Aiken City Council Minutes

WORK SESSION

December 12, 2016

Present: Mayor Osbon, Councilmembers Dewar, Diggs, Ebner, Homoki, Merry, and Price.

Others Present: John Klimm, Stuart Bedenbaugh, Gary Smith, George Grinton, Michelle Jones, Rick Toole, Ryan Bland, Brad Jeffares, Kim Abney, Sara Ridout, Dan Brown of the Aiken Standard, and about 10 citizens.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Osbon called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M.

INFRASTRUCTURE

GIS
Preventive Maintenance
Needs
University Parkway

Mr. Klimm stated one of Council's major directives to him was to develop and implement a proactive plan addressing our City's infrastructure. Tonight, Public Works Director Michelle Jones and Engineer George Grinton will give an overview of this process. Michelle and George will present how the GIS component to identify our needs works and give us details of our infrastructure issues that have been identified to receive proactive preventive maintenance. This thorough program addresses our City's roads, water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer infrastructure.

Once this presentation is complete, Rick Toole will give Council an update on several road projects, at the request of members of City Council, including the Dougherty Road/Whiskey Road intersection project and the University Parkway expansion project.

Mr. Klimm pointed out that staff had talked to Council some time ago not only regarding the serious concerns about the lack of attention over the past few decades in dealing with our infrastructure, but also the need for putting together a long range plan. He noted that about 6 months ago Mr. Grinton gave an initial presentation. He pointed out that an extraordinary amount of work had already taken place. He noted that much information had been gathered, and he was confident that we are headed in the right direction in putting a plan together to address our infrastructure. He pointed out that the projects that Mr. Grinton would discuss are the highest priority projects that need attention. It is the plan over the next year, to present a long range plan that includes the possibility of Capital Projects Sales Tax IV. He said he was not suggesting that the residents of Aiken will decide there will be a CPST IV, but his position as City Manager is that if there is to be a CPST IV that most of it needs to be committed to addressing the infrastructure needs. He said he had mentioned during the budgetary process last year that he believed that the city is headed towards a crises situation, but there is still time left to address these issues in a timely manner. He said, however, if we let another two or three years go by without addressing these issues, then we may be in the category of financial crises. He pointed out that in the spring staff will be presenting a financial plan. At this time the engineering staff is working on assessing the need for attention to the infrastructure plan. They are working with the financial team in putting together a financial model. He pointed out that before Council receives the operating budget for next year, Council will see a financial plan to address the highest priority projects that Mr. Grinton will talk about.

Ms. Michelle Jones, Public Works Director, gave a brief summary of the infrastructure and road projects update that would be discussed. The presentation will begin with an update on the infrastructure and the plan based on the risk-based planning approach that

has been implemented. Mr. Brad Jeffares, GIS Consultant, will give a review of the risk-based planning approach. Mr. George Grinton, Engineering and Utilities Manager, will review the planned projects that have been identified using the Innovyze Software Program. Then there will be a road projects update on the University Parkway corridor and the Dougherty/Whiskey Road intersection by Rick Toole.

Ms. Jones pointed out the Strategic Plan had identified infrastructure as the top priority. To help improve infrastructure the city has purchased the Innovyze Software Program to facilitate the analysis and prioritization of the infrastructure projects. They have confirmed the cost of water, sewer, and stormwater needs. They have also planned for costs of building and maintenance, and a new Stormwater Engineer has been hired. They have also instituted a roads program with funds for the program to be generated from the annual vehicle property tax which was approved by City Council.

Ms. Jones also pointed out that the Department of Public Works had been reestablished with the consolidation of the Public Services and Engineering and Utilities Divisions into one Public Works Department. She also noted that she had been hired as the Public Works Director.

Mr. Brad Jeffares then discussed the Risk-Based Planning approach that had been embarked upon. He said the city had embarked on a GIS program over the last 20 years, mapping the infrastructure, the manholes, pipes, valves, and hydrants. About 2 ½ years ago he was approached about better utilizing the data which had already been gathered and not just having a very active map, but also using it for active management. He pointed out that several software vendors had been interviewed, and after interviews the Innovyze InfoMaster software was chosen. He pointed out it was not just about purchasing software, but a shift in the way we plan and rehab our infrastructure. In the past we have been reactive and projects were determined as problems arose during the year, and we would do as many projects as we could afford each year, but overall risks in the infrastructure may not have been reduced much.

Mr. Jeffares reviewed some of the work done with the program. He pointed out what they are doing now is to assess actual risks in the utilities and use the software to help predict where problems might happen and address the high risk areas first. He reviewed the steps of the process with the first step being calculation of risk. Once the assessment is done the next step is the rehabilitation, costs involved, and budgeting. Ultimately the software will be able to produce a prioritized capital plan. Mr. Jeffares then reviewed the consequences of failure and likelihood of failure for sewer risk analysis. He noted that they look at proximity to churches, schools, and medical facilities, proximity to high volume customers, pipe diameter, and proximity to the downtown area in rating the priority for risk. These facilities are rated higher in the system because they impact more people and have a higher economic impact. He said in looking at likelihood of failure, they look at material of pipe, age of pipe, soil type which affects metal pipes, the count of backups and overflows, gravity main repair, and service repairs. He pointed out that staff had run the risk analyses and produced maps which show the high risk areas. He pointed out that there are 40 miles of high risk and 13 miles of extreme risk sewer lines and those are the first lines to be tested.

Mr. Jeffares then reviewed the water risk analysis and the consequence of failure and likelihood of failure of water lines with the risks being much the same as the sewer line risks. He also showed a computer produced map showing the high risk areas. Generally the downtown area pipes are at a higher risk. There are 13 miles of extreme and 17 miles of high risk water pipes.

Mr. Jeffares pointed out that they are not just looking at water and sewer pipes, but also looking at valves and hydrants. He noted that valves are important as they are used to isolate parts of the system when there is a failure. Some valves isolate only small areas, but others isolate areas with a large number of customers. He pointed out a map which pinpoints the valves and the ones that are higher on the priority list for testing. He noted valve pounding which is when a number of valves have to be turned off to isolate an area

if there is a problem. 353 valves were found that would require 6 or more valves to be turned off to isolate an area.

Mr. Jeffares pointed out that he had mentioned the work order system that was used to upgrade using the GIS. He said they are looking at different methodology to make sure the output from the Innovyze product is accurate and matches what they think is going on in the system. He pointed out a heat map which was generated from the work order system looking at leaks over the last 2 ½ years.

Mr. George Grinton, Engineering and Utilities Manager, reviewed the water, sewer, and roads infrastructure. He said what they are doing is taking the information gained through the Innovyze system and looking at projects to make improvements. Mr. Grinton presented some statistics on the water and sanitary sewer infrastructure. He noted the city operates and maintains 284 miles of sanitary sewer lines, 397 miles of water mains, 99 miles of water laterals, 171 miles of stormwater lines, and 85 miles of city roads. Regarding the sanitary sewer lines 52 miles are rated at extreme or high risk, 96 miles are rated medium risk, and 136 miles rated low or negligible risk. He noted a map showing where the risks are located. He pointed out the focus as a result of the information is to repair known issues, the Sand River Basin gravity lines, sewer capacity to support economic development, investigate pipe segments with elevated consequence of failure, hydraulic mode of city system, provide key equipment to utilities crews, and decide work for the next phase project.

Mr. Grinton stated the first project is to grout the Sand River Basin gravity lines which consist of about 49 miles of high risk Sand River Basin pipe joints, service connections and manholes. There is an opportunity through DHEC to get a State Revolving Fund loan at a 1.8% interest rate for the project. The project cost would be about $10 million. He reviewed how the grouting project would be done. He showed a map of the Sand River basin and area to be grouted. Another project is to investigate elevated consequence of failure pipe segments. There are 15 miles of pipe segments that have high consequence of failure due to their being large collector pipes. Sections of pipe with unidentified material or that are concrete pipe are associated with higher failure risk. The plan is to video inspect, evaluate condition and develop rehabilitation recommendations for defective pipe and schedule 3 to 5 year video monitoring inspections for acceptable pipe.

Mr. Grinton stated another project is to review lift station capacity. He noted that they had started hydraulic modeling of the development opportunities in the Powderhouse Road area. The developers wanted to know what their investment would be to handle all the additional homes that they were proposing to build. He said that can be answered with a hydraulic model. The model showed what areas flow to the Banks Mill lift station. He pointed out the Banks Mill lift station needs to be upgraded to handle sanitary sewer capacity predicted by proposed developments along Whiskey Road. The cost of the project would be about $1.2 million.

Mr. Grinton stated sanitary sewer modeling is another project. Some work has been done on this, but the work needs to be completed to allow for detailed capacity analysis to support development anywhere in the city. The project would cost about $342,000 and take about 12 months to complete. Another project is the Sandhurst aerial crossing project which is to replace aerial crossing at Sandhurst Road at a cost of about $250,000. We would work with the property owners in the area to obtain right of way for a rerouted sanitary sewer line. A tool that is needed is purchase of a new 3,500 gallon vacuum truck. The vacuum truck would be used in conjunction with the jet truck to capture sanitary sewage that is blocking a line. The cost of the truck would be about $375,000. The truck would be used to empty the lift station wet wells during scheduled maintenance. The truck would have the capability to excavate dirt so it could be used to locate utilities more safely and to clean out storm sewer lines. The truck would operate 35 to 40 hours per week and require a 2 person crew to operate.

Mr. Grinton stated another project is ongoing risk evaluation. The InfoMaster data base will be continuously updated with new ratings and GIS data from modeling and

inspections. Each year as the infrastructure ages, an updated Risk Analysis will be completed and will define project priorities for next phase evaluation and rehabilitation.

Mr. Grinton then reviewed the status of the water lines, pointing out there are 30 miles of water lines rated at extreme or high risk, 196 miles rated medium risk, and 171 miles rated low or negligible risk. He noted a map showing the risk areas. Mr. Grinton stated the focus is to investigate pipe segments rated at high risk, especially the downtown pipes, valves and fire hydrants as these are old. Another focus is hydraulic modeling of the water system and water production asset maintenance.

Mr. Grinton then reviewed the water leak work order heat map, the map showing water pipes needing 6 or more valves to isolate an area, and the map showing water valves affecting 50 or more customers.

Mr. Grinton reviewed proposed water projects, including downtown valve and hydrant improvements. The project would include installation of insert valves to provide cutoffs for hydrants, reliable pipe segment isolation and reduce customers impacted. The cost would be about $1.5 million. The downtown has the oldest valves in the water system, and we need to evaluate each for operation and leak potential. The project could be done as fast or as slow as we want. The proposal is to spend about $300,000 a year over a 5 year period. The project would upgrade about 500 fire hydrants as needed. The project would be done over several years to minimize disruption.

Another project is high risk segment evaluation. The cost for a leak survey of pipe segments with elevated risk would cost about $50,000, and valve turning of elevated risk valves not in the downtown area would cost about $40,000. Water hydraulic modeling is another project. We want to complete the Innovyze model of the city water system to allow for detailed capacity analysis and evaluation of operational improvements where we might want to add users of water. This would cost about $120,000 and the project would take 12 months to complete. Mr. Grinton stated there are identified water projects for water main replacements in two subdivisions with thin wall PVC pipe and asbestos containing pipe at a cost of about $1,350,000. One is the Hidden Haven subdivision. Also, an identified water project is maintenance of the water treatment plant replacing some of the older systems at Shaws Creek and water tanks at a cost of $1.6 million. Another water project is an ongoing risk evaluation. The InfoMaster database will continuously be updated with new rating and GIS data from modeling and inspection efforts. Each year as the infrastructure ages, an updated risk analysis will be completed and will define project priorities for the next phase evaluation and rehabilitation.

Mr. Grinton then reviewed the Storm Sewer system. He said staff had not started putting the stormwater information into the InfoMaster data base. He pointed out they had to prioritize water and sewer because of the amount of work. Water and sewer also have the infrastructure spending source of the Capital Projects Sales Tax, whereas we do not have that for stormwater as it all has to be funded from the Stormwater Enterprise Fund. He said they would be putting the same information in the system as was done for water and sewer, using the current staff. It is estimated that we have 171 miles of stormwater pipe. The focus for Storm Water is to complete any identified projects we have. We still model the likelihood of failure and the consequences of failure as we did for sewer and for water. The likelihood of failure is corrugated metal pipe age. He said we know that corrugated metal pipe in the Southeastern United States, due to very acidic soils, is corroding and deteriorating. He said they are prioritizing high consequence of failure concerns of stormwater pipes. Staff is updating Innovyze/GIS data to complete risk analysis and decide work for the next phase projects. He noted that there is a Hitchcock Woods Storm Water Task Force that is working on stormwater just for Hitchcock Woods. $5.6 million in the Capital Projects Sales Tax is allocated for the Hitchcock Woods project.

Mr. Grinton pointed out the projects that had been identified for the Storm Water Fund. One is the Chesterfield bridge storm water structure repair. The lowest bid for the project came in at $950,000. Staff did some reevaluation of the project as to why the cost was so high and the project has been rebid with the bids to be opened this week. There are also

sink holes in the Parsons Circle area and in the Kennedy Kolony subdivision. Replacement of the pipe will cost about $330,000. The Mallard Lake spillway needs to be improved with the project costing about $300,000. Mr. Grinton stated the big concern in stormwater is corrugated metal pipe. Corrugated metal pipe starts failing in 25 to 30 years. The significant consequences of failures include detention pond outlets which are corrugated metal pipe and there is a risk of losing a dam which could be very costly. Another concern is culverts located in roads and pipes located outside roads. Houndslake Subdivision is where most of the corrugated metal pipe is located. That is where a couple of culverts under the road gave way. Woodside is the next phase area of concern. Mr. Grinton then showed some pictures of some stormwater projects from last week regarding a sink hole. Some corrugated metal pipe projects are to rehabilitate city SW ponds with corrugated metal pipe outlets at a cost of about $630,000; SW corrugated metal pipe segments in road rehabilitation in Houndslake at $5.9 million, and SW corrugated metal pipe segments not in road rehabilitation in Houndslake at $2,832,000.

Mr. Grinton then reviewed the statistics for Roads. Within the city limits there are about 85 miles of City roads, 153 miles of State maintained roads, 4 miles of County roads, 28 miles of private roads, and 1 mile of private drives. The strategy for the Road Maintenance Fee is that in 2017 we will continue with planned road resurfacing based on worst first. We should have about $500,000 from the Road Fee to maintain the city roads. In 2017 we will hire a consultant to rate city road condition using standardized methodology and input information in our Innovyze database. In 2018 we would use the database to initiate Pavement Preservation projects allocating a portion of funding to pavement preservation and the remainder of funds to road reconstruction/resurfacing.

Mr. Grinton stated in summary funding for Water and Sewer projects had been identified at a cost of $17,297,000. The current rates support projects identified at this time including servicing State Revolving Fund loan at 1.8% interest over 20 years and Revenue Bonds without a rate increase. The remaining CPST 3 funds for infrastructure projects and current budgeted capital depreciation funds will be used as well for the projects. He pointed out that not all of the projects had been identified yet. Storm Water funds identified for projects total $15,662,681. Revenue falls short of the identified projects by $5,569,989 which will have to be addressed. Regarding funding for Roads, the $658,710 from CPST III and the Road Maintenance Fee should be sufficient to support the identified projects for the next 5 years.

Mr. Grinton pointed out the next step is preparation of the State Revolving Fund loan application. Once there is an agreement with SRF the loan request would be presented to Council for approval. The projects presented would be included in the FY 2017-18 budget. Staff would work with First Tryon on a Capital Planning Model to refine the project cost estimates for strategic plan funding. Mr. Grinton stated there were a couple of projects that he would suggest consideration for the next phase of Capital Projects Sales Tax. He said the next step is to do more work to identify the projects for the next 5, 10, 15, 20, etc. years.

There were several questions by Councilmembers, including if there were any state or federal funds available for any of the projects, if the projects include the line along the railroad track which is about a mile long and the pipe has no bottom, and whether the city owned the Innovyze software. Mr. Grinton responded that there may be some federal funds available from the Matthew hurricane storm. The projects do not include the line along the railroad track. The City of Aiken owns the Innovyze software, but there is an annual maintenance cost for updates, training, etc.

Mr. Klimm, City Manager, stated there are two teams working on this. The Engineering team is working on finalizing their recommendation. The Finance team is beginning to meet with them to put a financial model together. He said staff continues to assume this is Council's high priority and that we can continue on a long range infrastructure plan and that we are putting a plan together utilizing existing resources. He said staff will put a plan together and present it to Council in the spring that presents the highest priority projects with funding within existing resources.

University Parkway
Rick Toole

Mr. Rick Toole, of W. R. Toole Engineers, reviewed for Council the costs involved in the widening of University Parkway. He reviewed the current construction cost estimates. He noted the relocation cost of utilities, including sanitary sewer at a cost of $68,250, a 12 inch primary water main at $474,500, and 3 power pole relocations outside of the right of way at a cost of $60,000 for a total cost of $602,750 for utility relocations. Other service costs include right of way acquisition at $82,950, design and permitting at $297,000, and construction management at $400,000 for a total of $779,950. A contingency of 25% of construction would be $1,640,805. The escalation cost calculated to 2021 would be $2,618,051. He pointed out between the contingency and the escalation cost, the project cost is about $4.2 million. He noted that the longer you wait, the more the project will cost. Mr. Toole mentioned opportunities and risks involved in the project. Usually in opportunities we don't include donation of property that may occur from some of the larger landowners. That may result in a reduction of the cost. He also noted there was a very aggressive contingency and escalation. Some of the risks include the South Carolina Department of Transportation regarding the intersection of University Parkway and Richland Avenue. In their initial review they asked for duel left turn lanes to northbound Richland Avenue heading towards town and left onto University Parkway where there is a large turning traffic movement going to the hospital. SCDOT was told that was not included in the original request for the project and there was no money for it. It would probably be over $1 million to improve the intersection. If SCDOT does come back and demand the intersection improvements at Richland Avenue, that would have an impact on the overall budget. The other risk is the environmental permitting issue with $300,000 for this. There is a ditch that parallels the base of the embankment of the road just before getting to the USCAiken. The ditch was recognized by the Corps of Engineers as a jurisdictional stream which means it has to be syndicated. The problem is there are no mitigation banks for streams in the basin for South Carolina. Presently the Environmental Consultant has applied for another project and been allowed by the US Army Corps of Engineers to create a new or reconstruct an adjacent stream and repopulate it with vertical and in vertical species. Basically environmentally we would be moving the ditch over, and we would put the critters in the new ditch that were in the original ditch. We would approach the Corps of Engineers of that being the only possible mitigation that we have to apply for this project. He said technically that could shut the project down, but we will not know until we get to that process.

Mr. Toole reviewed the proposed schedule for the University Parkway project, with right of way plans completed by August, 2017, environmental documentation by May, 2018, right of way acquisition could be six to eight months which could be completed by February, 2018, and final construction plans could be from September, 2017 to February, 2018. No federal money is involved. We would need to address the environmental concerns which in this case is the stream. Advertising and bidding could be done over a 2 month period in May and June, 2018. Construction could begin in June, 2018 with 16 to 18 months for construction, with the project scheduled for completion in October, 2019. He pointed out that we would not be tearing up the road, but would be widening the road.

Mr. Toole noted this is not a difficult project, but the project is estimated to be $13 million, and that is in excess of the budget. He then reviewed alternatives for Council. He said the project could be phased. Phase 1 could be Richland Avenue to Medical Park Drive which is the primary traffic turning movement for the hospital and a significant turning movement to Pacer Downs and USCAiken. Phase 2 could be extension from Medical Park Drive to Trolley Line Road. Mr. Toole reviewed the proposed cost for Phase 1 as being $9,854,125. He noted that all of the right of way costs would be in Phase 1. Also, all of the environmental costs are in Phase 1 and most of the utility relocations costs are in Phase 1. The brunt of the overall project cost would be in Phase 1. Mr. Toole stated the bid could have a base bid for Phase 1 and an alternate for Phase 2. In case the escalation and contingency are not as extensive as estimated, we might be able to get some or all of Phase 2 done in the initial project. He noted that donations for property for right of way have not been explored at this point. He pointed out we have the same risks with the phase approach because all of the issues are in Phase 1 of the

project. He pointed out that Phase 1 would accommodate the primary traffic issues which are from Richland Avenue to Medical Park Drive. He pointed out that if Phase 2 were taken out and let 5 years from now, it would be a $5 million project with escalation. He pointed out for Phase 2 the utility relocation costs would be reduced and the environmental costs would be reduced as there are no environmental concerns in that area. Mr. Toole stated the assumptions for Phase 2 is that Miracle Lane would be relocated. The proposed Miracle Lane relocation was to accommodate the hospital owners in providing left and right turn movement from the elderly care facility in that location. In order to have left and right turns Miracle Lane had to be relocated to accommodate SCDOT requirements for access control for the area. Consequently, the relocation of Miracle Lane would cost about $500,000. Very little right of way is required from USCAiken, and no environmental permitting would be required and a minimum of utility relocation would be required for Phase 2.

Council asked how much money was available for the project. Mr. Bedenbaugh, Assistant City Manager, responded that we have $10.5 million for the project.

Councilman Ebner stated he had asked for the presentation for several reasons. During his term on Council when the County has been involved, they pass a resolution to provide something. He noted that his understanding is that a resolution is not legally binding. The County Council passed a resolution to fund $3 million of the University Parkway project. The City of Aiken has Capital Projects Sales Tax III to fund $3 million for the University Parkway project. Then there is funding from the SCTIB grant for $4.5 Million. He pointed out something he considered important is that the City of Aiken is responsible for any overrun. Once the $10.5 million is spent, the City of Aiken will be responsible for any overrun. He said that was the reason he had been concerned as there have been overrun costs for other projects. He said the specific thing he had asked for in this meeting was a path forward to deal with the landowners to say what the City is going to do. He said he did not want this to happen like the Hitchcock Parkway project. He pointed out that we know how much money we have for the project. He noted that there are two major property owners in the area involved—the University of South Carolina Aiken and Aiken Regional Medical Centers. He said someone needs to talk to those two agencies right away and discuss the project with them and what we are considering. He said we do not want a lot of adverse publicity that we did not tell anyone about the project. He pointed out that was his point. He noted that we have data that we can say what we can do and that the project could be done in two phases. He said the City needs to ask the other agencies for money to complete the whole job. He said he had specifically asked Mr. Toole to include all land costs even though USCAiken and Aiken Regional may donate some money. It was pointed out that $500,000 is in the cost to relocate Miracle Lane. Councilman Ebner stated what he was looking for from this meeting is that we have the right PR campaign. He said we have the numbers that should be sufficient to cover the cost. He felt that to move forward, we need immediately to tell the key landowners what we plan to do.

Mr. Klimm pointed out that staff would be going to Columbia on Wednesday to meet with the SCTIB board where Mr. Toole will give the same presentation to the SCTIB Board to get the grant money extended for the project.

Councilman Ebner stated staff also needed to have a meeting with the Aiken County Administrator and County Council Chair regarding how good is the $3 million from the County for the project. He noted that there is a resolution that implies the County will give $3 million towards the project cost.

Councilman Dewar stated the fact is we don't have enough money to do the whole project. The briefing is geared towards ways to get the project done by making it into two phases. He pointed out that the City is the prime agency on some of the projects, and the city gets nailed when the project costs increase and money is not available for the overrun. He pointed out that the Chamber of Commerce needs to be notified of the project as well.

Councilwoman Price pointed out the many projects that we presently have ongoing now, and there are not enough funds to fund all the projects. The question is whether we move

forward. She felt the projects need to go forward, but the question is where do we get the money.

Councilman Dewar stated we do need to move forward with road construction projects, but he would suggest that we need to prioritize them. He felt we need to ask if University Parkway widening is more important than building a road network that would alleviate traffic on Whiskey Road. He asked how important is the University Parkway widening project compared to Whiskey Road. He said he personally felt that the widening of University Parkway is not as high a priority as some of the other roads Council has talked about such as a connection to the Aiken Mall to alleviate a lot of traffic on Whiskey Road. He felt the projects need to be prioritized. He felt the last thing we need to do is move ahead on the University Parkway project and find out that we will run out of money like Hitchcock Parkway. He pointed out there are two big road projects on CPST III. One is the Powderhouse connector road which has a low priority. He felt that not enough money from the sales tax would be collected to get to that item on the list.

Councilwoman Price pointed out that the city has these projects, and that we have decided the priority. She noted that we have created traffic issues on Whiskey Road through approval of developments on Whiskey Road and that is not going to stop, but will only increase. She asked whether we push the University Parkway and other projects aside and continue to approve development on Whiskey Road. She felt it was not fair for the projects not to be supported when Council continues to approve development on Whiskey Road which increases the traffic flow. She felt Council should continue with the University Parkway project.

Councilman Homoki pointed out that we need more tax revenue or a vehicle to get more revenue. He felt we can't just stop where we are, we have to grow to be able to raise the total revenue.

Council continued to discuss the projects and the issues involved with funding and with traffic. Councilman Merry pointed out that Whiskey Road may be a traffic problem now, but even if there were no more development that would not solve the problem that exists now. His approach is what can we do to improve what we already have, plus future needs. He noted that is why something like the Owens Street development where there is an opportunity to provide a connector provides relief for ways to get on and off Whiskey Road without traveling the length of Whiskey Road. That can ultimately solve existing and future problems.

Councilman Ebner pointed out that three entities are involved with the University Parkway project, including Aiken Regional Medical Centers, USCAiken, and the Chamber of Commerce. He felt there should be efforts to meet with them and tell them what has been discussed.

Mayor Osbon stated that he and Mr. Klimm would meet with the Aiken County Administrator regarding the project and Mr. Klimm and Mr. Toole would meet with the other entities involved.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

Sara B. Ridout

Sara B. Ridout
City Clerk