

**COMMITTEE of the WHOLE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
DECEMBER 9, 2008**

The Committee of the Whole met on Tuesday, December 9, 2008 in the Council Chambers, located on the second floor of the Administration Building beginning at 11:00 a.m. Mr. Derrick, Committee Chairman presided.

Members Attending:

William C. Billy Derrick, Chairman	*James E. Kinard, Jr.
George H. Smokey Davis	Bobby C. Keisler
William B. Banning, Sr.	*M. Todd Cullum

*Messrs. Kinard and Cullum arrived after the meeting was already in process.

Absent:

Debra B. Debbie Summers, V Chairman
Johnny W. Jeffcoat
John W. Carrigg, Jr.

Also attending: Katherine Hubbard, County Administrator; Joe Mergo, Deputy County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Assistant County Administrator; John Fechtler, Director of Public Works/Assistant County Administrator; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

Lexington County Delegates in attendance:

Senator Ronnie W. Cromer, District 18
Representative Chip Huggins, District 85
Representative Walton J. McLeod, District 40

Central Midlands Council of Governments:

Norman Whitaker, Executive Director
Ben Mauldin, Planning Director
Greg Sprouse, Senior Planner

Others:

Mayor Randy Halfacre, Town of Lexington
Britt Poole, Town of Lexington Assistant Town Administrator
Norma Hamer, Chapin Chamber of Commerce
Doug Clary, Chapin Chamber of Commerce

Long Range Transportation Plan - Mr. Derrick opened the meeting. He asked that anyone with comments or questions to please come to the podium.

Ms. Hubbard, County Administrator, gave an update on the discussion about the road-widening portion of the Long Range Transportation Plan. She said that at the last meeting the group asked about the prioritized list of widening projects and requested staff to review the data provided to the Central Midlands Council of Governments (CMCOG) in determining the different categories for the points that went into the formula for the prioritization. Ms. Hubbard referred to the information presented on the overhead screen. (See attachment - COATS - Columbia Area Transportation Plan) She used it as an illustration to show how complicated this particular format is as far as getting all the pieces put together, see page two of attachment. She said it took time to break down every component and what we are going to do is to walk through this particular plan and share with you the information we have talked about with the CMCOG. We will give you updated information on where we are and where we can go from here.

Ms. Hubbard reported that in the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan there was a road-widening component that ended up having a formula that determined the priority for the list. In each part of the plan those points were associated with a particular data set. She said she wanted to talk about each point in particular and to walk through them. The first one has to do with the financial viability score and what you see from the middle of the screen to the right are all the different components that go into the financial viability score, see page two of attachment. One of the things that we have talked to Norman Whitaker about at the CMCOG is the maintenance cost, which is the amount of money per lane mile that goes into each of these roads. There appeared to be some standardization of the amount of money that was being put into the formula and you will see that the darker numbers are higher in costs and then it goes down in gradient as they go lower. One of the questions that we had is that when it comes to maintenance costs they are for two-lane road miles. What we have asked the CMCOG to do is to share with us, as these maintenance costs were provided from the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT), why the difference in those maintenance costs. If they came from each particular maintenance office that may explain it, but we just have some questions about how that maintenance cost went into the formula because keep in mind that as each piece of the formula is put together it ends up effecting the score. So we have some questions here that I know the CMCOG is following up.

Mr. Derrick asked what the duration of that cost is. Is that a twenty-year cost or a five-year cost?

Ms. Hubbard replied that is just the amount of money per lane mile and current costs.

Mr. Norman Whitaker answered it is based on a compilation of data (Mr. Whitaker was not at the podium initially.) Norman Whitaker said he was the Executive Director of Central Midlands Council of Governments. He said they were also COATS, the Columbia Area Transportation Study, and there were other staff members here also, Mr. Ben Mauldin, Planning Director and Mr. Greg Sprouse, Senior Planner, who worked on the model. The concern with the maintenance costs was

there are different numbers for different road segments and the numbers the dollar figures in Richland County were twice as high, nearly, roughly, in some cases than Lexington County maintenance numbers which does not hurt Lexington County but it may penalize Richland County. We asked the SCDOT what is the basis of those and they said first of all the data is collected at the county level and they have collected data for different types of roads as part of an annual review. Mr. Whitaker said he believed this was a year's worth of data that they based those numbers on. If it is determined ultimately that that is not acceptable an obvious way to deal with that is to average the dollars over the counties and adjust for how many miles were involved. But the reason the numbers are different is that they were done at the county level in two different counties for different types of roadways and it is a result of some time period, he believed a year's sample, of contracts that were actually let and implemented. These were the actual costs during the reporting period.

Mr. Derrick asked what the number represents.

Mr. Whitaker replied that it represents the cost of maintaining a lane mile of road, he believed.

Mr. Derrick asked for one year? He said he totally disagrees. That is 4,800 miles per year - per lane mile per year.

Mr. Whitaker answered well it is used to calculate a maintenance cost over a twenty-year period so the first one is, he believed, that is the cost per year maintaining a lane mile. And, that is applied to the length of the road and the lifetime of the plan. For example, the first project Two Notch Road you get an estimated twenty year cost of maintenance cost and resurfacing cost of a total of about \$4.5 million.

Mr. Derrick said I do not understand the disparity between Lexington County and Richland County. Either Richland County is getting a lot better maintenance which we want or we are getting poorer maintenance.

Mr. Whitaker responded during the reporting period these numbers were based on, this was the experience of the SCDOT, they paid more if you did it over a twenty year period. The anomaly might average itself out. He said he would like to also point out there are a number of factors and questions that you have asked about criteria that went through our technical committee, then went on to a transportation planning subcommittee, and then went on to our full board. These criteria, those methodologies, were adopted ultimately by the board. We are glad to look at anything that you are concerned about but ultimately we have to move forward and this was not a process that was done overnight, it was done over many months. Probably could have been done more quickly in a more orderly manner but many of these we consider settled issues and the criteria were adopted by the board which includes representation for three counties.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Whitaker in looking at Two Notch Road, just looking at Richland County's sector and then looking at Lexington County's sector which is about half way down, it just seems

like a fifty percent difference or maybe it's 100 percent if you want to calculate it that way. This is data that the SCDOT came to our county or their own records and received?

Mr. Whitaker answered yes sir and again an alternative technique would be somehow average these and adjust for the mileage that was involved.

Mr. Davis asked this is on a per one mile cost?

Mr. Whitaker answered the column that is shaded dark is a maintenance cost per lane mile. So if it is a four lane road it would be four times that and if it's a two lane road.

Mr. Davis asked but that's apples and apples on the same road in just two different counties.

Mr. Whitaker replied again the data came from the experience of SCDOT over a period of time, which I believe is a year, annually review their maintenance and resurfacing contracts to see what they got for their money. Two different offices reported this data to SCDOT and SCDOT's data base reflects the information on a per county basis. Mr. Whitaker said it may mean it's more expensive to work in one county or another, he doubts it, he imagines it's a result of the reporting methodology and period of time, types of contracts, and types of roads that were involved.

Mr. Derrick said let us move on to the next criteria. We agree that may be problem.

Ms. Hubbard said Mr. Chairman, and for the benefit of the group, Mr. Whitaker did point out something very important that this particular category may or may not impact Richland County more than Lexington County. That has really been our approach in doing this with Richland County and analyzing the data. There may be some things that they are more concerned about than we are. This is a COATS plan. This is for the metropolitan planning area. We certainly would think that the concerns we have raised maybe things that Richland County would want to look at as well. She also wanted to point out one other thing that Mr. Whitaker and her have talked about this so she does not think this will be a surprise to him. This is truly the first time that County Council is looking at the expanded priority list with all the factors included with the data. A number of you serve on the CMCOG Board although you may have made some decisions certainly she has made some decisions about how her vote went on the CMCOG Board. She said this has been the first time she has had the benefit of looking at it all holistically.

Base Year Capacity, page four of attachment. Ms. Hubbard continued by moving on to additional categories, the Base Year Capacity provided by the Department of Transportation. Where we are going with some of the questions about how this particular category and how the data was used, we want to highlight the particular column where the Base Year Capacity is included. It is our understanding that there is a possibility that SCDOT used the functional classification system to determine the capacity rather than the actual physical design of the road way. The reason why that is a concern of ours is if you look at some of the roads right here in Lexington you can see the

functional classification itself for the roads. Highway 6, when it is downtown may have a functional classification of carrying 8,600 vehicles but when it heads out-of-town it may increase to 10,000 almost 11,000 vehicles but it is the same road. We want to make sure we understand how that data fits in to the base year capacity and if there may have been other data that could have been used that would have presented perhaps a more accurate picture of the base year capacity. But again, a lot of this information is still coming back in from SCDOT so we do not have an opportunity to sit down and talk with Mr. Whitaker and his staff about how it impacted the particular formula.

Annual Average Daily Traffic Count (AADT), page five of attachment. Ms. Hubbard said this was calculated by the CMCOG transportation team that did the modeling for this. We have asked some questions about the actual traffic counts and how it went into the model that was used. If you notice here (see attachment) the actual traffic counts for some of the Lexington County roads, we do not have on hand the Richland County roads. The actual average daily traffic count is different than what the model showed for the calibration of the traffic counts. We just need an opportunity to sit down and talk with the CMCOG some more about why there were some differences. She said Mr. Whitaker and her have talked about some of those in a theoretical level but we would like to have some more time talking about that and how that may have impacted the particular calculation for this criteria which again enters into the overall priority ranking. She went back and pointed out why this may be an issue. If you look at Long's Pond Road (see page five of attachment) which is the second one from the top the 2005 Annual Average Daily Traffic Count is about half of what the model showed and trying to figure out that may have impacted the actual congestion score for the current congestion and the future congestion score. She said she realizes as we work through all of this she is throwing a lot of data at you. We had the opportunity to talk about it with Mr. Whitaker and had the opportunity to analyze it. What we want to have you keep in mind as we continue to go through this is that the two lane widening program, this whole list that you see, is important but is a relatively small portion of a much larger plan. She said she wanted to run to the end of the story as you are going through this, keep in the back of your mind, you want to use road-widening as part of your toolbox to address congestion and other traffic problems in the Midlands. It is not the only fix.

One of things we would want to talk to you at the end of this presentation is whether additional funds need to be allocated out of the two-lane widening program and into the congestion management portion of the plan. She said Mr. Whitaker and her have talked about how to present that to you today and have a little more discussion about it because that may be where we need to go with this.

Economic Development, page six of attachment. Ms. Hubbard said in economic development you will notice that when we take a look at the actual scores for these projects, which came out of the Department of Commerce, there are only two maybe three projects that even had a score in this. There were eight points that were assigned to this particular category and maybe two or three projects got four points. Our question to the CMCOG has been to be in touch with the Department of Commerce and ask what did you put into the criteria. If we are going to place eight points on this and zero were allotted to the first grouping of projects the score did not have much bearing on those projects. We are curious what a score of four means. If the economic development component is important to us and someone can get a four that is the highest score you can get from the Department

of Commerce, what does a four mean and what does it take to get a four.

Environmental Impact Assessment, page seven of attachment. Ms. Hubbard said that under the Environmental Impact score there is a matrix that Mr. Whitaker and she have had a chance to take a look at together along with Mr. Compton. It is a complex matrix that talks about the environmental impact of a particular road-widening project. You will notice that the higher the score in the left column the lower the impact score on the right. You get penalized with points if your project is going to cause an environmental impact that is serious. Hard Scrabble Road has an environmental impact assessment of seventeen and they get zero points in this particular category. One of the things that we probably need to look at little closer are the actual environmental assessments that generated these scores to be sure that we are comfortable that those criteria that truly will impact the community and the environment by road-widening were the ones that had the most emphasis when those points were established.

Public Safety, page eight of attachment. Ms. Hubbard moved on to the Public Safety score. These scores were provided by the Department of Transportation and Public Safety. What we are looking for is the breakdown of how those particular scores were assessed. We are assuming that when you are taking a look at public safety on the road you are going to look at accidents that happen on the road. One of our questions is we want to be sure in analyzing the information that SCDOT or Public Safety looked at those accidents that had nothing to do with the road design like DUI or suspended drivers licenses. Those types of things that may have warranted a ticket were not factored into the safety score here because they really have no bearing on whether the road is safe or not. It would be accidents that happened from poor vision, poor clearance, perhaps speed limits or traveling too close to things. We are curious about the actual accidents broken down by type that generated these scores.

Truck Traffic, page nine of attachment. Ms Hubbard said they are working with Mr. Whitaker on getting more information from SCSCDOT about how this particular score was developed. It appears to be is that the functional classification system was used again. We know the technical committee and transportation committee both talked about whether the actual truck traffic should or should not have been counted. We are still working through why the actual traffic count of the trucks might not be a better solution here especially for roads like Columbia Avenue where there is one way in and one way out of the town. So we are assuming the truck traffic maybe a little higher because of individual circumstances on these roads than what the functional classification system may actually indicate.

Mr. Davis asked if the functional classification system was a scientific “sort of” decision that is based on what?

Ms. Hubbard replied that Mr. Whitaker did a wonderful job explaining this and she asked him to answer.

Mr. Whitaker answered it is quasi scientific. A functional classification system divides all the roads anywhere into categories and the SCDOT uses a state-wide system that identifies interstate highways, major and minor arterials and collector roads. Below that you are into what are called local streets or residential streets and are really not a subject to this plan. In general arterial roads have considerable length and continuity. Highway 6 is a good example as something that functions as arterial. He said he was not sure that it is classified as one of those or a collector. Highway engineers tend to confuse collectors and arterials but the collectors are major roads that collect traffic from an area and take it to arterials. The arterials will allow you to cross the region across the county.

Mr. Davis asked if sometimes collectors become arterials?

Mr. Whitaker responded that they can function that way. The county might classify a particular road a collector and the SCDOT might say it is an arterial.

Mr. Davis asked if they classify the roads and then give them a number?

Mr. Whitaker responded that they have an assumed capacity for typical cross section of major arterials, minor arterials and collector streets. That is a state-wide methodology that SCSCDOT has used consistently all over the state with all the plans. It is a methodology that was used in previous long range transportation plans. It is based on that same calculation of the functional capacity. What are the alternatives? You could do detailed studies, hire somebody, hire a traffic engineer to count all the curb cuts to look at every intersection with a minor street, to look at everything that would really affect the traffic flow and come up with a specific traffic carrying capacity for every road in the state of South Carolina. He said from a practical stand point it has always worked in the past to use the idea that an arterial is going to be able to carry X number of trips.

Mr. Davis said in my lifetime I have gone over a lot of little black wires on the roads. What are wires those wires, are they counting cars?

Mr. Whitaker answered that they are traffic counters. They are counting cars. I think we created one of our own problems here by putting the term actual traffic count in our table. They are not really actual traffic counts that are used in this process and SCDOT does not publish actual traffic counts for these collectors and arterial roads. What they do is they put counters out for a day, collect data and then, depending on the time of the year people are travelling, you are going to get different counts. There are a lot of things that can affect those counts and to get an absolutely accurate count you would have to leave the counter out all year. SCDOT takes these short-term counts and adjusts them. They use statistical techniques and some judgment calls and their point of reference is some permanent counters they have on interstates that reflect variances seasonally. We are compiling a written response to all these questions that will give you a very detailed answer.

Mr. Davis asked but SCDOT does not share that count information?

Mr. Whitaker answered yes sir, they have it on their web-site and it is identified as estimated traffic counts.

Mr. Davis asked not the actual count?

Mr. Whitaker responded I do not know if they do or not.

Mr. Derrick said we had actually offered, in this particular category, to furnish our traffic counter which we have the ability to distinguish between truck traffic and automobile traffic. But apparently SCDOT does not have that capability yet.

Mr. Davis replied it just bounces on the wire.

Mr. Whitaker answered SCSCDOT can count different types of vehicles based on the axle bumps.

Mr. Derrick said let us continue.

Pavement Quality Index (PQI), page nine of attachment. Ms. Hubbard continued with the pavement quality index. She said we definitely agree with the CMCOG staff that this was an extremely good piece of data. The discussion that came about after our last meeting was how does this pavement quality index and all of this scoring that was done here, how does that fits into the long term resurfacing plan that SCDOT has for all these roads. One of the hopes that we have, through some of our capital improvement plans, is to make sure if we can adjust some of the capital improvements that we do to avoid costs we would want to do that. In this case, if you have a road causing a lot of distress with regard to wanting to make some improvements to it or some resurfacing because the paving quality is poor it might be better to avoid resurfacing and just go ahead and do the road-widening project and resurfacing at the same time. There may be some need to have a discussion that is becoming very surgical in how you approach a long-term transportation plan. It would seem that the most current long term resurfacing plan should be part of the discussion in looking at the pavement quality index just to avoid resurfacing a road as you are waiting for it to come up on the long-term transportation plan then turn around and scrape all that resurfacing up as you go to widen it.

Right-of-Way Preservation – page ten of attachment. Ms. Hubbard said in the case of this particular column it appears that all of the roads received a score of an eight which is the highest. She has spoken with Mr. Whitaker about this and it had to do with an effort, as you may recall if you served on the CMCOG Board, to talk to all of the jurisdictions about coming forward with their plan for right-of-way preservation. It appears from this score that everyone did what they needed to do with right-of-way preservation and received the highest score.

Where do we go from here? – page eleven of attachment. Mr. Hubbard offered four possibilities

and steps. She said she would show all of the possibilities because she wanted to have a chance for the group to see the end of the discussion.

Mr. Derrick asked before that could you please tell us what the maximum possible score was for each one of the categories?

Ms. Hubbard said she did not bring that information with her and deferred to Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. Derrick said that it seems we can eliminate several of the categories because we gave equal scores.

Ms. Hubbard replied she had spoken with Mr. Whitaker about the possibility that Council would want to look at changing the points for each category and maybe shifting some of the points. One of the questions you had at the last meeting that also factored into the discussion with Mr. Whitaker is that this plan is overdue. Apparently it was due in September to the Federal Highway Administration. Mr. Whitaker is concerned about the timeliness of this particular plan going in and any type of possible repercussions from the Federal Highway Administration with regard to Guide Share. She said we will let Mr. Whitaker answer the question about the points.

Mr. Whitaker answered the best way for him to answer that question is to tell you about the requirements for producing this plan. The plan that was done five years ago was done subject to requirements of the federal government. There is a transportation bill that is renewed every seven years that sets out the planning requirements. There is still federal transportation planning requirements now, there are also some state requirements. They came out of what is called the SCDOT Reform Act that was designed to put some science in the roadway project selection and take the politics out of it, supposedly. There are approximately nine criteria in the state law that have to be considered in developing a transportation plan if federal and state funds are going to be used. The SCDOT developed a sort of template with the CMCOGs and MPOs with a total of twenty transportation planning organizations in the state. We are two, a rural and an urban organization. They developed a template that our process was roughly based on. We did add one criteria right away, preservation. We do have some criteria that review consistently with land use plans. We think that you are the ones who can make that determination not us. Anyway, we have to address each of these categories. Financially viability, maintenance costs, public safety, let me start over. Financial viability and maintenance costs are twenty points, public safety is ten points, potential for economic development is eight points, traffic volume and congestion is 33 points, truck traffic is eight points, pavement quality index is five points, environmental impact is eight points, and right-of-way preservation is eight points. Alternative transportation solutions, should we provide bike lanes and buses instead of widening the road? That is not a scored thing that has to be analyzed when we get ready to do a project. Consistency with local land use plans, we are assuming if the project is offensive to you because it is inconsistent with your land use plans you will tell us. You will ask not to have it funded. Again, these criteria and weightings have been submitted to our board and adopted and then have been submitted to the SCDOT Commission and adopted.

Mr. Derrick asked what the points for economic development were.

Mr. Whitaker responded economic development was eight points.

Mr. Davis said these criteria were accepted but also we have asked a third party basically to rate the criteria.

Mr. Whitaker replied that in many of these cases the SCDOT or the Department of Commerce did the rankings. And this was determined going into the, we did not come up with the point scores and then try it out in a few different combinations on the roads. We developed the point scores, adopted those then ranked the projects. When we submitted the projects to SCDOT and the Department of Commerce for ranking on economic development, we did not know what kind of answer we were going to get. We certainly did not expect to get zeros on everything and we wasted the category and everything canceled each other out. But that is what we got. That is the first time that we ever had somebody rank projects for economic development potential.

Mr. Davis asked does commerce have an established system they use for ranking roads for economic development?

Mr. Whitaker answered they did for this purpose and they did it state-wide, Councilman. The answer we got from the Department of Transportation was the DOC used a GIS based system. They overlaid a variety of factors such as highway interchanges, access to utilities, and proximity to other employment centers. They overlaid this on maps and then the DOC staff looked at the maps and where these factors fell out relative to roadways and made an assessment. A specific question from the county was what does four points mean? That means a medium economic development potential. That is the methodology that was used consistently by SCDOT and the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Whitaker when they said economic development, are they talking about manufacturing firms or commercial businesses? What does GIS tell you?

Mr. Whitaker answered GIS would not tell you anything. You would have to have an idea going into that. I do not know, I am not going to try to speculate on what their definition of economic development was.

Mr. Banning said you would think it would not be retail because the Department of Commerce does not really work with retail.

Mr. Derrick said yes but congestion follows retail.

Mr. Davis said he thinks about the economic development for manufacturing we have had in this

County. Before Michelin was developed that was a very rural road with very limited economic development potential. If you put a map on it now you would have to see what it is.

Mr. Whitaker responded once you get one business park the suppliers for those industries might want to relocate. A similar question on the environmental impact assessment, there is no project by project environmental impact assessment. The methodology that the SCDOT has used consistently and state-wide we were told is this, again they mapped the roads, mapped the environmental features. This is really the reason GIS was originally invented to look at suitability of land for development. They mapped the wetlands, historic structures, whatever data they had and put on a map and looked at how it overlaid on a road. The environmental staff at SCDOT, some of whom worked for other environmental agencies but are stationed at SCDOT, jointly looked at the projects and gave them rankings. That is somewhat subjective but ultimately these are the people who if there is an environmental impact statement it is the same people who are making the judgments on those. And again, you have to remember this is something that has to be done state-wide and it is not always realistic to go out and do completely original research on each individual segment of each road. Mr. Whitaker said if you want us to answer these other criteria we will tell you that the pavement quality index was determined by taking an average of segments from data in the state's highway performance monitoring system. This is information they submit to the federal highway administration every year. There is no resurfacing plan that is involved in that ranking. There is a pavement quality index and a highway performance monitoring system. The highway performance monitoring system has data about pavement conditions and that is submitted each year to the federal government and that is where these scores were derived. Many of these criteria really did not get a lot of discussion even at our technical committee level. The ones that we are talking about today because they involved using information the state had and letting the state or a third party, some cases a fourth party, run an analysis consistently. On a couple of these if we had known the kind of answers we had gotten we might have weighted the projects differently. The one that I do not think I have a good answer for you on is the right-of-way preservation.

Mr. Derrick replied it does not matter the story is still the same, move on to the next one.

Mr. Whitaker continued and said the Town of Lexington does feel that they made an extraordinary effort and if everybody got aid then should have got more. We have talked about the maintenance. The base year capacity, again, we talked about functional classifications and it is more efficient and it has been done in the past, including past plans of COATS, to use the states assumptions on capacity for arterials and collectors on an average. He said he thinks it is very feasible that you could have different capacities in sections of Highway 6, downtown and out in the country. But, is it probably not realistic to do a study of each segment of each road to see exactly what the impedances are and what the actual traffic carrying capacity is. The 2005 Average Daily Trip Data, again, there are some variances the first two projects and the fourth project on the list. And, some that are outside that were not really projects that would be funded had some big differences between the 2005 SCDOT traffic counts which again are estimates that are derived through statistical adjustments to short duration counts. The transportation model is a tool that we are required to use

in transportation planning. It is loaded with demographic, development, traffic, and other data, and it is designed to simulate if a segment of road has X number of households nearby, X number of businesses, and the road has certain characteristics a number of calculations are run by that model and it gives an answer. It estimates how much traffic will occur in 2035 and it estimates what is happening right now. Now the old model, the history of these models is they get better over time but they are certainly not perfect. They include thousands of pieces of data, thousands of estimates, thousands of assumptions, lots of mistakes are inevitably in there and hopefully a lot of them cancel each other out. But the model that we were using previously in part includes travel behavior data that comes from the 1960s and this was very typical around the country. In the last five years NPOs or transportation planning organizations have been doing new travel behavior studies. The world is a lot different than it was in 1968. We have a study that was prepared by New Stats, a subcontractor for our model consultant, our model consultant was Parsons Brinckerhoff. New Stats surveyed a thousand households or so and asked about travel behavior and they came up with data that goes into the model that explains the basis of people making different decisions on how many trips they make. So it is a more recent model and in some cases the model is higher than the SCDOT published 2005 traffic counts which are estimates. The fact that the model is high does not necessarily mean the numbers are inflated. They could be, could be the SCDOT numbers are high or low.

Mr. Derrick said we need to move on with the rest of the presentation.

Ms. Hubbard said she has talked with Mr. Whitaker and his staff about Council's feelings that if this amount of time and effort is going to go into a transportation plan, this component especially of the plan, that the data that comes back from SCDOT or Commerce or Public Safety or whoever, a model, that your expectations of County and CMCOG staff is that an analysis is done of that data. She said she thinks that is what we are doing here in asking the questions. It is just to make sure we understand what data was used and how it impacted the rankings for this particular plan. Mr. Whitaker has been very cooperative in getting that information for us. She said she still believes there is additional analysis of the data that was provided to the CMCOG that needs to be done. We will continue to work with Mr. Whitaker on that so we can certainly understand it and explain it. She has also shared with Mr. Whitaker about Council's concern about the road-widening priority list. As you continue to look at very limited funds for road improvement projects in the County, impact fees, vehicle registration fees, penny sales tax, and all these different tools that are in your tool box for providing improvements to your constituents, that you need to have one transportation plan that shows priority lists for Lexington County. So we have every intention of taking the information that in the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan and use it as the basis for any additional priority discussion that may happen for things like impact fees and penny sales tax that may come in the future. We are very interested in making sure we understand the data and we that we agree with the data so we do not have conflicting data when you look at some of these other projects in the capital improvement plan that will be required as a result of that.

We do we go from here? – page eleven of attachment. Ms. Hubbard said one of the things that the staff, Mr. Whitaker and her have talked about is that the long range transportation plan for the

Midlands, the best you can hope to do with the Federal Guide Share money, is to improve congestion. There is not enough money, in her opinion and which is shared by Mr. Whitaker, to widen every two-lane or four-lane road in the Midlands to adequately address all of the congestion needs in the Midlands, not just in Lexington County. We need to be smarter. We need to work stronger towards congestion management. One recommendation from the staff to you is that as board members you work with the Central Midlands Council of Governments to allocate more money from the two-lane widening project to the congestion management plan. We have a copy of that and for board members a copy of that was in the board packet in October if you want to refer to that. The Regional Congestion Management Plan was provided to you by Reginald Simmons, CMCOG staff member, in October. There may be some data that needs additional attention in the two-lane widening calculations. We will know more once we have an opportunity to talk with Mr. Whitaker about the findings from SCDOT, DOC and DPS. But in any event there may be some areas that we would like to talk to the CMCOG about just with that particular plan again because we are using it as a springboard for other transportation planning that we are going to be doing in the County. Number three, we recognize that the CMCOG is under a time constraint in getting the plan into the Federal Highway Administration. We would want the changes in number one and two as our recommendation to be done before that is submitted to the Federal Highway Administration. Then after that has been successfully submitted to the Federal Highway Administration we would like to take a look at the 2035 Plan again through the COATS Transportation Planning process. She said she has certainly become much more educated in the last several months about how the process works. She would like an opportunity with her counterpart in Richland County and perhaps in Calhoun and Kershaw counties to sit back down with Mr. Whitaker and talk about some different strategies we may want to employ as the next update may happen to the extent to which a 2035 Plan can be revised to the Federal Highway Administration after it has already been submitted. We may want to talk about that as well after we talk about the whole process. She said she would answer any questions. She said the assignment was to get more information about the actual criteria and data and provide some recommendations to you before the December board meeting. She said she hoped we have accomplished that. We appreciate Mr. Whitaker being here and available to you to answer questions.

Mr. Davis asked on revising plans how difficult is that and when the plan seems to change, does the federal government look at that significantly or do they still send the money?

Mr. Whitaker responded they recognize that situations can change, priorities can change and it may be necessary to revise the plan. He said you would have to pretty much revise it through the same process that created it as far as public process, methodology and having public meetings. We may fall under air quality non-attainment. Some people say we will fall under air quality non-attainment within a couple of years. That will change. Again, you are seeing one page of a massive plan that addresses freight, bikes, cars, and congestion management. The congestion management will probably become much more important if we are under air quality non-attainment because certain types of projects are harder to justify in that situation. So we may not be doing as much road-widening in the future as we have in the past relatively speaking.

Mr. Davis asked so it can be adjusted and amended.

Mr. Whitaker answered the plan can be amended. It has to go back to SCDOT and through the FHWA. He said he will say that after this review process that he had a pretty high level of confidence in the plan. There is some flexibility also if Richland County and Lexington County decide that our number one and two projects are a) overrated or b) they are not our priorities. You can ask the SCDOT if you submit a justification, you ask SCDOT to agree that say the number four project should go first. That can depend on ease of implementation, connects up as a crucial piece with some other projects that have been done or it is just cheaper and you can get more projects done in the planning period if you shift the priorities.

Mr. Davis asked if that needs to be done prior to approval of the plan.

Mr. Whitaker answered no sir. After this plan is approved you have sort of a long-range laundry list and a vision and a list of, so far it looks like thirteen it could be more, projects that are for road-widening that are in the cost constraint plan. When you move something into the short-range spending plan, that is call the TIP, Transportation Improvement Plan. You take those projects out of that thirteen or fourteen project cost constraint plan and at that point the board can decide do we just want to take these in rank order and number one goes first or is there a compelling reason that we need to do number ten first. You have to craft a justification and adopt that and the SCDOT Commission has to agree on that. We would involve our district two commissioner very early on in that process.

Mr. Derrick asked if there were any other questions. He thanked Senator Cromer and Representative McLeod for being at the meeting. He asked where we need to go from here.

Ms. Hubbard said a number of us serve on the CMCOG Board and it would be appropriate that we meet as a group after you have an opportunity to digest the information and decide how you want to proceed with any motions for the board meeting on December 18, 2008.

Mr. Derrick said this is the appropriate time to mention that even though Mr. Whitaker said we could change the plan, Representative McLeod and I serve on the Rural Transportation Committee. We took the initiative to change the recommended point's criteria and sent it forward. The Administrator and Councilman Cullum were also part of the Committee. We unanimously made that recommendation to change the point's criteria and sent it to SCDOT and they sent it right back to us and said this is not appropriate. Mr. Derrick said we have some flexibility as long as we do not do something they do not expect us to do or something they do not want us to do. He said he has been real frustrated with the whole situation. Mr. Compton did a great job in comparing the 2025 Plan with the 2035 Plan. He put the plan through different criteria and made comparisons of one with the other. Mr. Derrick said he would like to sell the 2025 Plan again using the new categories but he knew that is in the future and cannot be done right now. If it was good enough for 2025 and we

were all marching in the same direction, using the same criteria, and headed where we wanted to go and all of sudden we have developed a plan that upsets the fruit basket. What was wrong with the plan we had, was it wrong or is the plan we are developing now wrong? That is my question.

Mr. Whitaker responded he would not say there is anything overall wrong with either one of them, neither one of them are perfect. The rules changed. The 2025 Plan gave most of the priority to the projects that would be the most congested in the year 2025. They looked at the projected traffic versus the existing capacity of the road. Columbia Avenue was projected to be the most congested road in 2025. The philosophy behind the new law, SCDOT tells us is worst first, more emphasis on places that are congested now. There are more points directly and indirectly given to projects in the new plan based on current travel conditions which we know more about than the conditions in 2035. That is the major difference. There is a reason that the two plans are different. Mr. Whitaker said he has asked the SCDOT this question. We have had one project on top of the list for five years, it is in the TIP to be designed, can our board choose to go ahead and fund that, can we put it in the TIP, obligate money and start building it. They said no you cannot because it conflicts with the SCDOT Reform Act.

Mr. Derrick asked how about the local match and the money that was spent to get it to that point. How do you make that argument? You said you want to take politics out of it, but how is it that on one day it is on the top of the list and the next day it is number five on the list? How in the world can even those administrators justify going from number one to number five after they spent their own money to develop the plan to get it to the point where it is?

Mr. Whitaker answered the CMCOG spent the citizen's money on a study of sub-area plan for the S48 Corridor. The conclusion was you need to widen part of that and you need to develop more of a transportation network, not just rely on S48 and Amicks Ferry Road as your whole transportation system. The CMCOG was glad to make that investment. It is a long-range plan and it has identified some things when we get some money, which we cannot count on from Washington, when we get some money there is some improvements including and beyond S48 that need to be made. But how can it be justified? The rules changed during the process. To get S48 into the priority list you could eliminate some other Lexington County projects perhaps and it would move up. He said the issue here is not the dollars but Lexington County has about \$145 million in projects in this plan out of about \$253 million that are currently identified for road-widening projects. The road-widening category can actually get a little bigger if one of the projects waiting in line is dropped out because it is too big to fit into the budget.

Ms. Hubbard wanted to make sure that there is some clarification on this because this question may come up later. She said that with regard to the 2035 Plan, as it pertains to this state statute that was passed, there was no section of the enabling legislation that defined the number of points per category.

Mr. Whitaker answered SCDOT has some guidelines but it is up to the local folks to decide that the

one rule they got is congestion has to be the predominant criteria and give economic development more points than congestion for example which is what happened to rural folk.

Ms. Hubbard said the CMCOG Board could come up with a different weighting within that formula as long as congestion is taken into consideration. It could be different than any other CMCOG area in the state.

Mr. Derrick said it was staff's recommendation that we meet again prior to December 18th and there are several CMCOG Board members here that serve on the Board. Board Members present; Mayor Halfacre, Rep. McLeod, Mr. Derrick, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Banning, Mr. Cullum, Mr. Jeffcoat, and Mr. Carrigg. Mr. Derrick confirmed that the group would meet December 18th at 10:30 a.m. at the CMCOG office prior to the board meeting.

Representative McLeod said it would be helpful if everyone knew what Mr. Derrick as Chairman and he, as a member of the Rural Transportation Committee, did relative to the point scheme and the formula which they changed and then when SCDOT more recently said that does not suit us. Although the law is not clear that it must be certain points. The Rural Transportation Committee met at the CMCOG within the past month. They had a formula which had traffic as the top criteria, next was economic development, next was environmental concerns, and next was financial viability. He said he did not think safety was in there, but he knew what we did. The formula said that traffic would have forty-five percent (45%) and the next category was economic development and that was fifteen percent (15%). Then the other two had twenty percent (20%). The committee members decided to reverse the two and have traffic at fifteen percent (15%) and economic development at forty-five percent (45%) because we thought that was best for the rural areas of Lexington, Newberry, Fairfield counties and the rural areas of Richland County. We thought we made an enlightened decision.

Mr. Derrick said we asked specifically if that was something we could do.

Representative McLeod said it was permissible under the law. We think we understood it clearly when we were told that yes the law allowed the CMCOG to adopt that policy. And more recently, Mr. Derrick as the chairman of the committee and other members have been advised that this proposal was submitted to SCDOT and they said basically do it another way. He said he was called to ask what he wanted to do, what did he recommend? He said shrink it five points if you can. Well that is not enough. Traffic must be the dominate amount. So we could have traffic maybe one point more than the other. Rep. McLeod said he did not have any way of knowing what SCDOT would do but for reasons that are unclear to him the department of transportation has determined that they desire traffic, i.e., congestion to be the dominate criteria and it must receive more points in the formula than anything else. His opinion is that we should shrink it as low as we can but of course we were talking about the rural areas and not about the COATS area. But the COATS area has a series of criteria that the net result is Columbia Avenue switch went from one to twenty. He said he regrets to say that he did not have too many suggestions other than it is distressing to be advised that

an enormous change. Of course we know where it came from the new transportation law as Mr. Whitaker says required that certain changes be made. But the goal of taking politics out of road building and road improvements, well you know you cannot take the politics out of the Methodist Church and you cannot take the politics out of the Catholic Church, you cannot take the politics out of government because government is politics. So it is a noble thought but entirely unachievable.

Old Business/New Business – None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Busbee
Assistant to the Clerk

William C. Billy Derrick
Chairman

Diana W. Burnett
Clerk

COATS

Columbia Area

Transportation

Plan

Route Name	County	Project cost estimate	Maintenance cost (\$/lane mile	Maintenance costs over 20 years	Resurfacing costs over 20 years	Financial viability/life cycle cost (\$/VMT)	Financial Viability Score
------------	--------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	---------------------------

\$6.5mil/mile

Two Notch Road	Richland	\$15,210,000	\$4,778.02	\$1,118,057	\$3,580,200	\$391	19.580
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	\$21,450,000	\$2,867.68	\$946,334	\$2,442,000	\$449	18.931
West Main Street	Lexington	\$4,290,000	\$2,917.28	\$192,540	\$1,009,800	\$386	19.633
Edmund Highway	Lexington	\$10,465,000	\$2,917.28	\$469,682	\$2,463,300	\$452	18.896
Hard Scrabble	Richland	\$24,050,000	\$2,705.73	\$1,001,120	\$2,738,000	\$353	20.000
Leesburg Road	Richland	\$24,180,000	\$4,778.02	\$1,777,423	\$5,691,600	\$519	18.155
Sunset Drive	Richland	\$5,200,000	\$4,778.02	\$382,242	\$1,224,000	\$436	19.074
South Lake Drive	Lexington	\$22,880,000	\$2,917.28	\$1,026,883	\$5,385,600	\$742	15.681
Kennerly Road	Richland	\$7,995,000	\$2,705.73	\$332,805	\$910,200	\$652	16.676
Hard Scrabble	Richland	\$18,525,000	\$2,705.73	\$771,133	\$2,109,000	\$520	18.148
Two Notch Road	Lexington	\$20,215,000	\$2,867.68	\$891,848	\$2,301,400	\$756	15.521
Edmund Highway	Lexington	\$18,655,000	\$2,917.28	\$837,259	\$4,391,100	\$529	18.051
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	\$30,875,000	\$2,917.28	\$1,385,708	\$7,267,500	\$736	15.747
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	\$44,135,000	\$2,561.37	\$1,739,170	\$10,388,700	\$800	15.029
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	\$26,000,000	\$4,778.02	\$1,911,208	\$6,120,000	\$789	15.160
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	\$14,040,000	\$2,867.68	\$619,419	\$1,598,400	\$603	17.228
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	\$12,675,000	\$3,062.96	\$597,277	\$2,983,500	\$457	18.848
Broad River Road	Richland	\$11,310,000	\$4,778.02	\$831,375	\$2,662,200	\$718	15.942
Percival Road	Richland	\$18,720,000	\$4,778.02	\$1,376,070	\$4,406,400	\$600	17.259
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	\$13,520,000	\$2,867.68	\$596,477	\$1,539,200	\$542	17.904

Base Year Capacity

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Existing Lanes	Improved # of lanes	BASE YEAR CAPACITY	2005 Actual AADT	2005 AADT	2035 AADT	Current Congestion Rate	Future Congestion Rate	Current Congestion Score	Future Congestion Score
									S/Q	T/Q		
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		21,766.60	34,970.52	2.015	3.238	20.000	11.726
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600	8700; 7600	16,751.68	30,045.68	1.948	3.494	19.160	13.000
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	2	5	14600	17000	21,552.83	31,927.23	1.476	2.187	13.297	6.488
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800	9000	18,392.65	26,497.27	1.703	2.453	16.117	7.817
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		21,271.57	28,822.47	1.970	2.669	19.430	8.890
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		16,388.83	23,540.77	1.517	2.180	13.810	6.453
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		19,495.74	26,757.04	1.805	2.478	17.386	7.937
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600	13600	11,218.38	20,663.87	1.304	2.403	11.162	7.564
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	2	5	8600		11,515.72	18,672.44	1.339	2.171	11.592	6.411
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		14,451.46	21,635.86	1.338	2.003	11.580	5.574
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600	2700; 5000; 6300	9,953.72	18,706.55	1.157	2.175	9.334	6.430
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800	9000	15,745.53	25,467.82	1.458	2.358	13.070	7.342
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800	10200; 11100	11,308.92	25,769.77	1.047	2.386	7.963	7.481
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600		10,351.77	17,457.84	1.204	2.030	9.910	5.707
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		10,787.26	24,944.94	0.999	2.310	7.363	7.101
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		12,491.72	19,890.73	1.157	1.842	9.325	4.769
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	2	5	14600		18,250.93	27,450.03	1.250	1.880	10.486	4.960
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		11,844.53	22,546.85	1.097	2.088	8.580	5.994
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		14,185.92	23,029.29	1.314	2.132	11.275	6.217
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		13,895.59	24,905.27	1.287	2.306	10.941	7.082

2005 AADT

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Existing Lanes	Improved # of lanes	BASE YEAR CAPACITY	2005 Actual AADT	2005 AADT	2035 AADT	Current Congestion Rate	Future Congestion Rate	Current Congestion Score	Future Congestion Score
									S/Q	T/Q		
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		21,766.60	34,970.52	2.015	3.238	20.000	11.726
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600	8700; 7600	16,751.68	30,045.68	1.948	3.494	19.160	13.000
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	2	5	14600	17000	21,552.83	31,927.23	1.476	2.187	13.297	6.488
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800	9000	18,392.65	26,497.27	1.703	2.453	16.117	7.817
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		21,271.57	28,822.47	1.970	2.669	19.430	8.890
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		16,388.83	23,540.77	1.517	2.180	13.810	6.453
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		19,495.74	26,757.04	1.805	2.478	17.386	7.937
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600	13600	11,218.38	20,663.87	1.304	2.403	11.162	7.564
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	2	5	8600		11,515.72	18,672.44	1.339	2.171	11.592	6.411
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		14,451.46	21,635.86	1.338	2.003	11.580	5.574
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600	2700; 5000; 6300	9,953.72	18,706.55	1.157	2.175	9.334	6.430
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800	9000	15,745.53	25,467.82	1.458	2.358	13.070	7.342
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800	10200; 11100	11,308.92	25,769.77	1.047	2.386	7.963	7.481
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	5	8600		10,351.77	17,457.84	1.204	2.030	9.910	5.707
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		10,787.26	24,944.94	0.999	2.310	7.363	7.101
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		12,491.72	19,890.73	1.157	1.842	9.325	4.769
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	2	5	14600		18,250.93	27,450.03	1.250	1.880	10.486	4.960
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		11,844.53	22,546.85	1.097	2.088	8.580	5.994
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		14,185.92	23,029.29	1.314	2.132	11.275	6.217
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	2	5	10800		13,895.59	24,905.27	1.287	2.306	10.941	7.082

Economic Development

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Economic Development Assessment	Economic Development Score	Environmental Impact Assessment	Environmental Impact Score	Safety	Public Safety Score	Per cent Trucks	Truck Traffic	Truck Traffic Score	PQI	PQI Score	Right of Way Preservation
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	1,306	5.273	3.14	1.86	8
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,843	8.000	2.83	2.17	8
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	0	0	5	6.857	3	6	7%	1,509	6.303	2.43	2.57	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	3	6	6%	1,104	4.244	3.88	1.12	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	17	0.000	2	4	6%	1,276	5.122	3.84	1.16	8
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	983	3.633	2.01	2.99	8
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	15	1.143	3	6	6%	1,170	4.580	2.84	2.16	8
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	11%	1,234	4.907	3.00	2.00	8
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	0	0	10	4.000	5	10	11%	1,267	5.073	3.19	1.81	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	6%	867	3.042	3.49	1.51	8
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	7	5.714	5	10	11%	1,095	4.200	2.71	2.29	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	1	2	6%	945	3.437	2.64	2.36	8
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	679	2.084	2.66	2.34	8
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	4	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,139	4.423	2.89	2.11	8
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	5	6.857	5	10	6%	647	1.925	3.10	1.90	8
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	750	2.445	3.63	1.37	8
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	0	0	8	5.143	2	4	7%	1,278	5.128	3.91	1.09	8
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	4	8	6%	711	2.248	2.59	2.41	8
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	7	5.714	2	4	6%	851	2.961	3.32	1.68	8
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	2	4	6%	834	2.873	3.69	1.31	8

Environmental Impact Assessment

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Economic Development Assessment	Economic Development Score	Environmental Impact Assessment	Environmental Impact Score	Safety	Public Safety Score	Per cent Trucks	Truck Traffic	Truck Traffic Score	PQI	PQI Score	Right of Way Preservation
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	1,306	5.273	3.14	1.86	8
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,843	8.000	2.83	2.17	8
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	0	0	5	6.857	3	6	7%	1,509	6.303	2.43	2.57	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	3	6	6%	1,104	4.244	3.88	1.12	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	17	0.000	2	4	6%	1,276	5.122	3.84	1.16	8
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	983	3.633	2.01	2.99	8
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	15	1.143	3	6	6%	1,170	4.580	2.84	2.16	8
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	11%	1,234	4.907	3.00	2.00	8
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	0	0	10	4.000	5	10	11%	1,267	5.073	3.19	1.81	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	6%	867	3.042	3.49	1.51	8
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	7	5.714	5	10	11%	1,095	4.200	2.71	2.29	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	1	2	6%	945	3.437	2.64	2.36	8
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	679	2.084	2.66	2.34	8
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	4	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,139	4.423	2.89	2.11	8
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	5	6.857	5	10	6%	647	1.925	3.10	1.90	8
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	750	2.445	3.63	1.37	8
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	0	0	8	5.143	2	4	7%	1,278	5.128	3.91	1.09	8
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	4	8	6%	711	2.248	2.59	2.41	8
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	7	5.714	2	4	6%	851	2.961	3.32	1.68	8
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	2	4	6%	834	2.873	3.69	1.31	8

Public Safety

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Economic Development Assessment	Economic Development Score	Environmental Impact Assessment	Environmental Impact Score	Safety	Public Safety Score	Per cent Trucks	Truck Traffic	Truck Traffic Score	PQI	PQI Score	Right of Way Preservation
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	1,306	5.273	3.14	1.86	8
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,843	8.000	2.83	2.17	8
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	0	0	5	6.857	3	6	7%	1,509	6.303	2.43	2.57	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	3	6	6%	1,104	4.244	3.88	1.12	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	17	0.000	2	4	6%	1,276	5.122	3.84	1.16	8
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	983	3.633	2.01	2.99	8
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	15	1.143	3	6	6%	1,170	4.580	2.84	2.16	8
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	11%	1,234	4.907	3.00	2.00	8
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	0	0	10	4.000	5	10	11%	1,267	5.073	3.19	1.81	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	6%	867	3.042	3.49	1.51	8
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	7	5.714	5	10	11%	1,095	4.200	2.71	2.29	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	1	2	6%	945	3.437	2.64	2.36	8
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	679	2.084	2.66	2.34	8
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	4	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,139	4.423	2.89	2.11	8
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	5	6.857	5	10	6%	647	1.925	3.10	1.90	8
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	750	2.445	3.63	1.37	8
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	0	0	8	5.143	2	4	7%	1,278	5.128	3.91	1.09	8
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	4	8	6%	711	2.248	2.59	2.41	8
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	7	5.714	2	4	6%	851	2.961	3.32	1.68	8
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	2	4	6%	834	2.873	3.69	1.31	8

Truck Traffic

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Economic Development Assessment	Economic Development Score	Environmental Impact Assessment	Environmental Impact Score	Safety	Public Safety Score	Per cent Trucks	Truck Traffic	Truck Traffic Score	PQI	PQI Score	Right of Way Preservation
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	1,306	5.273	3.14	1.86	8
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,843	8.000	2.83	2.17	8
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	0	0	5	6.857	3	6	7%	1,509	6.303	2.43	2.57	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	3	6	6%	1,104	4.244	3.88	1.12	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	17	0.000	2	4	6%	1,276	5.122	3.84	1.16	8
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	983	3.633	2.01	2.99	8
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	15	1.143	3	6	6%	1,170	4.580	2.84	2.16	8
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	11%	1,234	4.907	3.00	2.00	8
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	0	0	10	4.000	5	10	11%	1,267	5.073	3.19	1.81	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	6%	867	3.042	3.49	1.51	8
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	7	5.714	5	10	11%	1,095	4.200	2.71	2.29	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	1	2	6%	945	3.437	2.64	2.36	8
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	679	2.084	2.66	2.34	8
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	4	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,139	4.423	2.89	2.11	8
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	5	6.857	5	10	6%	647	1.925	3.10	1.90	8
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	750	2.445	3.63	1.37	8
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	0	0	8	5.143	2	4	7%	1,278	5.128	3.91	1.09	8
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	4	8	6%	711	2.248	2.59	2.41	8
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	7	5.714	2	4	6%	851	2.961	3.32	1.68	8
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	2	4	6%	834	2.873	3.69	1.31	8

Pavement Quality Index (PQI)

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Economic Development Assessment	Economic Development Score	Environmental Impact Assessment	Environmental Impact Score	Safety	Public Safety Score	Per cent Trucks	Truck Traffic	Truck Traffic Score	PQI	PQI Score	Right of Way Preservation
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	1,306	5.273	3.14	1.86	8
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,843	8.000	2.83	2.17	8
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	0	0	5	6.857	3	6	7%	1,509	6.303	2.43	2.57	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	3	6	6%	1,104	4.244	3.88	1.12	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	17	0.000	2	4	6%	1,276	5.122	3.84	1.16	8
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	983	3.633	2.01	2.99	8
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	15	1.143	3	6	6%	1,170	4.580	2.84	2.16	8
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	11%	1,234	4.907	3.00	2.00	8
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	0	0	10	4.000	5	10	11%	1,267	5.073	3.19	1.81	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	6%	867	3.042	3.49	1.51	8
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	7	5.714	5	10	11%	1,095	4.200	2.71	2.29	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	1	2	6%	945	3.437	2.64	2.36	8
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	679	2.084	2.66	2.34	8
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	4	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,139	4.423	2.89	2.11	8
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	5	6.857	5	10	6%	647	1.925	3.10	1.90	8
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	750	2.445	3.63	1.37	8
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	0	0	8	5.143	2	4	7%	1,278	5.128	3.91	1.09	8
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	4	8	6%	711	2.248	2.59	2.41	8
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	7	5.714	2	4	6%	851	2.961	3.32	1.68	8
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	2	4	6%	834	2.873	3.69	1.31	8

Right-of-Way Preservation

Route Name	County	Functional Classification	Economic Development Assessment	Economic Development Score	Environmental Impact Assessment	Environmental Impact Score	Safety	Public Safety Score	Per cent Trucks	Truck Traffic	Truck Traffic Score	PQI	PQI Score	Right of Way Preservation
Two Notch Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	1,306	5.273	3.14	1.86	8
Longs Pond Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,843	8.000	2.83	2.17	8
West Main Street	Lexington	PrincipalArterial	0	0	5	6.857	3	6	7%	1,509	6.303	2.43	2.57	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	3	6	6%	1,104	4.244	3.88	1.12	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	17	0.000	2	4	6%	1,276	5.122	3.84	1.16	8
Leesburg Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	11	3.429	5	10	6%	983	3.633	2.01	2.99	8
Sunset Drive	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	15	1.143	3	6	6%	1,170	4.580	2.84	2.16	8
South Lake Drive	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	11%	1,234	4.907	3.00	2.00	8
Kennerly Road	Richland	Collector	0	0	10	4.000	5	10	11%	1,267	5.073	3.19	1.81	8
Hard Scrabble	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	5	10	6%	867	3.042	3.49	1.51	8
Two Notch Road	Lexington	MajorCollector	0	0	7	5.714	5	10	11%	1,095	4.200	2.71	2.29	8
Edmund Highway	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	1	2	6%	945	3.437	2.64	2.36	8
Platt Springs Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	679	2.084	2.66	2.34	8
Old State Road	Calhoun/Lexington	MajorCollector	2	4	11	3.429	3	6	11%	1,139	4.423	2.89	2.11	8
North Lake Drive	Richland/Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	5	6.857	5	10	6%	647	1.925	3.10	1.90	8
Fish Hatchery Road	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	8	5.143	5	10	6%	750	2.445	3.63	1.37	8
Jefferson Davis Hwy	Kershaw	PrincipalArterial	0	0	8	5.143	2	4	7%	1,278	5.128	3.91	1.09	8
Broad River Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	6	6.286	4	8	6%	711	2.248	2.59	2.41	8
Percival Road	Richland	MinorArterial	0	0	7	5.714	2	4	6%	851	2.961	3.32	1.68	8
Columbia Avenue	Lexington	MinorArterial	0	0	9	4.571	2	4	6%	834	2.873	3.69	1.31	8

Where do we go from here?

1. Take one-half of the funds allocated for the two-lane widening projects and budget those funds for Congestion Management.
2. Fix any data needing attention in the two-lane widening calculations.
3. Submit the **2035 Plan** in time to avoid any problems with the Federal Highway Administration.
4. After successful submission of the **2035 Plan** revisit the COATS Transportation Planning process.