



**MINUTES
FAIRFIELD COUNTY COUNCIL
WORKSESSION
AUGUST 17, 2009**

PRESENT:County Council

David L. Ferguson, Sr.
Mary Lynn Kinley
Kamau Marcharia
Carolyn B. Robinson
Mikel R. Trapp

CTC

Clifton Hendrix
James McGraw
Clarence Trapp
David Williams

Staff

Philip L. Hinely
Davis Anderson
Shryll Brown

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80 (e), as amended, the following persons and/or organizations have been notified of the time, date, and location of this meeting: The Herald-Independent, The State, and Winnsboro Cablevision, and forty-three other individuals.

I. CALL TO ORDER

In the absence of the Chairman, Vice Chairman Trapp called the Council meeting to order at 6:14 P.M. Mr. James McGraw called the CTC meeting to order.

II. INVOCATION

Council Member Mary Lynn Kinley led in the invocation.

III. ITEMS OF DISCUSSION**A. Review Criteria For Future Road Selections**

- Tim Antley gave the following overview of Ordinance No. 517; how the original roads were tallied and the road paving program. Looked at number of permanent resident homes on the road; number of seasonal resident homes accessed from the road; number of permanent resident homes accessed from a dead end spur; number of seasonal residents homes accessed from dead end spur; average daily traffic count; roadway utilized for school bus routes and the number of churches accessed from the road. The CTC had this done prior to Dennis Corporation's work; however, Dennis Corporation put it into words in the ordinance so everyone would understand how the points were associated per road.
- McGraw: Some roads have one or two homes on the end of the road; may be five miles long; bridges out, etc. This ordinance does not address the bridges nor does it address the proximity of where the houses are located. Suggest that criteria be revisited to the point of getting more roads done. Look at all areas and scrutinize roads better than what the criteria is outlined as.

- Ferguson: Would like to bring forward where houses are on each end and bridge in the middle and long span in the middle. Is that road accessible from two roads so that it is not a through way. If it is accessible from two paved roads, can look at paving from where the houses stop on one end.
- McGraw: If ordinance is redone, next set of roads chosen should be under new criteria. Hope Road and Fort Wagner Roads are examples.
- Williams: Discussed Timberlane Circle.
- Robinson: How did it get on the list if no houses are on it—other than being a connector?
- Marcharia: There are some roads, in terms of need and necessity, where there is a concentration of population where school buses and other emergency vehicles are, these roads have been totally neglected and overlooked. The new criteria should address the immediate needs of the citizens.
- Williams: We do have a formula.
- McGraw: Timberlane Circle qualifies 74 points.
- Marcharia: What is the criteria? We have moved away from the criteria on some of the roads.
- McGraw: The Dennis group was required to follow the list that had been put before them according to the criteria that was before they came on board. Have to look at it now to be sure the criteria will address these roads that are in question.
- Antley: Timberlane is on the 2009 list to be done. Dennis Corporation took what was already given and put it into words.
- Hendrix: The criteria has merit. If the numbers are wrong, somebody needs to confirm yes or no.
- Ferguson: Don't think the criteria needs to be changed. Before any roads are paved, if there is any question they come back to either Mr. McGraw and/or the Chair of Council. Have to be sensitive to the point system. Have to follow some guidelines.
- Williams: Has Dennis Corporation checked behind any of these evaluations?
- Antley: We questioned some of them, but have not back checked them. Even though we received very good bids on the 2009, it is not to say some roads could not be cut off. The longest one is Timberlane Circle. If we could drop some mileage off and pick up Brantley Avenue, that would be another road that could be done in 2009.
- Marcharia: Where is the list of what roads are next?
- Antley: Refer to the master list.
- Ferguson: We talked about Billy and his crew staying a year ahead on these roads. If we did a house count, he could bring that concern back to Mr. Hinely.
- Hinely: CTC had criteria and it worked in general. It's time to recanvass the entire County. Let's look at where we are; see if that criteria fits. Mr. McGraw would need to give Dennis group direction. May need to get a new list and have the Dennis group look through the list and the county ride through the list.
- McGraw: Suggested at one of the previous meetings that the CTC pave roads every other year instead of going out every year because the funds are pretty much depleted. Before CTC can pave again, want to make sure the list is revisited. Still have questions about the criteria to take some of the guesswork out of it. May have to add something in about bridges.

- Williams: None of us are an engineering firm. The formula that was written, to determine how the roads prioritized, very few of us understand it. Engineering firm is contracted through the County and CTC for checks and balances. Before the criteria that we have is dumped in the water and rewritten, somebody needs to go through and reevaluate it as it stands to make sure the values that were given to the particular roads are true.
- Robinson: I think the Council some time ago decided that each district was going to get so much paved. District 5 had 22.5 miles; district 6 had 2.35 miles; district 7 had 18.77 miles. This should be close to getting all paved. District 2 had a lot of homes built in the last five years. Need to revisit and regroup as far as giving new numbers to the remaining roads. There is an inconsistency in paving and going by districts.
- Kinley: All of the ones in my district are non-pavable or nobody on the roads.
- Robinson: Some counties have gone and worked through the worst situation. Really need to revisit.
- Hendrix: In our initial conversation, we decided that bridges were going to be a separate entity. We were not going to do bridges.
- McGraw: We are not doing bridges; however, if we have to pave a road and have to get across the bridge to get to it. We need to at least put in on the floor as to what needs to be done about it.
- Ferguson: I have less than 2.5 miles thus far.
- Williams: If areas had been pavable, wide enough or didn't have boulders in the middle of it, you would have had 22 miles paved.
- Ferguson: That's total.
- Robinson: That's the total unpaved roads that he had in his district on this chart when this ordinance was put together.
- Marcharia: From my calculation, there are districts that have anywhere from 8 to 10 miles paved in their district in the last four years. According to the criteria of width and length of roads, the new subdivisions, old subdivisions were made with roads 20' wide, they are going to get service. People have been living on these small, narrow dirt roads where cars are hard to get past, never get their roads paved according to the criteria that we go about. We need to revisit that criteria; look at the needs of people who actually have communities where we have ambulance service, bus services and see if we can service them. It is a priority to look at that and serve the people to the best of our ability. I would like for that to be part of the criteria.
- Hendrix: That is a good thought.
- Ferguson: We are back at square one in the discussion stage. It has to be fair to all seven districts. Nothing was said in the criteria in the beginning about mileage of roads. It said when the point system comes up. We can't start jumping around on the list, because we have to answer to the public and be fair to the public and be fair to the seven districts. Maybe Mr. McGraw needs to encourage the Dennis group to go out and redo the roads because there are some new subdivisions, etc., that have a lot of homes on it that would jump to the top of the list.
- Kinley: Would you go over the 2009 list and tell what district they are.
- McGraw: Bracken Drive (District 1); Timberlane Circle (District 2); Strawberry Lane (District 3); Kenal Road (District 5); Greenwood Road (District 7).

- Kinley: Where are we with sidewalks? Are you not going to do any sidewalks?
- McGraw: We tried to get some sidewalk money, but it did not work with the criteria they had. It was matching funds. We would have had the opportunity to pave some sidewalks, but the criteria was such that it was not feasible to take that money to match it.
- Kinley: They just get worse and worse by the year. You can't walk on them or stroll on them with babies.
- Williams: Everybody received a letter. They did not give any matching funds without meeting that criteria.
- Kinley: The only one they are going to build is that one from Bi-Lo down to the school for the students. Is there a future at all to get any of that done?
- Antley: There are other avenues to look at doing sidewalks, i.e., CDBG grants we can go after, transportation grants. DOT has changed the rules dramatically. Fairfield County was the first one in line to get the sidewalk-to-schools grant. Not one dime has been spent yet. The principals of the schools have to initiate money.
- Hendrix: Who should prod the district? Should we or have Council?
- Antley: It would do good for an engineering company to go to them and say it.
- Hendrix: You say the school district. Does the school district know it?
- Antley: Yes, they know it. The DOT has gone to every school district. We are approved to administer that program, but when it came to Fairfield, DOT took it over and said they were going to administer it. That project is ready to go. Someone from the school district has to say we want this.
- Hendrix: Could you, as an engineering firm, draft that request and forward it to James and the Council Chair and they, in turn, can get together and present it to a school board meeting or superintendent?
- Ferguson: When I was Chairman, we had a meeting with Tim Antley and the School Board. We met at the high school. It's not that they don't know the funding is there. The crosswalk in front of the high school, is that some of that money?
- Antley: I am not sure. I have been trying to find that out.
- Ferguson: Some of that money has been expended because that is what paid for that project in front of the high school.
- Marcharia: In the Town of Winnsboro and proximity, Winnsboro will be sufficiently taken care of. It's the rural areas that I am looking at in terms of roads. I have less than 2 miles of roads paved in the fourth district. The list you just presented, we have a new substance that is supposed to greatly reduce the cost of putting these chemicals on dirt roads. In terms of being short of money, it appears that is going to be a benefit. People in the rural areas don't get their fair share with some of these projects. I am hearing we want to move on with the project, according to the criteria, the width of the roads, length, etc.
- Hendrix: When I look at the existing width, the new width is 25 feet. If I look at this, none of these qualify for it.
- McGraw: None of the ones we just called out? They do qualify. We were at the meeting. It was a meeting you all missed. The numbers were wrong. Mr. Lucas has gone out and actually measured these roads and they do qualify.

- Hendrix: The reason I said what I did, Mr. Marcharia had a number of roads that he could not do in his district because of the width. When you look at this, you say where is the fairness. The numbers are wrong. I understand that. But we should be using that good information. This is new, correct? We know the past, numbers might have been wrong but the numbers ought to be right now.
- Antley: The CTC directed me and said these are the roads.
- Hendrix: If I am looking at this tonight, the width ought to be right.
- Antley: If we want to make it clearer in the specs or the ordinance, we need to say the roadway width and not include ditch to ditch. At first, we were saying 16 feet wide is the minimum width we wanted, they would be the riding surface. The widths that you see on here are the widths in places we have measured; however, Billy has reverified them (where the grass was grown on the road, the width is there), it just has to be cleaned off.
- Hendrix: When you do the road, it is going to be 16 feet wide? If we have a standard, the standard ought to be the standard width. Even if you have 50 feet clearance, the road is still going to be 16 feet, right?
- Antley: Which road are you asking about?
- Hendrix: If you were to do a road, the asphalted part of the cemented part, is 16 feet wide, nobody how much tolerance you have?
- Antley: That is the goal. That is correct.
- Hendrix: When I am looking at this, it says that you have the proper right-of-way?
- Antley: You have prescriptive easement.
- Hendrix: What I was trying to say was what Mr. Marcharia was saying has weight, but it didn't meet the width requirement and he couldn't get the proper right-of-way, which was because his road was passed over. I think what I am hearing him say is we need to revisit that criteria because there are a number of people on it, but if you can't get the right-of-way our instructions to the Dennis Corporation were to bypass that road and go to the next one. Quite a few of Mr. Marcharia's roads were bypassed because of the right-of-way. That really was not our fault because we had directions; yet, people in his district felt betrayed. There was a reason they could not get them done because of the criteria. That sixteen feet width is reasonable. Do we still want that?
- Antley. That is correct.
- Trapp: In my opinion, we might want to lower the width. I think we are to just pave what the Public Works Department has been working. If they work a 10 foot road, I think that is what we ought to do, pave the 10 foot road.
- Ferguson: The reason we went to 16 feet was because of safety. If we have ambulances and school buses and fire trucks on an eight foot road or a ten foot road, you are asking for the county to be responsible for accidents on a ten foot road. That is the reason 16 feet was the minimum to start with. From an attorney's standpoint, the Council could not afford to do them any less than sixteen feet because of the legal matter.
- Trapp: But, would it be any different if for example, the Public Works Department goes out and motor grade the road, put gravel on it and the same scenario happens, what you just said. Would we be held liable then? What's the difference?

- Hinely: I never did see much of a difference, but the attorney did. The attorney said if you are improving it, you expect people to drive faster.
- Ferguson: What the attorney told us was that anytime you upgrade that road, you upgrade the speed limit. You don't have the same limit for a dirt road that you do for a hard surface road. Anytime, you have a hard surface road, nobody drives 25 mph.
- Hendrix: To me, the common sense part of it is if we have houses and it is high density and the road is narrow, why not put speed bumps every so many feet? That will stop the speed.
- McGraw: We questioned that too.
- C. Trapp: We discussed that. We talked about it, but it was the monetary value on putting it in there is what shied us away from it. Somebody looked into it and it was going to cost up in the millions to go back and put those speed bumps back in those roads.
- Williams: It is very fortunate that DOT and the State has not spoken up and said you need to build these roads to the state standard widths. If that had happened, there would not have been any roads built. We are kind of under the radar screen anyway, with 16 feet. The standard on state roads are to be 24 feet from center line.
- Hinely: A year ago, Mr. Pearson came to see me and said how come you guys are doing 16 feet and not 24 feet. I said that is as low as we can go. He wrote me a letter strongly urging us to do that.
- Williams: They are not going to take the money away from us, but they are not going to do any matching funds.
- Marcharia: However it goes, I am looking at this list and there are two roads apparently that do not meet the criteria. There is one fifteen feet wide and one twelve feet wide.
- C. Trapp: They went back and remeasured Greenwood. That was one of the roads that was covered with grass. It came up to twenty four feet after they did it from ditchline to ditchline. Strawberry Lane was approved by Mr. Lucas. He said it was actually wider than twelve feet, it met the criteria. It went up to the limit what they could pave. That was in our last meeting.
- Marcharia: The question I need to ask is: these roads have been measured. You don't have anything in the fourth district. I looked at my list and I have less than two miles of roads paved in the fourth district in eight years. People have six, seven, eight miles of there roads paved. Am I being punished or something as a Council Member or being discriminated against?
- C. Trapp: You have not gotten too many roads paved in District 4. One road that we were looking at.
- Marcharia: Family Lane met the criteria. You didn't do that.
- C. Trapp: It has not come up on the list yet.
- Marcharia: How did these roads get on the list?
- C. Trapp: These roads were ahead in the point system.
- Kinley: Were these roads on this list taken off of this list? I don't find them. Some of them are not on this list. I would like to know how they got on this one?
- C. Trapp: They might be in the Priority List. You have different sections. Some by district, some by number.

- Kinley: Don't they go by points, though?
- Antley: You have a Master Road List.
- Kinley: That is this right here?
- Antley: I am not a 100% sure what you are looking at?
- Kinley: I am not finding but two out of the group here that is on this list. If Mr. Marcharia is saying to be fair to each district, what would be wrong with going through each district, taking the top one from each district. These are not on here. None of them are in the number one position on the list.
- Ferguson: I will assure you that is the way it has been done.
- Kinley: They should have been on here, right?
- Marcharia: The last road they did in the fourth district was High Hill Extension and that road is torn up already.
- Ferguson: Tim, were you aware of that?
- Antley: No sir. Which road?
- Marcharia: High Hill Extension.
- Ferguson: Do you and Mr. McGraw need to take a look at that road and see what the problem is out there?
- Hendrix: Mikel and I are in the same district. We are guilty of having high mileage roads, but the point system dictated what we do. We had priorities one through six. I am well pleased with the roads that we have gotten in our district. What we said in the beginning, if there are seven districts and you only did five, we started out with one, two, three, four, five. The next year, it was going to be six, seven, one, two, three (from where ever that goes). If in my district, a road came up; if it didn't meet the criteria, we went to the next priority (road) in that district. I am well pleased what we have done because we have been keeping track of it. I am hearing differently now. Ours has worked fine. Mr. Marcharia, yours does not work fine?
- Marcharia: No.
- Hendrix: Why not?
- Marcharia: I am trying to figure that out now and get some answers. I certainly have roads in the fourth district that need to be paved.
- Williams: You assumed it is our responsibility to make the roads wide enough in your district that will comply. We can't do that. The firm that did this was an independent firm; hired by the County Council and by the CTC; did an evaluation of the roads through the whole county. I apologize that your roads are not wide enough and that you can't get enough roads in your district.
- Marcharia: No sir. You are incorrect. I am going to take one example. Family Lane is certainly wide enough and was on the list several times. It's only three-tenths.
- C. Trapp: That's Family Circle. Family Lane has not come up on our road priority list yet.
- Marcharia: How it came up, when it got to my road, what they said they skipped my whole district; went to the other one; said we went over a hundred roads just to get to you. That was not the process. It was supposed to when you went from Brown's Bridge Road to another road (I am just saying), when you got to the next road that qualified for it, that was the road we were supposed to do in our district rather than leaving that district and going to a whole new district. That's what you were doing to the fourth

district—just leaving that district and going to another district rather than going to the next road that qualified.

- Trapp: Mr. Marcharia, I think there were a couple of roads you had to go out and get required signatures to get the proper right-of-way and the deadline passed. That's one.
- Marcharia: That's High Hill Extension. That was the only road.
- Ferguson: Agnew Lane was the same way.
- C. Trapp: Prophet Lane came up too narrow. Eagle Trail, they went out and measured that and said it was too narrow, but Eagle Trail has was supposed to have been passed to be done. They were supposed to have gone back out and talk to the families out there. They said they would sign any paper that came to them. They never received a letter asking for approval to get that road paved. Eagle Trail was supposed to be opened up and it is a 40 on the list. Family Road is only 25. That's why it went to the bottom.
- Hendrix: The point system has nothing to do with it. When it is in the fourth district, even if it is 2 points, if that is the only one that qualifies, that is the road to get done based on the present instructions.
- C. Trapp: You had more roads in there that qualified besides Family Circle. Family Circle is actually third from the bottom on all the roads in four.
- Marcharia: What other ones qualify besides Family Circle and was not done.
- C. Trapp: Maybe ten that is above Family Circle. Family Circle is way done as far as district four.
- McGraw: We put the criteria together; we have come this far together and now it looks like it is getting to the point of finger pointing and trying to find somebody to point fingers as if we have done something wrong. This is not the case. We have done just as fair as we possibly can on these roads. I don't think we should deviate from that. If we are going to continue to work together with Council, we cannot sit here on one side of the table and have to answer to Council. We are going to have to work together to get from one point to the next point. There is nobody out here that is trying to do anything detrimental to one area or district. When you start dealing with districts, then you start to get so involved with politics you forget about the total picture. The only thing that is right is what is written. If you want to rewrite the criteria, then let's rewrite the criteria.
- Williams: When I came on this committee, the one thing that I was mostly concerned with was that the good old boys you had were over with. This is why we had this criteria and this is why it has worked. I apologize to anybody that feels like they are slighted but the formula is a mathematical formula and you can't argue with math.
- Hendrix: I don't think that is what is going on. The point system in our districts. If Mikel and I are in a district and we have a road that does not meet the criteria, it is our job to go out and make the people aware to get that right-of-way. If each one is made aware and they still won't bulge and we have a road that is scheduled to be paved and we don't get the right-of-way, we go to the next road. That is what Mr. Marcharia has been doing. I am hearing two things. He said the road that we did is torn up. That should not be based on the criteria that we have. What we have to do is to make sure Dennis Corporation knows that and go back and get a fix for that and possibly the people that did it need to be made aware of that. That's a separate issue. If Mr. Marcharia has ten roads in his district and if one, two, three and four don't meet the criteria, well five, six and

seven should. I heard him say when this road came up, we missed his district and went to another district. That should have never happened if that happened. It didn't necessarily happen, but his perception is. He should be in the know, but he should also come to us and tell us that.

- Antley: I will tell you the truth. That did happen because the way it was relayed was once we don't get a road that is wide enough, we go to the next road. Never did it convey to me that next one in that district until after the fact. Then we started after that one year that we skipped that, and we went back where we had a Council meeting that we actually went back to those roads that we did skip. That was that meeting.

- Ferguson: All the way back to road number one (to the very beginning).

- Antley: The first year we did do that.

- Hendrix: But we made up for it the next year, right?

- Antley: We made up for it in this Council meeting.

- Hendrix: But we should have done that, right?

- Antley: Last year, we actually caught up. Now, when we get to one that is not on the list, I give Mr. McGraw the next one in that district that does meeting everything. I presented that to them and they are the ones who told on the 2009, this is the one we are doing. So, they had that information at the last CTC meeting.

- McGraw: The problem we are running into now is we don't have the money like we used to have.

- Hendrix: But the priority system is still in place, right? That has not been changed?

- Marcharia: I think Mr. McGraw used the term that somebody was finger pointing. I have made some accusations, but I have not called names or districts. I am simply saying if we had a priority list or criteria and one road gets 74 points that has one house on it for four miles, how did that happen. If you have one district in four years that had 8-10 miles road paved, how did that happen. I got a mile and a half of road, I am just looking at that criteria and saying if that is the case, we need to straighten this up and move ahead. I am not trying to drag nothing into it, but that happened.

- Williams: You were on County Council when that person was chosen to administrate the choosing of the roads. I was not on CTC when that happened. I would have asked for checks and balances to make sure the numbers were correct.

- Trapp: I think we are being confused with miles versus road. One road in my district was three miles, but we were going to do one mile per district. A road in your district might not have been but a quarter of a mile. That is why the mileage is so out of balance compared to the road.

- Williams: That wheel continues to turn.

- Trapp: Eventually, somebody is going to have a long one and I am going to have a short one.

- C. Trapp: The mileage on them is going to stay out of balance.

- Marcharia: Not so much mileage, I am saying how did you get 74 points with the criteria that says you have to have bus service, number of houses; but you only have one house in four miles, but that road gets paved. I think that diverted from what our own criteria said. I am saying we need to take a look at that.

- McGraw: We have asked that they take a look at that. We don't know that it has been diverted. I have not been out on Timberlane Circle. I can't sit here and say that

anything is wrong. We asked that one of the purposes of this meeting was to revisit how these roads qualify. Mr. Trapp, along with Mr. Antley, if we just start, since we won't be paving any roads in 2010 that we have time to go back and revisit this list. That is what we said we would do that we would revisit this every five years. Now is the time to correct whatever error we have made. In the meantime, if we are going to use this criteria that we are going to use here, we need to go back and ask the Dennis group to look at these roads and revisit them according to the criteria. We can find out why it is 74 points there. Mr. Trapp, that is the only purpose of this meeting. Now we do need to have another one to revisit the ordinance altogether so that we can look at how we are dropping from 60 points back down to 15 points to get a road in a district. All these things we need to balance when we come back for the ordinance. Right now, if we don't need to recharge the criteria (the point selection that we currently have), we don't know that it is broken. I think if we ask the Dennis group to go back, and if the CTC would agree, we could authorize the Dennis group to go ahead and do that, with the direction from the CTC to go back and revisit these roads according to the criteria and make sure. If they find anything that is out of balance, call us back together again and let us look at it and we may have to then revisit the criteria.

- Williams: To revisit all the roads in the county?
- McGraw: If that is what it takes.
- Hendrix: At the same time, wouldn't it be wise to use a common sense approach. If there is a road that is long and it is approachable by a paved road on each side and there is a mile difference between the two, just do a quarter mile from one side and quarter mile from the other, or whatever that distance is.
- McGraw: He can't make that decision without us authorizing it or giving him some direction.
- Hendrix: What I am saying, when he does the point system, just make a footnote and say that. That way we will have the data.
- Ferguson: I would like to make a recommendation that, because we are going to pave roads this year, I think tonight we should come to some conclusion about if these roads have inferior bridges on them that we need to make a decision and to put this actually in the point system or have something in to verify to say this is the reason that road wasn't done because we didn't have money to fix the bridge. {That we could up with some verbiage or some criteria that those inferior bridges have a bearing on whether we are going to pave a road or not}. I would like for it to be put in tonight to take the guesswork out of it.
- Trapp: Let me get an understanding first, Mr. Ferguson. Let's use Possom Branch as an example. Since it has a bridge on it, we wouldn't pave from the lower end, we would come in from the other end and pave where the houses are. Is that what you are saying?
- Ferguson: If it had a paved access road on both ends, you would pave to the last house and then you would go to the other end and do the same thing. If there are no houses on the other end, you don't pave anything.
- McGraw: If the bridge is already passable and it is already in great shape, then it is not a question too much.

- Ferguson: We have so many on our dirt roads; we even have bridges on our state roads that are not up to par. There are many of them on our dirt roads. It would apply to just about every dirt road that has a bridge on it in Fairfield County.
- Marcharia: I concur with Mr. Ferguson for the simple reason that when you pave roads like that and those bridges are in bad shape, when young people are on those roads flying doing 60-70 miles per hour, the county is really liable if we lose a life down that road.
- Robinson: Supposed the bridge needs to be fixed in order for me to get out from my house? I am locked in to my house if we don't fix the bridge.
- Williams: Then it's a partnership between the County and CTC to partner up and work towards some way to get her out of her house.
- Robinson: That's just an exception to the rule that you are discussing.
- Ferguson: A one way in and a one way out, if it is a county road then we are locked into fixing it whatever the cost it.
- Robinson: We don't want to x that road out of the system, then.
- Marcharia: But the language should say that.
- Ferguson: If it says if those folks have another way in (if it's a through road) and you have paved roads at the end of both of them, it may cost somebody to have to go around to get to another road, but the fact is do we have the money to put a bridge in that we don't have to put in right now, we don't have it.
- Hinely: I have listened to everybody. I think everybody is pretty much saying the same thing. The point system is pretty good up to where it went. I was making some notes earlier and the following is a synopsis of what was discussed: stick with the current point system and go one step further to add to the process after the point review (start over for the year 2010 going forward), then the CTC would review the road point list to determine the cost effectiveness of improving the road (or the safety and accessibility), i.e., connector roads that have clusters of people on either end, but have a long distance in the middle where there are no homes, would use discretion and sound judgment whether to improve the west end and the east end of that road or if there is a bridge to be replaced and it is prohibitively expensive, but people have access. After you get all this back in, Mr. McGraw, then you look it over. {i.e., don't want a 100-mile road that meets the criteria, but will take all the money}.
- McGraw: I am very much in agreement with that, Mr. Hinely. I just believe that if this committee and Council were to ride some of these roads prior to paving, especially Possum Branch, where Mr. Marcharia and I rode down. I had never been on that road before and he made mention of young people riding 60-70 miles an hour. I was scared to go across that bridge. It was in bad shape. If I had known that it was that bad out there, I guarantee you I would have made some recommendations that we do something because that is putting lives in danger. If we can get the verbiage in here, Tim, to give you some guidance when you go on these roads, I really believe that we need to put something in there that is going to address these bridges and get people in and out.
- Ferguson: *I would like to make a motion that we put the verbiage in there for the accessible roads and the bridges before we leave here tonight.*
- Trapp: Your motion will be that it start with the next round, that's 2010.

- McGraw: That was my suggestion with him because he can't get these roads between now and the time of paving 2009. We are only doing four miles of road.
- Trapp: Is that what we were intending to do. I thought we were going to work on changing the ordinance for 2010.
- McGraw: That was my intent because these roads that are already on 2009 will be done; however, I don't think we can do anything here tonight to change that. If we can start in preparing ourselves, we have a whole year that we can do this and do it right.
- Robinson: If we can possibly look at this connector road and take care of that and then move on to another road this year. I think early on we could possibly do that this year.
- McGraw: That won't have anything to do with the bridge situation. It's just dealing with the connector road.
- C. Trapp: Timberlane Circle does not have anything on it?
- Antley: There's a connector road between Timberlane and Shangri La.
- Ferguson: What would be the next road in Mrs. Robinson's district to come up?
- Ferguson: That's for the dustdown. They did one in my district, too, but it failed miserably. I am going to ask Mr. Antley to expound on that in a minute.
- Marcharia: What I heard Mr. Ferguson say rather than change the ordinance that he's just asking for an amendment to that section.
- McGraw: On the road that we are speaking of now, that is not an ordinance change.
- Antley: You are trying to give me direction as to what to do for the re-evaluation.
- McGraw: Right. And that starts with 2010 roads. 2011 roads, really.
- Antley: Mr. Ferguson, the next road in district 2 would be Dovewood Road.
- Ferguson: What is the mileage on that road?
- Antley: .6. I don't know that it is a quarter of a mile. The next road on the list is Brantley Avenue. I don't think that little draw road between there is a quarter of a mile long.
- Hendrix: You are talking about the same district?
- Antley: No, the next road on the list.
- Ferguson: According to the criteria, you go to the next district. You wouldn't go to the next road, you go to the next district.
- Hendrix: I am looking at this list. It says one, two, three, five, seven. What about four and seven?
- McGraw: That was the list we did at the last meeting. We didn't have the money to pave the next road, so we just shut it down.
- Antley: At the last CTC meeting, I brought the list that had all the other roads that were next in that district. They voted on which ones needed to be done. I have no say-so.
- Hendrix: If there is one, two, three, five and seven district-wise; now you have a chance for another road, it either should be four or six. No vote is required for that.
- Antley: I don't have a problem with that.
- Marcharia: Somebody must have a problem with it, because it is not there.
- Antley: The voting part came out of the CTC. Dennis Corporation does not have anything to do with what gets paved and what does not get paved. We give the information and you all determine what gets paved.

- Hendrix: If we are going one road in each district per year, whatever we can do. But, we are going one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Once we do that, one comes up again; two comes up again; three comes up again; four comes up again. All I am saying is that we have one, two, three, five and seven this year. Now we have room for one more, it should either be four or six. It shouldn't be a vote required for that.
- Antley: They are not saying they have room for one more road. What they are going to do is take off that distance of that road (that spur road). What I am understanding, that distance of that road between Shangri La and Timberlane Circle (say it's a thousand feet), if you wanted to replace that thousand feet with another road that's a thousand feet (or less), great. I gave a list to everybody that was at the last CTC meeting of the roads that were there and what was next on the list in each district. If one road did not meet the criteria, I gave the next five roads in that district.
- McGraw: As good as we are trying to be, we are running into a situation that we have not had before and that is money. The next road in district four was too narrow. That was Harbour Drive. It was too narrow; it did not meet the criteria. The next one was Morris Creek Road, which was a mile and a half, and we don't have the money to pave that amount of road. Either we stop it or don't do anything.
- Hendrix: But then, stop that. We are not going to do it next year but the next year, when you do start, Morris Creek should be at the top of that list. That's the fairest way.
- Antley: That's how we have done it.
- Robinson: Prophet Road, what's wrong with it? It's fourteen feet wide.
- Marcharia: They required signatures on that road and some roads we didn't if it was fourteen or sixteen feet. That was my understanding. The landowner didn't sign these letters and they moved on to the next one. The next road after that I thought was Family Road – in terms of width.
- McGraw: Family Lane is on down the list.
- Marcharia: Even if it is down the list, it's the next road that qualifies, is what I thought we were looking for.
- McGraw: Not in district four.
- Marcharia: So, what would be the next one to qualify?
- McGraw: The next one to qualify would be Morris Creek Road. It qualifies, but we don't have the money for 2009.
- Ferguson: I ran into one of my roads the same way Mr. Marcharia did. Most of the people would sign and two of them wouldn't. You are out in the cold when they do like that--nobody gets a road.
- Hendrix: In district four, Mrs. Robinson and Mr. Marcharia are talking about the next road should be Eagle Road. Why is it not there?
- Marcharia: It's no. 58.
- C. Trapp: The reason why Eagle Trail is not there is they had said it was too narrow at the last meeting.
- Marcharia: It's fourteen feet.
- Ferguson: You have to get the signatures first.
- Marcharia: I don't think anyone sent anything out to get signatures on that road to my knowledge.

- Ferguson: Have you all done anything with Eagle Trail, as far as contacting the people on there for signatures?
- Trapp: We agreed that the Council Members should go on the roads to get the signatures.

{Council took a short recess at this point}.

{At 8:32 P.M., Council Member Robinson made a motion to come out of recess and return to worksession. The motion was seconded by Council Member Marcharia and unanimously approved by Council}.

- Trapp: Mr. Hinely disseminated a sheet with all the suggestions that were discussed. Has everyone had a chance to look over it? {Following is the synopsis of the discussion}:
 - ◇ Use the current point system for evaluating the roads
 - ◇ Use the current road width requirements
 - ◇ Direct the Dennis group to re-evaluate all the roads in the county based upon the above criteria
 - ◇ After submission by the Dennis group of recommended roads, the members of the CTC must physically inspect the roads being proposed for the next two years. The CTC must evaluate the cost effectiveness of improving each road based upon such common sense ideas listed below and if they decide to remove all or a portion of any road from the road improvements list, it must be by majority vote of the CTC in open session:
 - a) If a connector road has clusters of residences at each end of the road and the residents have access to a hard surfaced road, then their road would only be improved to a reasonable point from the hard surfaced road to past the majority of residents. The area of the road having little or no residents would not be improved, or
 - b) If a bridge on a recommended road requires expensive repairs, or
 - c) Repairing a bridge or road will create a speeding/safety hazard, or
 - d) If the road to be improved is so costly as to create a financial burden on the resources of the CTC, or
 - e) Any reasonable or unique issue the CTC decides is appropriate
- Ferguson: It seems to be consensus among the CTC and Council Members that we postpone this for a vote until we meet again. *Having made that motion, I would submit that we do that. I withdraw my motion.*
- Hinely: If you semi-like this, or if it is something you want to change, let me know. This isn't anything that is cast in stone.
- Hendrix: That last statement, explain it to me.
- Hinely: That is kind of part of the next to the last one – where the CTC looks at it and say okay, based upon the common sense idea such as connecting roads or if there is a bridge that requires extensive repair and during that repair the road will increase the traffic so much that it would create a safety hazard, then the CTC would take that into consideration.
- Hendrix: I thought we were not going to be in the bridge business.

- Hinely: That's kind of what this is. If by improving the road and there is a bridge there that it is okay for dirt road traffic, but is not okay for paved road traffic, but otherwise that road meets the criteria based on this, you could take that off the list. (I might could say that a little bit better, Mr. Hendrix. I will be glad to improve that a little bit).
- Hendrix: A bridge could eat up a couple of year's worth of road business.
- Hinely: That's hopefully what this is saying.
- Trapp: So, we are not going to take any action on this until the next time we meet? Do we have any other discussion pertaining to this?
- Williams: *I would like to make motion that the CTC, in working with the Dennis Corporation Engineering firm, get a figure on the cost of re-evaluating the county roads by the criteria that was laid out, with use of same roads widths and requirements as in the bylaws now (what's written now), and give County Council a figure on what the cost of re-evaluating the county roads again. {I think now we have no recourse on the accuracy of what's been done and what hasn't been done. Our rules were that we would re-evaluate in five years and 2010 is the five year period and we would like to see that before the end of this year if the members are satisfied}.*
- Hendrix: *I will second it.*
- McGraw: *All in favor of said motion, let it be known by the sign of aye. Opposes? The ayes have it.* Tim, do you have any questions on that? You understand the directions?
- Antley: You just need a cost from us.
- Robinson: We have a motion on the floor.
- Trapp: He took his off. Any other discussion?
- Marcharia: On the second one "use the current road width requirements", what is the minimum amount we are going with in terms of width of roads?
- C. Trapp: Sixteen feet.
- Marcharia: Sixteen. You say you went back and re-evaluated and found twenty-five more feet you didn't see before.
- Hendrix: I thought the minimum requirement was twenty-five or twenty-four.
- C. Trapp: That's for paving.
- Hendrix: I'm not talking about paving. We know that sixteen is the minimum width of the road, but we had a ditch to ditch requirement that we had to have.
- C. Trapp: Sixteen feet. From center road to center road out is twenty-four feet. Is that right, Tim?
- Antley: From center road you go out eight feet and eight feet, that's your sixteen. If you go out for the ditches, if you measure that all the way across from back of ditch to back of ditch, you have a sixteen foot wide riding surface, you will have twenty-five foot minimum prescriptive easement.
- Hendrix: When we go to the homeowners, we say we want twelve foot from the center line of the road to the other side of the road.
- Antley: That's the minimum. If you are going for the gusto, go for twenty five. That's fifty feet.
- Hendrix: When we were talking in one meeting, that was what we have been doing. Something is not right.

- Antley: On page four of the ordinance, it says in here "no work will be performed to subsection D above except on the basis of right-of-way deeded for right-of-ways fifty feet in width, whenever possible, but in no case less than twenty-five feet if all safety warrants permit, having being executed in acceptance in accordance with one seven.
- Hendrix: I hear what you are saying, but the letter that the county sends out to the homeowner has fifty feet on it; yet, we are doing roads that are less than fifty.
- Hinely: We had a joint meeting on April 17, 2008 with the CTC and the Council. We had a fifty foot road requirement and everybody said the fifty was too much. That is when we went to the twenty-five and as a result of that, we said the property owners were notified by certified mail, return receipt requested, that fifty foot minimum right-of-way was the requirement. We re-notified all those same people, by certified mail, that the requirement of twenty-five feet (12.5 feet from the center line toward the shoulder) would be now acceptable.
- Hendrix: I really did not know that.
- Marcharia: I remember the language in talk, but it got confused with me between fifty to sixteen, twenty-five.
- Hendrix: The letters that I saw that we were talking to members about getting right-of-way said fifty.
- Trapp: They sent out a different set of letters.
- Hinely: After we met on April 17 of last year, you all said send out another letter. Fifty feet was prior to that meeting. After that, we sent out a letter that said twenty five feet.
- Hendrix: Are there any roads that we have passed that required fifty and we didn't do them and we went on to the next one?
- Hinely: We went back and said make it twenty five.
- Marcharia: I went back to High Hill Road rather than Extension. In fact, I have been having community meetings there and some folk that live there say they never got letters. I know we sent them out. Also the Prophet Lane, said they never got letters. Some. Some did; some didn't. It had to be everybody had to agree to it. We had some people to agree and three or four that did not.
- C. Trapp: I went back and talked with some of the people on Prophet Lane that did not get a letter and they were willing to get it up. I asked them had they gotten the letter, they said they never got it.
- Trapp: We had agreed that each Council Member was supposed to canvass the road and get the property owners to sign it. Any other discussion on this future road selections?
- Ferguson: I would like for the whole group to be told by Mr. Antley, if it is possible, where we are with the dust down treatment they tried out. I would like for him to explain where we are with that.
- Antley: The Green Techniques came in almost a month ago and sprayed Majestic, Ivy and Sandy Lane Extensions. What they put down was a polyacrylymide. It's a green technique. The material they put down, it worked to a certain extent but not to everybody's perception. It's actually still working. It's called a dust down; not a dust suppressant. You are going to get dust but not as high. Since the perception was there that it didn't work the way it wanted to, I called Green Techniques. They did not charge

the county a dime for what they had done. They went back in and redid some chemicals and they are actually looking at doing Ivy Lane Friday and want the County to look at it before they spend more money to do the other two roads.

- Marcharia: When we do this, would you mind putting the districts next to these numbers. What did it cost Council, within thirty years, to put gravel versus putting this new stuff down and is there a savings to that? If we would take those roads, stop graveling them and apply this substance, does that substantially reduce. How much money did we invest in those thirty years?
- Lucas: It would save, but I have no idea how much right off the top of my head.
- McGraw: Is the Council satisfied with the ordinance or are we going to come back next year and revisit the ordinance?
- Ferguson: I think most of the folk was basically pleased with it.
- Trapp: I think before we pass it, the next time around, we will probably have time to go through it then. I don't see a whole of changes they have made, if any at all.
- Antley: One of the things you might want to specify is: what is a riding surface? There is one thing in the ordinance that some of you may be aware of is we were asked to do a speed study on some of these roads. Great North, we implemented it there. We are putting speed limits on these roads of 25 mph and 15 mph in the curves. We went through legal counsel and they are fine with that. They are advisory (yellow). I don't think the County needs to get into putting up the white and black regulatory signs because if you do, the Sheriff's office has to enforce it. We went with the yellow and black advisory signs because it protects the County if an accident does happen, you do have it posted for a certain speed limit.

IV. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 P.M., upon unanimous approval of Council and the CTC.

SHRYLL M. BROWN
CLERK TO COUNCIL

RUSSELL DAVID BROWN
CHAIRMAN