

**2014 Lexington County
Penny for Progress Commission
Meeting #004 Minutes**

Date/Time: December 5, 2013 / 10 A.M.

Place: Lexington County Council Chambers
212 South Lake Drive, 2nd Floor
Lexington, South Carolina 29072

Reference: Lexington County Penny for Progress Commission Master Plan for the 2014 General Election in Lexington County, South Carolina

Project No.: 13175-0032

Agenda Items:

Members Attending:

Mike Crapps, Chairman
Sammy Hendrix, Vice Chairman
Lee Bussell

Jimmy Shealy
Larry Stroud
Frank Shumpert

Also attending: Diana Burnett and Kim Stutts with Lexington County Council; Jamie Frost, Ryan Slattery, and Rebecca Breland with Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc.; 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.

Note: The following meeting proceedings can be viewed in its entirety on the Lexington County Video Portal at www.lex-co.sc.gov.

The Meeting was called to order at 10:04 am by Chairman Crapps.

1. Approval of November 7, 2013 Minutes
 - Motion by Mr. Bussell, 2nd by Vice Chairman Hendrix to approve the minutes as received.
 - Motion Carried 6-0 as presented.
2. Penny for Progress Commissioner Example Scoring Session
 - Chairman Crapps explained that the commission has been provided example project submittals from past Penny for Progress projects in other counties in



order to prepare the commission members for the task of reviewing and scoring the projects that will be submitted.

- Mr. Slattery stated that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. has provided five (5) different types of projects: Economic development, water line, infrastructure, renovation to town hall, very small town hall renovation, and recreational project from previous Master Plans that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. has been involved in in the past.
- The purpose of providing these projects is to illustrate that there are several different types of projects that will be submitted and to give an opportunity to review the projects and sample scoring of the example projects.
- Mr. Slattery recommended that the commissioners review each project in its entirety prior to scoring each of the projects.
- Mr. Slattery reviewed the 80 point scoring criteria and encouraged the commissioners to review the scoring criteria with the sample projects to become familiar with the process.
- Chairman Crapps reiterated the purpose of the sample projects to prepare for how the commissioners will evaluate and score the projects that will be submitted next year. Chairman Crapps suggested that the commission review the six (6) scoring criteria one at a time to discuss how each project would be scored. Chairman Crapps asked the commissioners how each commissioner would evaluate each project on “Direct Economic Impact” scoring criteria.
- Mr. Stroud requested that Mr. Slattery provide a synopsis of the five (5) projects that had been provided.
- Mr. Slattery summarized Project 1: Industrial Park infrastructure improvements to a 52-acre parcel. Requesting matching funds on a grant they had received to complete the project for water, wastewater, and roadway improvements to serve an Industrial Park. \$1.5 Million request.
- Vice Chairman Hendrix inquired about the scoring criteria for Project 1.
- Chairman Crapps inquired about the readiness to proceed of Project 1.
- Mr. Slattery stated that all plans, permits, and right-of-way had been obtained for Project 1.
- Mr. Slattery summarized Project 2: Water line transmission replacement. Project amount \$6,000,000. Requesting \$3,500,000 for ten (10) miles of Ductile Iron Pipe water line construction. Project will last fifty (50) years. Will serve the County seat and nearby municipalities. Plans and permitting had not been initiated for this project. All right-of-way had not been obtained for the project. The project will serve 30-40% of the county from a land mass perspective.
- Mr. Bussell inquired if Project 2 is sufficient for industrial and residential use.



- Mr. Slattery stated that the proposed Project 2 is sufficient for both uses.
- Mr. Bussell inquired if there is sewer included in the project submission and if sewer is already in place.
- Mr. Slattery stated that there is already sewer in place.
- Mr. Stroud inquired how the entity would go about obtaining right-of-way.
- Mr. Slattery explained the steps to obtain the right-of-way depending on funding source.
- Mr. Stroud inquired what happens if lack of right-of-way can cause a project to “derail”.
- Mr. Slattery explained that it is possible that lack of right-of-way can cause delays to a project.
- Mr. Shumpert inquired if after a certain amount of time it is obvious that a particular project does not have the appropriate right-of-way and is not viable to move forward.
- Mr. Slattery stated that it is important to have contingent projects at the end of the ballot in the event that projects on the ballot do not occur.
- Mr. Bussell inquired about establishing time frame for obtaining the right-of-way.
- Mr. Slattery stated that you would need to start the project with design, right-of-way acquisition, etc. and depending on the funding source and how the project is bonded, if the project could not be completed due to right-of-way the project would be terminated.
- Chairman Crapps inquired if projects could not be completed by the end of the seven (7) years could the contingent projects be funded at the point in the process.
- Mr. Slattery responded that those contingent projects could be funded.
- Mr. Slattery added that if the right-of-way acquisition process is complete and inconclusive then that particular project would need to be closed.
- Chairman Crapps asked who determines that a project on the ballot cannot move forward due to lack of right-of-way.
- Mr. Slattery stated that it would be the responsible of the submitting entity. The submitting entity would make that decision based on their ability to proceed.
- Mr. Shumpert inquired if a five (5) year deadline could be placed for entities to obtain right-of-way, and if not obtained then the project will be moved to contingent.



- Mr. Slattery recommended that if the Commission has questions regarding right-of-way acquisition of a project, the Commission has the opportunity to go back and ask those questions of the submitting entity. There is the opportunity to score the projects based on the Readiness to Proceed. Mr. Slattery states there are three (3) questions on the Submission Checklist that acknowledge these questions.
- Mr. Stroud stated that there is some confusion on what “readiness to proceed” means and how to evaluate those criteria.
- Chairman Crapps acknowledged the struggle for scoring the projects.
- Mr. Bussell inquired if Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. will be providing guidance on the likelihood of a project acquiring the necessary right-of-way.
- Mr. Slattery stated that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. can inform the Commission on the process but cannot weigh in on the possibility of them acquiring the right-of-way.
- Mr. Bussell inquired what Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. will be doing to obtain the necessary data to fulfill the Readiness to Proceed criteria.
- Chairman Crapps explained how he would evaluate the two (2) projects that have been discussed to this point.
- Mr. Stroud inquired if when Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. team is reviewing the projects and sees one without right-of-way can the team automatically go back to the submitting entity to obtain more information on the entity will acquire the right-of-way.
- Mr. Slattery explained that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. will be working with the entities prior to January 30, 2014 to get as much information to fulfill the Readiness to Proceed criteria. That is the purpose of the two (2) month time frame between when the submittals are in and scoring begins.
- Mr. Hendrix acknowledged that many of the questions are addressed in the Submission Checklist.
- Mr. Slattery summarized Project 3: City Hall Renovation of an existing building. New lobby, restroom, conference room. Provide ADA accessibility. Update non-compliant plumbing, electric, HVAC. \$720,000 request for addition and renovation of a City Hall. No plans completed but property is available.
- Mr. Slattery summarized Project 4: Town Hall Renovation. Requesting \$366,000 for new construction. Evidence rooms not up to state standard, ADA, HVAC, Electrical, secure office for collecting funds and paying traffic tickets, additional parking space.



- Mr. Slattery summarized Project 5: Recreation Improvement to state park facility. Additional parking and pedestrian access. Entrance Signs, gravel and ADA compliant parking area. \$163,000.
- There are other examples like roadway, cultural, that are not in the example, but to consider water line project similar to a linear roadway project that requires right-of-way.
- Chairman Crapps suggested to the commission to discuss how to evaluate each criteria for each different project. Also suggested that the commissioners take these projects and score them separately and provide scoring to Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. to compile.
- Mr. Bussell inquired if other commissions determine how much of each type of project will be selected.
- Mr. Slattery explained it is not typical but that there have been situations in which counties have chosen to focus on specific areas such as transportation; however this is for the commission to determine.
- Mr. Hendrix inquired if Florence did this by choice.
- Mr. Slattery stated that Florence County did not go through as much public outreach as this commission is doing.
- Chairman Crapps chose Community Impact and asked the commission to discuss how each commissioner may interpret the Community Impact.
- Mr. Bussell explained that he does not consider Community Impact from a geographical perspective as much as from an economic development impact that create jobs and tax revenue. The Marion County Industrial Park would be graded higher from the Community Impact view than the Newberry water project.
- Vice Chairman Hendrix explained that he would view the Town of Sellers project to have a high Community Impact. Considering the size of Sellers, that project would be a big impact to that particular Community.
- Mr. Stroud stated that for some of the smaller projects that may not have a five or six county impact but may provide an improved quality of life for those communities.
- Mr. Shumpert the Community Impact of a recreational project that may not cost a lot of money but may have a large impact such as the (Lake Murray) Dam.
- Chairman Crapps asked how the commission would grade the Community Impact for each of these sample projects.
- Mr. Stroud stated that he would view them in the 18-20 point range.
- Mr. Shumpert inquired if the improvements at the Marion County Industrial Park ensure job creation.



- Mr. Slattery explained that there is nothing contingent on the improvements at the Industrial Park.
- Mr. Shumpert stated that the Marion project is a “if you build it, you hope they will come”.
- Chairman Crapps noted that the project submission stated that revenue would be created through economic development however it could not be determined at that time.
- Mr. Hendrix stated that the question is how do you grade on Community Impact versus Economic Impact?
- Mr. Slattery explained that in the particular case, there has been investment made since the improvements have been completed because of the readiness to proceed.
- Mr. Bussell mentioned the Saxe Gotha Industrial Park and that the companies that are located there now were not looking when the infrastructure was constructed there. He continued to explain the importance of having the infrastructure because if you do not put money in to these types of projects, the projects will not locate in your county due to the fast track timelines that companies have when choosing a location. “Don’t build it and they won’t come”
- Chairman Crapps felt like his higher scores in Economic Impact went to the City of Newberry and Marion and his lower scores went to the town halls for that particular scoring criteria.
- Mr. Bussell commented that in some instances community and economic impact may balance each other out.
- Vice Chairman Hendrix inquired once scoring is completed on all projects does that determine how the projects will be prioritized.
- Mr. Slattery explained that will be the start but there will be an opportunity to call back in the submitting entity and get additional information. The Submitting entities will also rank their own projects which should help in the Commissioner’s evaluation. There will also be an opportunity to discuss the option of reducing the scope of the projecting with the entities.
- Vice Chairman Hendrix asked if the other counties that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. has worked with been able to spread projects around the county.
- Mr. Slattery responded that they have been successful in accomplishing this.
- Mr. Shumpert inquired how you would score innovation and return on investment for a project like a Town Hall renovation.



- Mr. Slattery explained that there can be improvements to energy efficiency and improved the practices in the use of the space. Removed a lot of the asbestos and other hazardous materials.
- Mr. Stroud inquired if projects that have made the ballot in other counties have been successful.
- Mr. Slattery encouraged Mr. Stroud to look further into the success of projects in other counties.
- Chairman Crapps asked the Commission for feedback on the exercise of reviewing the projects.
- Mr. Shumpert stated that he would like to come together and go through the scoring criteria as a group.
- Chairman Crapps recommended that each commission member review the projects and submit the scoring to Mr. Slattery by January 5, 2014 to compile and further discuss in February's meeting.

3. Engineer's Report

- Mr. Slattery stated that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. has held a series of fifteen (15) workshops in the month of November with additional six (6) meetings; additional meetings are scheduled to assist entities with their submission checklist.
- Many of the projects will be submitted by other engineering firms or the entities themselves.
- The architecture component of the projects may carry-on longer than the Jan. 30 deadline. Vertically integrated projects may take some time longer past the submittal deadline but will include a placeholder cost for those services.
- This was the first phase of workshops and there will be another phase of workshops once the commission determines the ballot questions. Mr. Slattery noted that the Penny for Progress website contains all of the information provided at the workshops.
- Mr. Slattery reviews FAQ's.
 - Concerns on having to have right-of-way. Entities do not have to have the right-of-way or purchase agreement in hand but it will affect the "Readiness to Proceed" scoring.
- Held an engineering firm workshop and a question of who administers the funds if the ballot is passed.
 - A question regarding who is responsible for administering the funds, each municipality and entity will administer the funds for each of their projects.



- Questions on what can be included in regards to equipment.
 - The Penny for Progress does not include stand-alone equipment.
 - Mr. Slattery states for the next two (2) months Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. will be working to assist with maps and cost estimates for the submissions.
 - Mr. Hendrix inquired who administers the funds?
 - Mr. Slattery replied that the county distributes the funds but the administration of the funds will be by the entity or municipality; money is not comingled with other county funds.
 - Mr. Bussell inquired if other counties have bonded the funds or if it will be a pay as you go.
 - Mr. Slattery responded that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. staff will be coordinating with Jeff Anderson to determine what portion of the funds can be bonded through the County's bond council.
 - Chairman Crapps requests that Mr. Slattery review the schedule following the Jan. 30 deadline.
 - Mr. Slattery explained that the two (2) months following the deadline submission, Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. will be continuing to review the submissions come April 2014 the Commission will have all projects ready to be scored.
 - Mr. Shumpert inquired what will be accomplished during the month of June.
 - Mr. Slattery stated that the Commission will likely have the draft ballot completed for submittal to County Council for three (3) readings and a public hearing; County Council cannot change the ballot.
4. New Business
- None
5. Public Comment
- None
6. Adjourn
- Motion by Vice Chairman Hendrix, 2nd by Mr. Stroud to Adjourn at 11:00 AM. Motion Carried 6-0.

