

## **TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**May 27, 2025**

A meeting of the Traffic and Transportation Committee was held on this date, beginning at 3:34 p.m. in person in the Council Chambers at 80 Broad Street and over Zoom.

**Committee Members:** Councilmember Michael Seekings (Chair), Councilmember Karl Brady (Vice-Chair) arrived @ 3:59 p.m., Councilmember Boyd Gregg, Councilmember William Dudley Gregorie, Councilmember Jim McBride, and Mayor William S. Cogswell

**Also Present:** Michael Mathis, Julia Copeland, Melissa Cruthirds, Josh Martin, Amy Wharton, Katie Dahlheim, Councilmember Caroline Parker, Magalie Creech, Elizabeth Dieck, Hampton Logan, Jason Kronsberg, and Donna Constance

Chair Seekings called the meeting to order.

### **Invocation**

The meeting was opened with a moment of silence led by Chair Seekings.

### **Approval of the April 22, 2025 minutes**

On a motion by Mayor Cogswell, seconded by Councilmember Gregg, the Committee voted unanimously to approve the April 22, 2025, Traffic and Transportation meeting minutes.

### **Ashley River Crossing Update**

Mayor Cogswell provided an update on the construction progress and discussed proposed alternatives for the Eastern Landing. The span section on the west side has been completed, along with the permits for the piles and track beams. They poured the concrete coffer, and the structure was taking shape, along with the railings and lighting. There were some safety concerns about the eastern access point because the bridge came down and landed on the Ashley River or the Lockwood slip lane. They are considering other options for narrowing the slip lane. After crossing the bridge, there was an island controlled by the B Street light, which made it a logical place for commuters traveling to and from work. They also wanted to focus on the majority of bridge users and provide them access to the north side of the cross-town, leading to Brittlebank Park. In November, they presented an idea for adding another landing point that would connect to the battery extension. A switchback would lead to a floating dock beneath the Ashley River Bridges, tying into the Ashley River Walk. This will connect to the Marina and extend along the dock space to Brittlebank. This will change the elevation to accommodate the battery extension. The estimated cost for this was under \$10 million. Funding will be provided by the hospitality tax over the next three years. The second component is to have two access points off the bridge for safety reasons.

Councilmember Gregorie asked (inaudible)

Mayor Cogswell said that it would not add any value to the project, but the order needed to be executed promptly to prevent any delays, as construction was progressing from the west side to the east. The permits from the Ashley Riverwalk should not impact the schedule.

Councilmember Gregorie asked when this was scheduled for completion.

Mayor Cogswell said the end of 2027.

Chair Seekings asked if the idea was to bring the change order with MasTec.

Mayor Cogswell said yes.

Councilmember Gregg asked if there would be dedicated pedestrian lanes and dedicated bike lanes, or if it would be split in half.

Mayor Cogswell said they were split in half.

Councilmember Gregg asked if there would be dedicated pedestrian lanes and dedicated bike lanes on each side.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if they thought most people who would be using the bridge would be using it for pleasure, and if they thought there would also be a large portion of time this would be used for the MUSC and other employers in that area.

Mayor Cogswell said he did not know. They generated the estimate by asking the Traffic and Transportation Department to pull the counts on the Ravenel Bridge. About 92% to 93% were walkers or pedestrians, and 6% to 7% were cyclists. He did not have information on how many were leisure cyclists versus commuters, but looking at this as an example, he hoped it was a majority. They also wanted it to be a significant focus for residents, not just commuters. They received a letter from all the West Ashley neighborhoods supporting the creation of designs that promote leisure use and commuter use.

Chair Seekings said that the Ravenel Bridge was a fantastic route, knowing that people were going to use it, and something like this had a very different layout, especially with the 2.2-mile crossing of the river from the Mount Pleasant side. He believed this would provide a significant opportunity for recreation, and that the medical university community would ride their bikes and walk across to attend RiverDogs games. This could alleviate parking issues and would attract substantial use at all levels. He asked if there were any recommendations that the committee would like to send through to their colleagues at City Council about the Mayor's presentation.

Mayor Cogswell said he would like to make a motion that the Traffic and Transportation Committee approve moving forward to get a formal contract change order for council discussions in the amount of not to exceed \$11.5 million for the additional access point on and off the park bridge.

Councilmember Gregorie asked not to exceed the \$11.5 million.

Mayor Cogswell said that this was not an estimate. They had conducted extensive work and created detailed drawings with JMT, the designer of the original bridge. They were confident when they signed the change order for a specific scope change under a design-build contract, knowing the responsibility lay with the contractor to deliver. They managed to keep the ARC Bridge on

budget. They originally had a strong relationship and partnership with Superior, now with MasTec, which contributed significantly. To ensure thoroughness, they consulted a third-party contractor to assess this independently of the contract. They met with Gulf Stream, who conducted an in-depth analysis of the economics and costs, and they felt assured about this figure.

Councilmember Gregorie said that they did not start at \$100 million. He asked where they started.

Chair Seekings said that one of the things they had done efficiently was assemble a funding package that did not require an increase in the City's contribution along the route. This was the largest portion of it, and they would still receive it once this was finalized if they invested \$100 million into this project for 20% of the City's funding. This was a great deal for the City and the design team that devised it, and connecting this with the future River Walk was something they had not considered when they initially envisioned this project. Achieving this now would be much better than trying to retrofit it ten years down the road.

Councilmember Gregg asked if they could get an overview of the economics of how much they spent, and what the City's portion was, and what the delta was, and where the money came from to pay for it.

Mayor Cogswell asked Ms. Wharton if she could provide them with the exact breakdown. He noted that this was not \$100 million, and that these funds were federal and county. This was a City-led initiative change order, and he recognized it was a substantial amount. However, retrofitting this to accommodate the battery extension or future northern connections would be considerably more expensive. This situation would not reflect well on them, as they were the stewards of public funds. They planned to finance this through the hospitality tax, spread out over three years, which would cover the costs.

Councilmember Brady said he knew people who lived in the Avondale area who worked in the medical district would like not to have to take a bus to the medical university, but would rather be able to walk or bike across to get to work. He thought there would be a large commuter portion that would use this.

Chair Seekings said he recollected that the MasTec contract was for \$80 million, and they were in for about 20%.

Councilmember McBride said this had his support. He was aware that this had begun before his arrival and that the funding for the overall project came from federal and state sources. Since this was a different pool of money than usual road infrastructure funds, he wanted to fully understand where all the project funding originated and be able to communicate with his constituents. Therefore, he would not be voting for this. Given that this was an ongoing infrastructure project, not proceeding to ensure that the infrastructure would be fully functional for as many people as possible would not be prudent.

Ms. Wharton said the total project budget was \$92.2 million. For the City, without the \$11 million would be a \$10 million contribution.

Chair Seekings said right, they were at 12%, and at the end, they would be putting in 20% of the \$100 million budget.

Councilmember Gregorie asked (inaudible)

Mayor Cogswell said the City planned to take the Ashley River Crossing Bridge and the Ashley River Walk, which was a separate project that would have the floating docks underneath the bridge that would connect to the City's Marina and eventually to Brittlebank, and merge those two projects, for which they already had the permits.

Chair Seekings said this project was part and parcel of a second project. When they looked at the total amount that was spent, the money was spent on one project, and then a good bit on the second project.

Mayor Cogswell said the potential funds would be counted towards the battery extension and their partnership with the Army Corps, so this would be all tied in with that, versus having to build the component separately.

Chair Seekings said this also had a huge safety component to it on the City side, with the road dieting on the slip lane and changing the curve around it.

On a motion by Mayor Cogswell, seconded by Councilmember Gregg, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend sending this to City Council as a change order to go through Councilmember Gregg's Ways and Means Committee, with a limit of up to \$11.5 million.

### **Lowline Update**

Mr. Martin said that the Lowline project was approved by the City Council to proceed with the contract. For phase one, they completed the schematic designs and hoped to break ground in a few months. They launched a new website called [lowline.info](http://lowline.info), which will host all the project's information from the City side, including updates. Over 250 people attended the design kickoff meeting. A design team was selected for phase one. They will progress from Line to Mount Pleasant, with construction starting in the north and working south. Some pedestrian connections are planned along the west side of phase one that will lead into dead-end streets, such as Poplar and Grove. Questions arose about how it will look, safety concerns, and waste management. They will address these concerns on a block-by-block basis and engage in public outreach to ensure they are aligned with the community.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Martin said the plan was to have pedestrian connections to get to the trail safely from the street.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Martin said that was correct.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if there were any connections to the water.

Mr. Martin asked to water.

Councilmember Gregorie said some streets would connect with the Lowline, such as Grove Street, which went directly to the water. The corridor seemed like a project that would expand the Lowline footprint to connect to the water.

Mr. Martin said that it had been coordinated into this plan as well as their plan.

He said that for phase one, they talked about the combined trail, which would have two separate pathways. One would be a dedicated bike, and one would be a dedicated ped, which would be

separated by a swale. The associated furnishings would have 24-hour security cameras and full-time maintenance that would be dedicated to the line itself. They were building a park and two revenue parking lots at Shepard Street and Huger Street. They would have a guaranteed maximum price, which they had allocated \$15 million. It seemed they would be able to do all of this within that budget, which was great for design and construction costs. They were looking to break ground in September, and this would be put out to bid.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if this was for phase one.

Chair Seekings said yes.

Councilmember Gregorie asked about the specifics of Phase Two, as the discussion had only focused on the trails and bike paths without addressing what was outlined in the grand master plan.

Mayor Cogswell stated that Phase Two would extend from Line Street to Marion Square. They aimed to expand and were seeking federal funding for improvements to stormwater drainage.

Councilmember Gregorie said this was a long time coming and that this was moving quickly.

Mr. Martin said they had envisioned future phases with side options, such as basketball courts and things of that nature. There was a large interest in wanting to give to this project, so they were looking to do a fundraiser, and working with friends to come up with how to organize themselves in terms of what those donations would be for. They wanted a sophisticated palette to receive those funds, which could range from \$100 to \$10 million.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if places like Courier Square had already committed.

Mr. Martin said that most of the property owners on the south had already committed to constructing their section. They would have to wait because of all the construction going on in the laid-out areas, which would take a few years to finish, and then move forward.

Councilmember Gregorie asked that, as they moved forward, there would be affordable units along those trails.

Mr. Martin said yes.

Chair Seekings said that this was presented to the public at the kickoff meeting, that if they built the basic infrastructure through the corridor, it would grow organically from there. Then, as they got to the south end and saw how successful the north end was, it would renew vigor on the south end, where there were larger developments to give heartily into this project.

#### **Update and potential action regarding the knee wall along Lockwood Boulevard**

Mayor Cogswell said they wanted to address the flooding across Lockwood, which had severely shut down parts of the peninsula. This took on a new life with the water plan, with regard to some of the recommendations that were made there, and how it could double in conjunction and work in tandem with the battery extension for future stormwater relief. He thought that it would make sense to move aggressively since they had approved the design package with JMT. The wall would go along Lockwood Drive, where the erosion was. The wall would be about 22 inches tall and would go along the outside of the existing sidewalk. This would be a concrete structure with blue stone. This was currently in the permitting phase, and the estimated cost was under \$9 million. If they move forward, groundbreaking could begin as early as this fall and would take about

6 to 8 months to complete. In terms of funding, there would be a third water draining, a third general fund reserve, and a third hospitality. They had a meeting in Washington with the Army Corps of Engineers and HUD to talk about this project. This would show their commitment to the federal government that they were sincere, not only with the Perimeter Protection Program but also with the Basin Action Plan.

Councilmember Gregorie asked where on Lockwood this would stop.

Mayor Cogswell said it would go from the Coast Guard base to Three Lockwood.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if this would be retention or detention.

Mayor Cogswell said it was a polder.

Councilmember Gregg asked if there would be a check valve.

Mayor Cogswell said yes.

Councilmember Gregorie asked how high the battery extension wall would be.

Mayor Cogswell said as high as the high battery. This came within 4% of the original estimate, even though they were building a more beautiful structure. The complexities of having this on land were cheaper construction costs, but the added costs of the other components would end up being more expensive.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if they would need to get money for this.

Mayor Cogswell said yes.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if the \$9 million was for Lowline.

Mayor Cogswell said it was for the knee wall.

Councilmember Gregorie said that they were spending a lot of money and hoped that they would have money left over to do other things.

On a motion by Mayor Cogswell, seconded by Councilmember Gregg, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend approving the contract for the \$9 million figure and for the Council to proceed with the contract.

**An ordinance to Amend Article XVI (PEDICABS) of Chapter 19 (Motor Vehicles and Traffic) of the Code of the City of Charleston by amending Sections 19-465 "Renewal and expiration of Operating decals " and Section 19-469 "Agreement with the city ".**

Ms. Cruthirds said that they had 30 pedicab decals that were not issued. Last year, they voted for six additional nighttime decals, which had yet to be put out for bid or awarded. The current decals, which began in 2016, were renewed in 2021 and will expire in August 2026. The current term consisted of a five-year initial term plus a five-year renewal. The decal owners inquired with the staff about the next steps when their current decals expire. They proposed changes to the ordinance, aiming to remove the decal term from the ordinance and grant the committee or council authority to define the decal term in the franchise agreement. They intended to remove the terms and place them in the agreement. They requested an amendment to the ordinance to establish the terms of the agreement for both the current and new decals. One option would be to amend the current agreement so that the existing decals would expire in 2036, adding 10 years, while

aligning the new decals to expire in 11 years so they would terminate simultaneously. At the end of the term, the intention would be to rebid all the decals with new terms. If the committee approved the ordinance amendment, they would provide directions regarding the new terms, issue the pre-qualifications, and at the next Council meeting, the ordinance would be open for first reading, with the possibility of adopting the new terms in the franchise agreement by resolution. Following that, they could issue the solicitation for bids and adopt the ordinance, and receive the bids for the new decals.

Councilmember Gregg asked if 2011 was when they issued the original decals.

Ms. Cruthirds said she was unsure, but the current franchise agreement began in 2016.

Chair Seekings said 2010 was when they first issued them.

Councilmember Gregg asked if 2016 was when they gave them another extension to 2021.

Ms. Cruthirds said 2016 was when the set term was set by the City Council.

Councilmember Gregg asked in 2016 when they decided that 2021 was the existing agreement, and then they gave another extension in 2021 to 2026.

Ms. Cruthirds said before 2016, there was no term at all, and in 2016 Council said there would be a five-year initial term plus a five-year renewal.

Councilmember Gregg asked in 2016 when the existing pedicab owners would have known that their existing agreements expired in 2026.

Ms. Cruthirds said yes.

Councilmember Gregg asked if there was an option to take some of the existing decals, and every three to five years, they would decide to reissue those for bid instead of all at once in 2026. If that was something they could do within the existing ordinance.

Ms. Cruthirds said yes because the ordinance would remove any terms. They may also need to review the code section to determine if any changes were necessary to achieve that.

Chair Seekings said in January 2010, the pedicabs were discontinued by a prior council and prior councilmembers. They came up with an entirely new set of rules, regulations, and requirements for the pedicabs to be able to operate in the City of Charleston. To pre-qualify them, they were asked to build up a business infrastructure that met their requirements, which included having a physical presence in the City of Charleston and being able to store pedicabs on the peninsula of Charleston. When the original franchise agreements were signed, they had automatic rollover provisions in them that took them through 2016. It was a mistake to change the rollover provisions to sunset them, which did not give them any assurances that the City would protect them against the major investments they made to do business in the City. So, this would give existing businesses a period in the future when they would not get shut down after making major investments in the City. This would level up by the time all the decals, including the six additional ones, would be viewed. If someone came in who was not the already existing companies that bought in and had decals and met the requirements, which included having a physical presence on the peninsula would be assured that they would get at least 10 years out of it if they made that investment.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if this would add 10 years and make it 2036.

Chair Seekings said 10 years to the existing and 11 years to the new one.

Councilmember Gregorie asked whether they could go further, as this would be addressed in the franchise agreement rather than the ordinance. Additionally, he asked if there could be a way, when they began to review the requests in 10 years, to prioritize local businesses, considering that many of the pedicab operators had established this as their livelihood. He suggested discussing the terms of the agreement to allow for scoring or additional points if they were local.

Ms. Cruthirds said yes.

Councilmember Gregorie said as they continued to talk about the locals first, they needed to start expanding and start looking at those vendors and companies that had been around for a while.

Ms. Cruthirds asked if he was talking about in ten years.

Councilmember Gregorie said he thought they should consider some type of local first provision in the franchise.

Councilmember Brady said that when Lowcountry Local First approached them about safeguarding Avondale from the situation on King Street, where prices skyrocketed and large national chains ousted local competitors, they considered implementing measures similar to those in Folly Beach, which limit franchise businesses from entering Avondale. However, the council ultimately opted against this approach. He voiced concerns about large pedicab operators coming in from New Orleans or Los Angeles, as he favored a local presence and was apprehensive about their potential impact on local businesses and carriage horses. Furthermore, he questioned the local restaurant industry regarding their decision to permit chains to enter and compete with local restaurants and owner-operators, who also invest significant resources and capital.

Chair Seekings said that restaurants depended on a business license issued by the City. There was no franchise agreement required, nor was there an obligation for them to operate indefinitely as long as they followed their lease. They also made significant investments to establish themselves, including acquiring a business license with stipulations. The only distinction was that the franchise requirement for carriages, pedicabs, and similar businesses involved making substantial investments, setting it apart from restaurants with leases.

Councilmember Brady said they would not restrict a landlord who had a local restaurant tenant who wanted to bring in a national chain because they would pay more rent.

Chair Seekings said they were not doing that, and they were not excluding anybody who wanted to come in and do business in the City of Charleston. They wanted to make sure that the people who were currently doing it would not get shut down immediately.

Councilmember Brady said if they moved to some type of scoring model, local businesses should be rewarded. They wanted people to hold the assets locally, and to do that as they moved forward with this, there should be a way to prioritize.

Ms. Cruthirds asked if they could have directions on the terms.

Chair Seekings said that the terms were presented to the City Council for the ordinance amendment without changes.

On a motion by Mayor Cogswell, seconded by Councilmember Gregg, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend the ordinance amendment to the City Council as is.



### **Recommendation and path forward regarding Maybank Highway from River Road to the Paul Gelegotis Bridge**

Mayor Cogswell said they discussed Maybank Highway between River Road and the bridge turn. They were exploring various options to address the ongoing issues. Exiting the island, there was only one lane, which caused backups. The DOT and the county had differing perspectives on adding a lane there; it would involve removing many grand trees, constructing an additional road, and connecting it. This approach seemed excessive and would take two to three years to finish. Mr. Kronsberg, the Mayor, and Mr. Somerville measured the asphalt and reviewed the as-builts, concluding that by deviating from the DOT standards for 14-foot lane lengths and widths, they could fit an extra lane. They proposed narrowing the lanes from 14 feet to 11 feet in one instance and to 10 feet for the turning lane into Fenwick, which would enable them to implement another lane quickly. They were collaborating with the county to secure funding for this. A budget of \$15 million was set aside for this purpose, making it a less costly and quicker option. The City needs to take ownership, similar to what they did on King Street. This presented a challenge, and the solution lay in not following DOT guidelines if the county funded it. By assuming control, they would gain the flexibility, which was a risk worth taking.

Chair Seekings asked if this was bifurcated, where there would be a takeover from the state and then a negotiation with the county for the building of it.

The Mayor said they would go in with an MOU with the county. He thought they would be supportive and would agree to fund the cost for the additional lane. Then they would write a letter to the secretary and ask them to transfer ownership to them.

Chair Seekings asked if they had given any indication of their approval.

Mayor Cogswell said he had not approached the subject with him, but he was receptive before when they offered to take over roads such as King Street.

Councilmember Gregg said he did not understand why they would have to take over ownership.

Mayor Cogswell said that the DOT would not approve narrower lanes.

Councilmember Gregg asked if they were to take over the road, would the county receive CTC funding to maintain those roads, and pay for repaving, or would they pay for it?

Mayor Cogswell said they could ask if they could work together on the long-term maintenance of it because this was a huge issue for the county council as well.

Councilmember Gregg said this had his support as long as they could allocate a budget of CTC funds for repaving or an agreement to maintain it. They should not be responsible for the repaving because they were getting money from the state.

Chair Seekings said that on tax dollars and sales tax dollars, which were their dollars too.

Councilmember Brady thanked them for the proposal and mentioned that he understood Councilmember Gregg's concerns, pointing out that the one-size-fits-all approach was based on limited factors and wasn't always the best option. Therefore, to implement those limited measures, they would need to do so locally, and they now have a better relationship with the county council and the legislature than they did several years ago.

Mayor Cogswell said they saw this as a partnership and that this was all public dollars, and for the county, this was a major issue for them as well. He did not think they intended to leave them on the hook for long-term maintenance, and they did not have any funding sources for this.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if they had estimates for the cost or data from the state, saying it would cost this amount of dollars to maintain. He was unsure if he could support this because of the lack of data that would tell him what the cost was. Also, he was not sure of what the state and or the county would do for the maintenance of the roads because of the expense.

Mayor Cogswell said the idea was to come back to the council with those specifics and to negotiate with the county on those details. The goal was to start a conversation to make them understand how critical this problem was and that there was a simple, cost-effective solution that could be worked out. He said they were not voting to take this over; they were voting to move forward, get them the details on the cost, and have conversations with the DOT.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if the council was privy to the safety in reducing the width of the lane or having a safety factor.

Mayor Cogswell said at present the speed limit was 40 mph, and the idea was to narrow the lanes down and reduce the speed to 25 mph to 30 mph max.

Councilmember McBride said this had his support. The county spent \$1.7 million on surveying that road. He was unsure why it cost that much, but it was completed, and like all major projects around Charleston that were county projects, this was the closest to being shovel-ready. This would save many trees because people were concerned about the county's plan, whose hands were tied by the SCDOT's requirements on the number of trees that would have to be cut down. This would significantly reduce the number of trees that needed to be removed and could be done more quickly. If the City were to take charge of its roads that run through the City, that would be a disconnect they had endured for decades. This was one way to help solve that, since they were taking ownership of a road that had become a bottleneck, and they would have a direct role in fixing it.

On a motion by Mayor Cogswell, seconded by Councilmember Gregg, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend sending this to the Council to give the Mayor and staff the ability to negotiate with the County the particulars of this project, including the costs associated therewith. If approved, then go to the DOT with the understanding that the road would be taken over by the City.

#### **Discussion regarding Secessionville Road (Requested by Councilmember Caroline Parker)**

Councilmember Parker said Secessionville Road was a heavily traveled route on James Island. Constituents have asked for safety improvements. The DOT did trim back trees and helped, but they were hoping to see safety improvements such as yellow arrows, reflective lights, and additional crosswalks. The two big requests they were requesting from the committee, and the City would be to propose a resolution for sidewalks along this road. The other would be to place feedback signs. The town was successful in placing one along Fort Johnson Road, a heavily trafficked and heavily traveled residential road, and they were able to get DOT to place a permanent radar feedback sign. The goal was to slow things down, even though the speed limit was not an issue. They would like more of a police presence, which could help. People would walk along there, which had two big developments, and they would cross the road to utilize the playground, and there was a dangerous curve.

Mr. Mathis said they had discussed this with Councilmember Parker about different funding opportunities, and they think there could be some opportunities to use next year's budget to make some requests. They would continue to work with her to see what they were looking at and get back to her.

Councilmember Gregorie said that a list for sidewalks already existed, which was ranked for connectivity. They were curious to know where Secessionville Road fell in the ranking process because of their experience with Fleming Road. They wanted sidewalks there for years, and they were not there yet. They wanted to ensure that the infrastructure was in place first for drainage and stormwater before they could do the sidewalk.

Mayor Cogswell excused himself at 4:48 p.m. and was not present for the vote.

Mr. Mathis said they would need to look at this because they already had a list with over 200 sidewalk requests.

Councilmember Parker asked, because this was a sidewalk list request, if anything needed to come from the committee or council, or if a request could be made to the state.

Mr. Mathis said it would be helpful for the Traffic and Transportation Committee to make a recommendation so they could take this and move forward.

Councilmember Parker said this was a huge connection and a big gap right on the other side of Secessionville, which would connect Camp to Folly, which would be beneficial for the island. They also had a big intersection project that would come through the county in that area and would be a huge improvement.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if they were doing a turnabout at Secessionville and Fort Johnson.

Councilmember Parker said yes, and it was going to be a traffic light.

Councilmember Gregorie said it would be great if they could connect that to the sidewalk, even with amending it and requesting additional dollars.

Councilmember Parker said they did make that request through the county. She would appreciate any directions from Traffic and Transportation and the City.

Mayor Cogswell returned to the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Mr. Mathis said that for the 2026 funding year, the Transportation Sales Tax allocation and the CTC projects had been submitted, so for that type of funding, it would be for the 2027 funding.

On a motion by Councilmember McBride, seconded by Councilmember Brady, the Committee voted to make this a priority matter from the Traffic and Transportation Committee for Mr. Somerville and Mr. Mathis to act.

**Discussion regarding CARTA Benches/bus stop Sidewalk requests along with Folly Road and side routes (Requested by Councilmember Caroline Parker)**

Councilmember Parker said they had a lot of needs on James Island. They had people sitting on electric boxes. She did make a few requests to CARTA, but hoped to see some improvements. They were aware there was a budget for bus sheds and the like. They had some handicapped people at the Fort Johnson Folly spot, and the SCDOT had just installed an ADA access, which

went nowhere. There would be a need for 25 to 30 feet of sidewalk, and if CARTA could help with that. The main goal was to get benches with shade at some of these stops.

Chair Seekings said that now that they increased service on James Island, the lead head time was cut in half. There was more ridership there; they would get together with CARTA and go to take a look at it.

Councilmember Brady said that they could encourage local schools and nonprofit groups, and exchange clubs to help raise money, since these were worthy projects. Business owners could work with the owners of the right-of-way in front of their businesses, or if they had a stop, this would be good for their patrons as well as those of CARTA. So, they may want to figure out of way they could communicate, whether it was through the City newsletter or something similar, that would encourage people to donate benches and ways for the patrons of CARTA to rest in front of businesses.

Councilmember Parker said they did have someone do that for one of their stops, and it was well received. This was a great idea, and they would need to pitch it to the City and CARTA as well.

Councilmember McBride said the roundabout in front of River Road was complete and would open this week.

With there being no further business, the Committee adjourned the meeting at 4:54 p.m.

Donna Constance

Clerk of Council's Office