

MINUTES
GPATS STUDY TEAM COMMITTEE
September 24, 2018
Suite 400 – County Square
10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Keith Brockington, Dyke Spencer, Patrea St. John, Jon Caime, Greg Gordos, Shawn Bell, Skip Limbaker, Jason Knudsen, Ronda Sloan, Pete Knudsen, Mike Holden, Todd Steadman, Blake Sanders, Valerie Holmes, Rick Wyatt, and David Burgess.

OTHERS PRESENT: S. Holt, C. Link, J. Keel, K. Larimore, H. Gamble, A. Ikein, S. Amell, E. Hailey, J. Parkey, B. Hansley, A. Reid, D. Montgomery, T. Gibbs, J. Mustar, and E. Dillion.

CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME

Keith Brockington called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

Keith Brockington welcomed all in attendance and requested those in attendance to introduce themselves.

SCDOT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Erica Hailey addressed Study Team members with a brief update of projects which were included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Brockington advised the Woodruff Road Congestion Project will be on hold until February 2019 due to State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) funding. A meeting is scheduled for GPATS and SCDOT to speak with Ron Patton on October 2, 2018 and discuss the submitted application. Mr. Larimore brought to members attention how there is a lawsuit pending and no funds will be released until the lawsuit is settled. A question was asked if additional funds have been identified which would go to the project should it be approved. Mr. Brockington stated the scope in the LRTP only put 39 million towards it. When it was brought into the TIP it ended up being 41 million.

Ms. Hailey made herself available for any questions.

GPATS BY-LAWS CONSOLIDATION AND UPDATE

Mr. Brockington advised members the by-laws were unchanged from last meeting but were tabled by Policy Committee. This will still be on the upcoming Policy Committee agenda.

Recommendations: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections from the members to pass recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. No objections or questions by consensus.

GPATS PERFORMANCE MEASURES UPDATE

Ms. Hansley addressed the members regarding GPATS Performance Measures required by the FAST Act. Documents of the Performance Measures and the TIP amendment were passed around to members for their viewing. The following are the measures and targets to be presented at the upcoming Policy Committee meeting with the Study Team recommendations to adopt the State's targets.

- Infrastructure Condition
- System and Freight Reliability
- Transit Asset Management

She advised GPATS needs to do an update to the TIP document and the LRTP; to explain how all the financial decisions are made based on trying to meet or match one or more of these targets. Hardcopies of the LRTP were sent around to Study Team members to view. Mr. Larimore advised there is no penalty for not reaching set targets; however, there is a penalty for not setting targets.

Recommendation: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections from the members to pass LRTP amendment recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. No objections or questions by consensus.

Recommendation: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections from the members to pass TIP document amendment recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. No objections or questions by consensus.

FTA SECTION 5310 APPLICATIONS

Mr. Ikein addressed the members only two applications for the FTA Section 5310 Funding for Elderly, Disabled, and Job Access service were received. He advised there is 1.4 million dollars available. First applicant, Turning Point of SC, applied for \$150,301 with a local match of \$49,355. Next applicant, Senior Solutions, applied for \$440,000 with a local match of \$139,000. The Transit Coordinating Committee (TCC) met and approved both projects with a recommendation to hold 10% of 5310 funds for administrative services for coordinating Human Services in the region and potentially throughout the state.

Recommendation: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections from the members to pass holding the 10% from 5310 Funding recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. After a brief discussion there were no objections by consensus.

Recommendation: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections from the members to pass adding the Turning Point of SC and Senior Solutions to the GPATS TIP document recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. No objections or questions by consensus.

GPATS TIP 2018 – 2023 AMENDMENT AC #4

Mr. Brockington advised members of two changes to the GPATS Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Fiscal Years 2018 through 2023 provided in their agenda packet. Mr. Brockington requested Mr. Larimore to update members regarding the Interstate Bridge Project. Mr. Larimore stated funds of 45.2 million are being set aside for the Rocky Creek and I-85 Project and funding will be strictly from the Interstate Bridge funds. He advised there will be no GPATS funds used for this project and how a recommendation is needed to expedite this to the Policy Committee for their approval to avoid interruptions with traffic.

Recommendation: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections from the members to pass recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. No objections or questions by consensus.

UPWP SPECIAL PROJECT ENDORSEMENTS

Mr. Brockington advised members of two Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Projects to be added. Mr. Brockington requested Mr. Steadman to speak about the Automated Transportation Network (ATN) Feasibility Report sent in their agenda packet. Mr. Steadman recalled the Study Team did not support funding for this study; when it first went to the Policy Committee. Policy Committee redistributed funds to be shared among all groups and approved to give this study approximately 23 thousand dollars. Mr. Steadman advised he sat in on one ATN meeting with Clemson University officials, Clemson City officials, and members of the Study Team. He stated he did a fairly harsh edit on the first draft of the sixty-five page report in regards to many issues which were inconsistent, unclear, or inaccurate. Very few of those concerns or issues were reflected in the final report. Mr. Steadman stated his position to this report is the ATNs remain a valid opinion for our region and with the exception of the cost modeling which is reflected in this study; this includes what they projected as operation cost, capital cost, and even revenue models. The study does advance the concept of ATNs and points towards the need for more inclusive and detail study with an emphasis on cost. He stated in defense of this study this is emerging technology and there is nothing like this in the United States from which to extrapolate cost and makes it a challenge for anybody. The specific criticism of the report, beside the veracity of the financials, is the team viewing it was very presumptive when it came to the University; and they probably did more harm than good to get the University being partnered in the project because of the way it was handled. He advised he spoke very frankly with Councilmember Payne, who is the lead charge in this from GPATS stand point, in much greater detail than what was

just shared with the Study Team. He stated he advised Councilmember Payne how he recommended to the study revealed the need for additional study. He does not endorse the report due to he finds flaws in the report from the factual and cost stand point, but it does provide some good information in regards to how this would benefit the region. He advised he is not sure where to go from here because he does not support the report due to the facts and figures. A question was raised to Mr. Steadman regarding what would a follow-up study entail. Mr. Steadman personally would recommend, from a conversation he had with Keith Moody, with regret on this and was prior to realizing they had not been as inclusive as they had indicated with the University. They had identified a couple of routes they thought would make sense to get realistic about cost of implementing to operate of one of these routes. From his observation, there is no exporting this out in the field. It is new and basically you would have to pay somebody to go to school for this and learn what is working. He stated there are a lot of these systems in the Mideast and Asia and we can learn about these systems; try to determine what about those systems would cost to implement and operate here. It will take a lot or research and time. He advised to pick a portion or a segment of this transportation system and try to drill down and get realistic on the cost.

Another question was raised regarding what was the intended output of this study. Mr. Steadman answered the idea was a study would need to be done to come up with a proposed route, in this case there was three routes Greenville, City of Clemson, Clemson University, and some surrounding areas across the lake; then to take those route maps and come up with realistic cost to implement and operate. Also, to look at some alternatives whether gondolas or pod systems. He still believes this still needs to be done and was not accomplished in this study. He thinks they did come up with the route system. When asked why they had 47 stops in City of Clemson and they admitted some of these stops were not necessary. He advised he inquired why they are then in the study. They had for the entire system for the City of Clemson at 153 million; then looked at a smaller portion that involved the University and some adjoining property which had 8 stops at the cost of 119 million. He questioned where the study was coming up with these numbers and stated they never responded. A question was asked if GPATS can go back to the consultant and ask for study to be more accurate. Mr. Steadman replied he agreed and asked this same question about six weeks ago when he saw the first draft and by his edits advising these numbers do not match-up. He said when the final study came back the numbers were way different. He continued he does not believe in this study.

Another question was asked as to who was the lead force in this study. Mr. Brockington advised Councilmember Payne with the Policy Committee and how there were a few with County of Greenville who also assisted Councilmember Payne. He stated he helped Councilmember Payne with the refinement of the application.

Mr. Steadman added how he attended one meeting were there was one representative maybe two from the University, City Administrator, and the Mayor. He advised this was the only meeting he was involved with and had no other conversation with Councilmember Payne on this. He continued Councilmember Payne and the Study Team were the ones reaching out to the University and there was a complete study for City of Greenville as well. Mr. Brockington asked Mr. Keel from Greenlink if Alex John was involved with the study. Mr. Keel advised he vaguely remembers him being involved. The concern was raised among members regarding the success of potential future studies given current political agendas.

Mr. Steadman requested Mr. Brockington for when the ATN Feasibility Report is presented to Policy Committee to convey the Study Team believes in the ATN concept and values for this type of study which continues to be important and is supported by the Study Team; however, the Study Team has an issue with this particular study.

Mr. Brockington is going to draft a statement for the Study Team members to review before submitting to Policy Committee with their concerns regarding the ATN Feasibility Report. The approved statement will be placed in the Policy Committee memo for the upcoming meeting on October 15, 2018.

Mr. Larimore inquired if full payment has been paid for this study. Mr. Brockington replied all invoices had been received and has been fully paid out of the PL. Mr. Larimore stated unless the scope has significantly changed you would not be able to repeat federal funding on the same exact project. This would not be able to be reissued in the UPWP two years later for another report. He advised if possible to place these extra concerns in the drafted memo. He then suggested having the consultant revisit the scope and meet with more public involvement.

Recommendation: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections on the ATN Feasibility Report from the members to pass recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. After further discussions the Study Team agreed no recommendation due to significant objections and the Study Team Chair will explained to the Policy Committee of these objections and concerns.

Mr. Keel with Greenlink addressed the members with the Greenlink Transit Development Plan. He stated Greenlink did a comprehensive analysis in 2016 and is in the process of changing all their routes which is to be online sometime in January. This part of the plan will only cost capital to add more stops. He continued how Phase Two of the Transportation Development Plan has been extended from 5 years to 10 years and to be looking into expanding service hours, add longer service times, and additional days to the existing schedules.

Mr. Keel made himself available for questions.

Recommendation: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections on the Greenlink Transit Development Plan from the members to pass recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. No objections or questions by consensus.

GPATS CALENDAR YEAR 2019 MEETING SCHEDULE

Mr. Brockington stated a meeting schedule for upcoming 2019 calendar year was included in their electronic agenda packet. After his discussion with Mr. Kirven, due to lack of agenda items in April and unable to get a quorum in June a decision was reached to create a meeting in May for Policy Committee.

Recommendations: Mr. Brockington asked for approval or any objections from the members to pass recommendation to Policy Committee for approval. No objections or questions by consensus.

RECOGNIZE OUTGOING MEMBERS

Mr. Brockington addressed members this will be Councilmember Payne's last Policy Committee meeting. He asked if any members are aware of other outgoing members of the Policy Committee to advise him so they can be recognized at the October 15, 2018 Policy Committee meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Hansley shared status Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) fund allocations. Decision was made to wait until next year's meeting due to creating a new TAP document with the new guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

Without objection Mr. Brockington adjourned the meeting at 11:49 a.m.

Denise Montgomery

Submitted by Recording Secretary