

RIDE II Committee Meeting
Monday, November 24, 2003 @ 1:00 p.m.
Horry County Administrator's Conference Room

In Attendance: Mitchell Flannery, Jim Hulen, John Kost, Gary Loftus, David Norris, Darrell Ricketts and Steve Gosnell.

Guests Mark Hoeweler, Waccamaw Regional Planning, Lisa Bourcier, Public Information Officer and Katherine Jenerette, Congressional Field Representative, Representative Henry Brown's Office.

Absent: Chairman Mike Wooten, Edsel "Coupe" DeVille, James R. Frazier, Donald Helms, Thad Viers and Tee Hooper.

Vice Chairman Gary Loftus called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes from November 10, 2003. A motion was made by Mitchell Flannery and seconded by Darrell Ricketts to approve the minutes as presented. Approved by the Committee. Mr. Kost stated that he would reclude himself since he had not received the agenda and minutes in the mail prior to the meeting.

Priority Update: Steve Gosnell presented the committee with an overview of the three different reports that were generated using the committee's recommendations at the November 10, 2003 meeting. The reports were broken down by priority number, map quadrant location and whether it was under state, county or city jurisdiction. Roads identified by RIDE I and GSATS were also included and noted accordingly.

Vice Chairman Loftus stressed that this was a draft document and should not be given to the press at this time. It is a working copy for the committee only and he didn't want to see anything in the newspapers regarding the choices RIDE II had made.

Vice Chairman Loftus also stated that the committee needed to determine how we deal with the Southern Connector evacuation route. He doesn't want to see us waste time on something the group down there (CARS) has under control. Mitchell Flannery agreed that the Southern Connector was an important issue. He felt the committee needed to get input from CARS, a group that Coupe DeVille works closely with. While this is a very important project, Vice Chairman Loftus felt that if we get involved in funding for this project we'd lose site of a lot of other things. We need to resolve this issue so that we don't waste a lot of time and energy doing something that someone else is already doing.

John Kost stressed two points to the committee. Point #1 – He feels we need to speak to the state regarding potential projects and get their input. There is no money available for our projects currently no matter what we decide. GSATS are dreamers – the funding is not there for their recommendations nor for the recommendations we make. We need to reduce our list to five projects - or maybe 10 - but not overwhelm the state or County Council with a list of 105 projects.

Point #2 - What are the COUNTY projects we want done? We may have a mechanism for funding those projects if we're looking at a potential Local Option Sales Tax. We need to identify the major projects and provide them to the state for their review.

Mr. Hulen thought we were coming here today to look at really, really serious problems and that we were going to focus on those problems. While he felt this was a nice list, they are projects that are not getting done because of inadequate funding at the state level. He noted that there are projects that are really key in terms of traffic congestion, evacuation and for traffic safety that we should be focusing on. Last time he presented an analysis of North Myrtle Beach and Little River and why it was critical and why those problems should be solved. Mr. Hulen would like the committee to focus on those types of problems.

Steve Gosnell tried to clarify this issue for Mr. Hulen. He stated that the list that they had been given was comprised of the committee's November 10th recommendations, RIDE I projects and GSATS projects.

Mr. Hulen said he'd like to make a motion that the RIDE II Committee develop a criteria for prioritization that would narrow down the alternatives to no more than ten. Mr. Kost seconded the motion.

Discussion on motion: Mr. Kost stated that he didn't want the local needs to get caught up in the state kind of morass that is going to exist. If we're going to develop a list he'd like to see it include county roads, not city roads, but county ones, and a list for the state. If in fact we start to take on the city roads as well, any funding mechanism that we come up with we'll need to go to every one of the city council meetings and say "this mechanism is going to include you" and he didn't think we'd receive a very warm reception this time. We need to focus on the things that are in the county.

Vice Chairman Loftus pointed out that the number one priority that we identified is shown as a state project. John Kost concurred that this was correct.

Mr. Hulen amended his motion to state that the committee would develop a methodology to develop criteria for narrowing the project alternatives down to ten projects and reject any city projects since they should be the city's responsibility – the projects were to be split between County and State projects with no more than five (5) of each.

Vice Chairman Loftus explained to the committee that if a Local Option Sales Tax is passed county wide how can we really reject the city? He would also like to see ten (10) projects in each category. Deleting the city's project from our list really concerns Mr. Loftus.

Mr. Gosnell stated that if a Local Option Sales Tax is passed a six person committee will need to be established to approve projects and administer the funding and that committee will include three city representatives. We probably shouldn't reject city projects because then we immediately lose their vote. He informed the committee that at the Fall Retreat staff had been directed to proceed the analysis of the cost. Revenue options to include the potential of a Local Option Sales Tax referendum for capital projects in

November. Mr. Loftus questioned what County Council meant by “capital” projects. Steve Gosnell stated there were two types of Local Option Sales Tax scenarios – one is a capital sales tax. The other is a Local Option Sales Tax which must be designated for 71% property tax rollback. County Council recommended staff move forward on the Capital Sales Tax option and discussed potential capital projects including roads, education facilities, building facilities, open space, etc.

Mitchell Flannery said that he hated to approve a motion to tie us to any specific criteria at this time. Vice Chairman Loftus said that a motion becomes a goal and right now its broad enough for us to work with.

At this point, Jim Hulen amended his motion to include the cities and increase the project number to 15. The motion is to develop criteria.

Vice Chairman Loftus stated that the motion and its amendments now reads: **To designate a methodology to establish a criteria for prioritization that would narrow down the alternatives to not more than fifteen projects. With no further discussion Vice Chairman called the question. Hearing no further comments the committee voted on the motion and it was passed unanimously.**

Vice Chairman Loftus recommended that he meet with Steve Gosnell and Mike Wooten to establish a draft criteria to identify projects, which they would then forward to the committee members. Steve Gosnell stated that they should understand that there is not a lot of traffic data out there for the committee’s review. Those numbers are just not available. Mark Hoeweler will also be asked to attend this meeting. Vice Chairman Loftus felt that utilizing the “level of service” was a good format to use. Steve Gosnell agreed and also informed the committee that the available data on county roads is zero. They will meet and get this information to the committee as soon as possible.

Steve Gosnell explained the ADT (Average Daily Trips) handouts that he had provided to the committee on county roads. There are 10 ADT’s per home for each road. The first report is sorted using the “ADT’s only” method. This method will not pave as many roads. The second report uses the Standard Method which includes ADT’s divided by the length of the roadway. More roads are involved utilizing this method. Steve explained the protocol for each report. He agreed that he would prepare a map for whichever designation they selected. John Kost said that County Council was more likely to endorse the standard method.

Darrell Ricketts recommended that we use the standard method and then remove all roads under ½ mile in length since school busses won’t go down a road ½ mile or less – this will delete a lot of roads immediately.

Steve Gosnell recommended that we look at 100 miles – even though the two reports go up to 300 miles each. Our only funding option remains the Local Option Sales Tax and there is a time limit for the tax referendum to be prepared. Vice Chairman Loftus agreed that we needed to narrow the list quickly.

Steve Gosnell stated that we use a construction cost of \$600,000/per mile with a 4% increase per year. The report showing the Standard Method will address more people and this is what we use for the Horry County Local Road Improvement Program. John Kost stressed that he would like to select those roads that connect two roads. Steve Gosnell agreed that staff would go through the top 100 miles of each method and highlight the through roads and map them. This will be available for the next meeting.

Local Option Sales Tax: As requested, the Finance Department prepared a handout which illustrated the potential revenue for 1%, 1 ½% and 2% sales tax for the next seven years.

Steve Gosnell stressed to the committee that current state law related to a capital local option sales tax requires that projects must be identified and completed in 7 years. The hospitality fee which is funding the RIDE I projects had a 25 year sunset. We will have until June to put our list together in order to place the referendum on the November ballot.

Meeting locations: Steve Gosnell provided the committee with a location list of the high schools where previous county informational meetings had been held for their review.

Vice Chairman Loftus reiterated that he would meet with Mike Wooten, Steve Gosnell, and Mark Hoeweller prior to the next meeting to establish a criteria for selecting the RIDE II road project recommendations and that Steve Gosnell will review the first 100 miles of each of the ADT lists and identify the through roads. He will also create maps using both ADT methodologies for the next meeting. A new quadrant map will be produced utilizing four different colors. Additionally, the report will be re-run with the priority order listing column hidden.

Vice Chairman Loftus said that the next meeting is scheduled for December 8th with an additional meeting scheduled for the 22nd of December. He recommended to the committee that they cancel those two meetings and schedule just one meeting on the 15th. The committee agreed. **Vice Chairman Loftus made a motion to schedule the December meeting for the 15th. The motion was seconded by Darrell Ricketts. There was no discussion and the motion passed unanimously.**

John Kost said that he would like to propose a motion that the committee identify the road plan as a group at the next meeting. We won't walk out with loose ends hanging. We will have 15 selections available when we leave. They have to be identified so that we can find out how much they will cost. The criteria will be sent to the individual committee members prior to the meeting so they can make their selections based on that information.

Web Page: Steve Gosnell introduced Lisa Bourcier, Horry County's Public Information Officer. Lisa will be in charge of placing the RIDE II committee information on the County's web site. Mitchell Flannery stated that the committee needs to be introduced to the community. Jim Hulen stated that he would like access to maps, etc. for review and information purposes. He asked if these items could be included on a closed intra-net

access for committee members only. The actual web site will provide the public with information on how the committee makes their decisions.

It was agreed that Lisa Bourcier will be provided with the purpose of the committee, how the members were appointed, the goals, a committee member list, minutes of all meetings to date, the committee's mission statement, the first quarter report that Chairman Wooten provided to the I&R Committee and whatever else she might need regarding the committee and its directive.

Jim Hulen stated that he would like Mark Hoeweller to come to Myrtle Beach to meet with his constituents so that they will be better informed. The committee had no problem with this request as long as the public understands that the committee is still in the draft stage of selecting road projects. Jim Hulen withdrew his request until such time as the committee does have a finalized list of projects.

A motion was made by John Kost to adjourn, seconded by Jim Hulen and approved by the committee.

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, DECEMBER 15th AT 1:00 P.M.
HORRY COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S
CONFERENCE ROOM

PLEASE NOTE: MEETING DATE HAS BEEN CHANGED
TO DECEMBER 17TH AT 1:00 P.M.