibly be a little better than waiting until everybody else starts getting bids. This is one of the things for calling a meeting was try not to wait another month to get to October to do this.

Mr. Arthur clarified – The money that the 600 miles that was narrowed down to 70 , inspected them all and then narrowed down to the 32.63 this came from the list that the DOT furnished their secondary state road if that would qualify for the funding, as the CTCs can't do lane widening nor new construction. It is pretty much resurfacing, road repair, and reclamation.

There are many restrictions as to the way this money can be used. No intersection improvements; no turn lanes. Most of these are going to be redone by using cement reclamation. And, a little bit of widening is incidental to the process itself. So there will be some widening just because of the method we are using, but not like making another lane. There are also restrictions on the ability of doing ditching or pipes (things of that nature). Parallel systems are not permitted. Cross pipes that are in need repair can be done.

Mr. Arthur don't think the state is going to need any money from us for maintenance this year since we are getting \$9.7M then could we could use some of the required 25% out of our regular CTC funds that we have to use towards state roads, if you found a culvert that needs to be replaced , but you can't do it out of the 9.7 then you could come back to the committee and get a recommend

ation to replace this culvert because you don't want to resurface over a culvert that will collapse in a couple of years. So, we could use our 25% of the state requirement, for those purposes if the committee deemed it logical to do.

Mr. Kirby implied the winter months would not be spent idle but would be spent looking at these roads making sure that culverts that needed to be replaced were replaced; utilities would not have to be relocated – things of that nature. We will look at things like possibly widening turn lanes as a separate CTC project but it can't be a part of this funding project.

Mr. Arthur stated that it make absolutely common sense that if we need to put in a turn lane in, we could use some of the required 25% on State Roads as required. The funding just needs to be kept separate.

Mr. Brown ask if the falling oil prices has decreased asphalt cost or getting any cheaper.

Mr. Kirby stated that it makes it a little more affordable. Actually with asphalt – 95% of the weight and tonnage is rock. But we have not seen a reduction in the price of the rock, manpower, or the material with the fall of oil prices. The county gets a price because our budget is about 2 to 2.5 million dollars a year. Asphalt prices went from \$72 a ton last year to about \$68 a ton this year. There has been a little of a reduction, but not a huge difference.

I just see a lot of them wanting to index their pricing now on things. They probably want to go up pretty quick, but go down real slow.

Mr. Gillespie: If we go ahead and approve and get the pricing, and it does not meet the November cut-off and can't get an extension, would those contractors hold that price till spring?

Mr. Kirby discussed Mr. Ashmore, (and he does a lot of the cement reclamation) one of his suggestions was to go ahead and release a big road, like John Dodd Road, so that he could go ahead and lock in some of his prices over the winter. So that is a possibility.

From Mr. Gillespie's understanding you don't think you could meet that November 15th deadline.

The contractor may be able to resurface a mile or two before the winter deadline and then they would have to start back again in March. The feeling at public works is that we wanted to get a project completed before the winter, and then spend some time looking at some culverts, etc and then start releasing projects in March. Shutting it down November 15 is just too soon.

A question was asked regarding what would happen if some of these jobs expand and all of a sudden the \$9.7M is not going to cover all our projects? What would be done?

This is That is why the engineers want to let it down to the 32 miles to have a little bit of a buffer in there as we certainly did not want to come in at 40 miles and cut it close and then have to start cutting roads. This non-recurring funding will be taken project by project. Therefore, we are not going to have five projects going on at once. We will do a roadway at a time.

Mr. Kirby hopes that with the pricing, we should be able to get a little more miles than anticipated. We try to under promise but over deliver. But, we should be able to add to this not deduct.

There is no deadline to complete the projects; we just want to be pro-active, but the DOT knows it takes time to get these projects out and bid, award the bid, and get them started. There is no deadline, the sooner we get ours under way, the better off we are.

Mr. Throckmorton moved to approve the list of projects for 32.6 miles as stated on the map subject to the available non recurring funds.

The motion was approved for not only the road miles, but also the State Secondary Roads as listed on the map. The motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. Throckmorton changed his motion to include subject to available funds, as all the non-recurring funds have not been received, nor have the bids been received or awarded.

Item C: Pavement testing for reclamation for Anderson Mill Road @ \$5,000.00

Some core test is an excellent candidate for the cement reclamation process. With that we have to have a soil test and an engineering design for the cement pavement section. The estimate cost is \$5,000.00 which would be used for pavement testing on Anderson Mill Road.

A motion was made to approve the \$5,000.00 for the pavement testing on a section of Anderson Mill Road.

A motion was made for the cost to be taken out of the special appropriation fund. The motion was seconded and carried.

a. Recommended roads to be resurfaced with State Non-Recurring funds (See map Exhibit 1 of 1)

Mr. Ron Kirby briefed the CTC Committee as to the lengthy process used to rate and create the list of roadways in Spartanburg County for the Spartanburg CTC to begin the process of using the current funding received of the State Non-Recurring funding to repair the following roadways: New Cut Road @ 15.50 miles; John Dodd Road @ 3.70 miles; Anderson Mill Road @ 2.85 miles; Parris Bridge Road @ 2.77 Miles: and Duncan Reidville Road @ 7.81 miles. The entire listed road will be repaired using the reclamation process.

After many hours of examining, viewing, taking core samples, etc. by Jim Nelson, Todd Carroll, Steve Lawson, Ron Kirby, and David Sellars it was decided the most needed repairs (for the non-recurring dollars on hand) would be made on 15.50 miles of New Cut; 3.70 miles on John Dodd Road; 2.85 Miles on Anderson Mill Road; 2.77 miles on Parris Bridge Road; and 7.81 miles on Duncan Reidville Road using the reclamation method. This totals 32.63 miles of roadway improvements.

Other non-recurring funding will be forthcoming at a later date.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the list of roadways as submitted in order to try to complete some or all the above listed projects before winter weather sets in.

c. Pavement Testing for Reclamation of Anderson Mill Road @ \$5,000.00

The County is requesting \$5,000 for pavement testing with regard to reclaim Anderson Mill Road.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

Mr. Tom Arthur, Chairman

Carol Crowe, Attested