

Teddie E. Pryor, Sr.- Chairman
J. Elliott Summey – Vice Chairman
Colleen T. Condon
Henry E. Darby
Anna B. Johnson
Joseph K. Qualey
A. Victor Rawl
Henry D. Schweers



Beverly T. Craven, Clerk
(843) 958-4030
1-800-524-7832
FAX (843) 958-4035
E-mail: bcraven@charlestoncounty.org

CHARLESTON COUNTY COUNCIL
LONNIE HAMILTON, III PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING
4045 BRIDGE VIEW DRIVE
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA
29405-7464

April 22, 2011

Richard L. Tapp, Jr.
Corporate Secretary
South Carolina Transportation Infrastructure Bank
955 Park Street
Columbia, SC 29201

RE: I-526 Mark Clark Expressway Project

Dear Mr. Tapp,

Please be advised that on April 19, 2011, Charleston County Council approved the attached April 14, 2011, Finance Committee Recommendation regarding the I-526 Mark Clark Expressway Extension Project. Charleston County would like to meet with the South Carolina Transportation Infrastructure Bank or its designated representatives to discuss a path forward in light of Council's decision.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "TE Pryor" with a stylized flourish above the "o" in "Pryor".

Teddie E. Pryor Sr., Chairman
Charleston County Council

cc: County Council
Joe Dawson, County Attorney
Allen O'Neal, County Administrator

RECOMMENDATION OF: FINANCE COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MET: April 14, 2011

SUBJECT: Completion of I-526 - Request Decision

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

That it considered the information furnished by Allen O'Neal, County Administrator, and Joseph Dawson, County Attorney, regarding Completion of I-526.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

A. That Council rejects the SCDOT's Alternative G for the completion of I-526.

B. That in recognition of the following:

1. The County did not originate the I-526 proposal, but instead, was encouraged to host this project originated by the State.
2. The County is required under federal law to consider all options resulting from an Environmental Impact Study.
3. SCDOT's alternatives yielded by the Environmental Impact Study exceed the funding approved by the State Infrastructure Bank.
4. Funding shortfalls are the responsibility of the County.
5. All reimbursements are at the discretion of the State Infrastructure Bank.
6. Based on extensive public hearings, the public's preference of the SCDOT allowable alternatives unexpectedly appears to be "No Build".
7. Widespread opposition, including many elected bodies and regulatory agencies, exists to SCDOT's build alternatives.

Therefore, if enhancements to existing transportation infrastructure to accomplish the project goals are still being refused for consideration by the SC Department of Transportation, then County Council directs staff, in cooperation with SCDOT and SIB, to negotiate a "No Build" agreement.