

**2014 Lexington County
Penny for Progress Commission
Meeting #005 Minutes**

Date/Time: March 6, 2014 / 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

Members Attending:

Mike Crapps, Chairman
Sammy Hendrix, Vice Chairman
Lee Bussell

Jimmy Shealy
Larry Stroud
Frank Shumpert

Also attending: Jeff Anderson, County Attorney and Kim Stutts with Lexington County Council; Ryan Slattery and Kyle Clampitt 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 10:02 am by Chairman Crapps.

1. Approval of December 5, 2013 Minutes
 - a. Motion by Mr. Stroud, 2nd by Mr. Hendrix to approve the minutes as received.
 - b. Motion Carried 6-0 as presented.
2. Penny for Progress Example Scoring Session Results
 - a. Chairman Crapps provided an overview of the intent of the example scoring projects process conducted. Chairman Crapps then turned over the detailed discussion of the example scoring process to Mr. Slattery. Mr. Slattery listed the type of projects that were scored as part of this example scoring which were



from projects outside of Lexington County. The projects were scored based on the approved scoring criteria for Lexington County. Mr. Slattery noted that due to the number of projects submitted (139 total projects with 398 total individual projects) the projects scored were very close in their results. Mr. Slattery recommended the Commission score the projects down to the tenths of a point and further recommended a more detailed gradation of the scoring. Mr. Slattery suggested that each category has a very clear breakdown of the point system and that the Commission is in agreement with this breakdown. In addition, public entities who submitted projects are being asked to go back and score their projects with these criteria in mind. Mr. Slattery then referenced the Commission to specific questions within the Submission Checklist and how each area addresses the scoring criterion.

- b. Mr. Stroud asked what role Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. could play in assisting with scoring of the Readiness to Proceed section. Mr. Slattery stated Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. is available to assist, but further inferred that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. could not be part of the scoring. Mr. Slattery noted that this should be made clear after the vetting process.
- c. Mr. Stroud requested clarification as to the intent/need to score the projects to the tenth. Mr. Slattery stated that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. feels that with the sheer number of projects submitted, it would afford the Commission to distinguish differences in the projects and limit the number of ties.
- d. Chairman Crapps stated he felt the ranking of projects by the public entities should be given credence to help the Commission in the ranking process. In addition, Chairman Crapps pointed out the reference by Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. that the scoring was conducted in an optimistic fashion, inferring the projects were scored too high demonstrating the need for the scoring gradation. Mr. Slattery confirmed this to be the case.



- e. Mr. Stroud asked if the Commission will be receiving ranking of the projects from each Eligible Entity. Mr. Slattery stated this would be provided with each eligible entity project submissions in both letter and in the spreadsheet that would be provided to the Commissioners.
 - f. Chairman Crapps thanked the Commission in advance for the time and hard work that will go into this process of ranking the projects over the next few months.
3. Request to Delay Project Submission Due Date to February 6, 2014
 - a. Ratification of the extension of the project submittal deadline due to weather conditions from January 30, 2014 to February 6, 2014. Motion by Hendrix and 2nd by Bussell. Motion Carried 6-0.
 4. Penny for Progress Received Project Submission Summary
 - a. Mr. Slattery stated the list will be available once each project has been reviewed and the project costs would be further reviewed. 139 project submittals in the total amount of approximately \$772,000,000 from 24 eligible public entities within Lexington County. Mr. Slattery then listed those entities which submitted projects. Mr. Slattery stated that some of the projects were submitted as a group project. Should those projects be broken out separately, there would be 398 individual project submissions. Mr. Slattery then provided a breakdown by project type with total cost for each category. Projects should include 10% contingency, 3% bonding contingency, and 3% materials cost increase as part of the project estimates. Mr. Slattery stated that Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. is in the process of requesting additional information from each of the entities and will provide the binders to each of the Commission members in groups as they become available. The project submissions will be provided in a 3-ring binder to the Commission. The entities are being requested to respond to the request for additional information within two (2) weeks of the request for more information. Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. is projecting that the



first round of projects will be provided to the Commission by the end of this month.

5. Engineer's Report

- a. Mr. Slattery stated the 139 project submittals are in the review process by Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. and this review will be complete prior to the next meeting, where the total list of projects and costs will be presented. Presentations are being conducted by Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc. to provide information on the Penny for Progress process. These groups include Rotaries, Chambers, Municipalities, Political Groups, etc.
- b. Mr. Bussell requested how the information will be provided, electronic or hard copy. Mr. Slattery stated it is up to the Commission members as to how they would prefer to receive the information, but the plan is to provide hard copies to each Commissioner.

6. New Business

- a. No new business

7. Public Comment

- o Lyle Campbell, citizen representing Kleckley Colony Home Owners Association, stated he had concerns with the Ingress/Egress along Corley Mill Road for their subdivision. Mr. Campbell cited there were 30 occupied houses, 6 under construction, and total of 64 homes at full build out. Mr. Campbell stated that Lee Kleckley Court provides access to Kleckley Colony and in his opinion, the road is in disrepair. Mr. Campbell requested that this road is repaired as part of the Penny for Progress projects.

8. Adjourn

- o Motion by Mr. Stroud, 2nd by Mr. Shumpert to Adjourn at 10:33am. Motion Carried 6-0.

