CITY OF BEAUFORT
1911 BOUNDARY STREET
BEAUFORT MUNICIPAL COMPLEX
BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA 29902
(843) 525-7070
CITY COUNCIL WORKSESSION AGENDA
July 9, 2024

STATEMENT OF MEDIA NOTIFICATION

"In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d), as amended, all local media was duly notified of the time, date, place and agenda of this meeting."

WORKSESSION - City Hall, Planning Conference Room, 1st Floor - 5:00 PM

Please note, this meeting will be broadcasted via zoom and live streamed on Facebook. You can view the meeting at the City's page: City Beaufort SC

I. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Philip Cromer, Mayor

II. EMPLOYEE NEW HIRE RECOGNITION
   A. Fire Department - Giovani Murgolo, Joshua Nicholas

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   A. King Street Stormwater Project Options Discussion
   B. 2024 Transportation Sales Tax Referendum

IV. ADJOURN
CITY OF BEAUFORT
DEPARTMENT REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

TO: CITY COUNCIL
FROM: JJ Sauve
AGENDA ITEM TITLE: King Street Stormwater Project Options Discussion
MEETING DATE: 7/9/2024
DEPARTMENT: City Managers Office

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The King St. Stormwater Project is one of four ongoing stormwater improvement projects being completed based on the Downtown/Point Drainage Study commissioned by the City of Beaufort in 2021 and completed in 2022. These projects are all funded through various state and federal grants, with the King St. Project funding coming from a grant with a December 2026 sunset. The other three funded projects only involve underground collection and conveyance systems and outfall structures, while the King St. Project is based on the need for a pumping station and control center. Davis & Floyd and Architect Rob Montgomery provided city staff with initial design concepts in late February 2024, and the public input process began shortly after.

The public input process has provided significant community opposition to the original designs discussed below in option two. Further, the public input has ranged from distaste for the proposed aboveground structures, requesting cleaning of existing pipes or replace of existing pipes alone, to questioning of the underlying engineering study, to questioning of the need for any stormwater work at all. Council is well aware of the many concerns raised throughout this process, and most are available for viewing online.

Because option one below is timebound due to grant funding requirements and a pending OCRM permit hearing, staff is requesting that Council provide guidance on how it wishes to proceed with this project. There are three identified options that were presented at the last City Council Workscession, and the attached memorandum provides pros and cons for each of those options.

PLACED ON AGENDA FOR: Discussion

REMARKS:

Staff is requesting guidance on how to proceed.

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King St Project July 9 2024 Options Memorandum</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
<td>7/3/2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuesday July 2, 2024

MEMORANDUM

To: City Council

From: J.J. Sauvé, Assistant City Manager

Re: King Street Stormwater Project Options

I. Introduction

The King St. Stormwater Project is one of four ongoing stormwater improvement projects being completed based on the Downtown/Point Drainage Study commissioned by the City of Beaufort in 2021 and completed in 2022. These projects are all funded through various state and federal grants, with the King St. Project funding coming from a grant with a December 2026 sunset. The other three funded projects only involve underground collection and conveyance systems and outfall structures, while the King St. Project is based on the need for a pumping station and control center. Davis & Floyd and Architect Rob Montgomery provided city staff with initial design concepts in late February 2024, and the public input process began shortly after.

The public input process has provided significant community opposition to the original designs discussed below in option two. Further, the public input has ranged from distaste for the proposed aboveground structures, requesting cleaning of existing pipes or replace of existing pipes alone, to questioning of the underlying engineering study, to questioning of the need for any stormwater work at all. Council is well aware of the many concerns raised throughout this process, and most are available for viewing online.

Because option one below is timebound due to grant funding requirements and a pending OCRM permit hearing, staff is requesting that Council provide guidance on how it wishes to proceed with this project. There are three identified options that were presented at the last City Council
Worksession, and this memorandum provides pros and cons for each of those options.

II. **Option One: Proceed With Original Design**

The first path forward is to proceed with the current engineered system that requires some configuration of underground conveyance, a pump station, and a control housing. There is some room for aesthetic changes and features such as removing the generator housing, adjusting height and design of the control station building, taking ownership of Federal St from SCDOT and placing the pump station under Federal St, or moving to another pump design that could lower the outfall height by approximately two feet. This path keeps the project on-schedule with the grant requirements, and is the path recommended by the engineering team, but is not favored by the public.

**Pros**

- Provides the greatest long-term protections and resiliency for the community according to the engineers
- Executes the plan originally identified in the Downtown/Point Drainage Study
- Already designed to approximately 60% completion stage and permitting process begun

**Cons**

- Not favored by the community
- Requires building a control station in Knott Park
- Unsightly large pump station
- Requires a specific timeline due to grant funding
- Most expensive option
- Requires significant construction and disruption of daily lives during construction phase

III. **Option Two: Change-Order for Scope of Work**
The second path forward would require a change order in the engineering process, and approval by the grant authority, and may push the project timeline to no longer align with the grant funding requirements. This path would be to direct Davis and Floyd to go back to the original engineering design for the conveyance system and determine if a completely different design could achieve the desired stormwater drainage results without the use of a pumping station. This was discussed by Davis and Floyd, and achieves the same results as Mr. Ivy’s proposal, but would not run afoul of local, state, and federal procurement requirements. This path could also explore other alternatives as requested by Council, such as the incorporation of green infrastructure as discussed by Councilmember Scallate. Based on our most recent discussions with Davis & Floyd, we believe that this option could be possible (see addendum) and could even be completed in a manner that would allow for the addition of a pump station in the future if that were to ever be desired.

Pros

- Addresses many of the public’s concerns and complaints
- Removes need for the pump station and any above ground structures
- Believed to be a significantly less expensive option, even with the new design/permitting requirements
- Addresses the aging and failing existing collection and conveyance system and outfall
- Could be designed to allow for a pump station in the future if ever desired or needed by the community

Cons

- Does not address all the public’s concerns and complaints—specifically those who believe there is no flooding/stormwater problem
- May extend timeline beyond that of the grant funding
- Change in scope will require approval of SCIIP for continued grant funding which is not guaranteed
- Still requires extensive construction and disruption to daily life during the construction phase
IV. Option Three: Postpone Project

The third option is for Council to pause things and re-assess the priority of the King St. Stormwater Project. This could be accomplished by providing notice of termination of the design contract and following that procedure as outlined in the contract for services or allowing the design and permitting process to be completed and then shelving the project for future review. Either way Council would have the opportunity to re-assess the need and priority of the project at next year’s strategic planning session, and in any future Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) planning sessions.

Pros

- No or minimal further expenditures of City funds
- Addresses many of the public concerns and complaints, specifically the comments that flooding/stormwater are not an issue
- If fully designed/permited and shelved, may be brought forward in the future more quickly if deemed necessary

Cons

- Does not address any problems or potential problems now or in the immediate future
- If design/permitting not completed, City has nothing to show for already expended funds
- May be required to explain stoppage of project if applying for state or federal grant funding in the future
ADDITIONAL

Options Summary from Davis & Floyd
Thank you for your time and discussion during our meeting yesterday. We understand that the City is looking to present 3+/- variable / alternative approaches to the project scoping and delivery for Council consideration together with a staff recommended approach for possible actions forward. The following approaches were entertained as part of the discussion:

1. Continue with the design, permitting, and bidding of the project as currently planned / contracted, following the City’s selection of layout / location for pump station and power & controls facilities, addressing aesthetics to the extent practicable as design progresses
2. Redesign all of project elements for a reduced level of performance and to a level that does not offer or require use of a Pump Station, following the City’s selection of a performance objective / level of service
3. Pause / stop project immediately or at some point in advance of awarding construction

As discussed and collectively developed in response to the above three approaches being entertained, we recommend that the City entertain a hybrid of the above, as described below:

- Proceed with final design of Collection & Conveyance System (current standard level of design performance = 10-year)
- Amend Engineering Contract to suspend all further conceptual, preliminary, and final design of the Power & Controls Facilities (facilities to be located in Knott Park supporting the operation of a Pump Station), deferring this work indefinitely
- Advance Pump Station design to a 60% design level such that the Outfall can be designed as a compatible but free standing / fully functional gravity outfall that attempts to mitigate increases in (tidal pond) stage over existing (pre-project) conditions and can be built without the Pump Station, deferring the Pump Station final design, permitting, and construction indefinitely
- Restart USACE / OCRM Permit Application reviews and Public Hearing for the Outfall construction only
- Advance Outfall design to 100% for bidding and construction together or concurrently with Collection & Conveyance system

The above project design / permitting approach does not sacrifice any of the design completed to date and limits if not fully avoids any redesign (outfall may be only risk here for some redesign need, to avoid adverse impacts in Tidal Pond). Further, this approach allows the City to fully design, permit, construct, and ultimately accomplish two of the four basic project components, facilitating future advancement / continuation of the ‘complete project’ if and when the work is desired in the future. The public will be given opportunities, again, in the future to support or object to the continuation of the project through local, state, and federal review / approval processes that would follow future preliminary and final design of the Pump Station and Power & Controls facilities.

Performance of the system constructed following this approach has been demonstrated in prior council work sessions (attached for convenience).
As for the offered and discussed photo or sketch rendering of the Outfall without Pump Station, we are unable to prepare such in advance of Tuesday’s Council Meeting. However, as we discussed, the outfall (creek) side will be same size and very similar if not exactly the arrangement currently depicted in the Permit Application Drawings (plan and section) and the upstream (pond) side will (without the Pump Station) look much like the existing structure, but larger. It will be all-new and on the order of 3x size. As with all of the work to date, we would expect being tasked with and attempting to address the aesthetics to the extent practicable, but the City is reminded with respect to the need and size of subject structure (outfall piping and control structure) that the Collection & Conveyance improvements has the need to bring roughly 3x the capacity of the existing system to alleviate the flooding along its route (King Street) and therefore, the outfall has the need to convey the same capacity so that it does not adversely affect stages within and surrounding the Tidal Pond. Anything less being desired / required of us for the size of outfall will require electing and pursuing Alternative No. 2 above.

Please know that we remain available to answer any questions you may have and we look forward to supporting the City in and through any approach that is elected.

Mike

----Original Appointment-----
From: Carrie Gorsuch <cgorsuch@cityofbeaufort.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2024 4:03 PM
To: Carrie Gorsuch; Michael V. Horton, PE, CFM, LEED-AP; John Sauve
Subject: King Street
When: Tuesday, July 2, 2024 10:00 AM-11:00 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

No pump station, generator, and controls discussion.

Microsoft Teams Need help?

Join the meeting now
Meeting ID: 236 416 910 716
Passcode: PBBaw4
For organizers: Meeting options

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast, a leader in email security and cyber resilience. Mimecast integrates email defenses with brand protection, security awareness training, web security, compliance and other essential capabilities. Mimecast helps protect large and small organizations from malicious activity, human error and technology failure; and to lead the movement toward building a more resilient world. To find out more, visit our website.
ALTERNATIVES

Collection & Conveyance Only (High Tide) vs. Existing Conditions (High Tide)
ALTERNATIVES

Collection & Conveyance + Outfall (Low Tide) vs. Existing Conditions (High Tide)
CITY OF BEAUFORT
DEPARTMENT REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

TO: CITY COUNCIL  DATE: 6/28/2024
FROM: Councilman Josh Scallate
AGENDA ITEM TITLE: 2024 Transportation Sales Tax Referendum
MEETING DATE: 7/9/2024
DEPARTMENT: City Managers Office

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Beaufort County will place a Transportation Sales tax referendum on the November 2024 General Election ballot. The itemized list of projects associated with the referendum directs $10M to the City of Beaufort. See attached handout for reference.

PLACED ON AGENDA FOR: Discussion

REMARKS:

We are less than four months from the General Election and the public education effort ahead of the referendum should include clear communication on intended use of funds. It may be beneficial in this education effort if the City could communicate to its voters, residents and businesses how the City Council would prioritize the $10M that would be allocated to the City of Beaufort.

This item is placed on the agenda to begin discussion on the path forward to determining how the funds will be prioritized in consideration of other capital project needs.

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handout</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
<td>6/28/2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goals of the proposed 2024 Sales and Use Tax Referendum (the penny tax) are to address Beaufort County infrastructure needs through the completion of critical transportation and mobility projects amidst historic growth in our region. According to the latest census data, South Carolina is the fastest-growing state in the nation, and Beaufort County is one of the fastest-growing counties within South Carolina. The referendum question, proposed to be placed on the ballot in November 2024, will ask voters to approve a one percent (1%) sales and use tax in Beaufort County beginning the following year (2025) and continuing for ten (10) years, or until $950 million in funds are raised, whichever occurs first.

**COUNTY-WIDE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS**

Completion of underfunded Transportation Sales Tax 3 (2018) projects:
- US 278 Corridor Project ($90M)
- Lady’s Island Corridor Projects ($60M)
- Sidewalks and multi-use pathways county-wide ($30M)

**Greenbelts** ($50M)

**Mass Transit** ($80M)

The Triangle Project – SC 170, US 278, Argent Blvd ($120M)

**Ribaut Road Improvements** ($75M)

**SC 46 Improvements** ($50M)

**Safety & Traffic Flow** ($100M)

**Dirt Road Paving and Resurfacing** ($80M)

**Pathway Projects** ($20M)

**Municipal Projects:**
- Hilton Head Island ($30M)
- Bluffton - Not Incl. 5B ($30M)
- North of the Broad - Port Royal, Beaufort, & Northern Beaufort County ($30M)

**Resiliency/Emergency Evacuation Projects** ($55M)

If approved, a Citizens Led Oversight Committee would be established, similar to that in use at the Beaufort County School District. This would a volunteer group who will oversee the referendum projects, schedules, and expenditures.
Will my taxes go up?

No. Current Sales Tax is 7%. The Green Space Sales tax penny will roll-off at the end of December 2024. If approved, the Transportation Sales Tax will replace the existing Green Space Sales Tax and sales tax will remain at 7%.

Is the 1% sales tax different from property taxes?

Yes. Property taxes are assessed based on the value of the property you own, while sales taxes are generated from the purchase of goods and certain services. The renewal of the 1% sales tax will allow non-property owners, as well as those traveling to the County who shop or make purchases, to help share the burden of transportation project costs.

What will I be taxed on?

Per state statute (4-37-30), sales tax is levied on most retail purchases. Exceptions to the tax are listed in state statute (12-36-2130) include, rent/mortgage, fuel, unprepared foods, medical prescriptions and supplies.

How were the projects chosen?

A 17-member Citizen’s Sales Tax Advisory Committee (STAC 1.0) was first established in January 2022. The committee provided a recommendation to County Council in May of 2022 that included a list of projects throughout the County. Instead of moving a Transportation Sales Tax on the ballot in 2022, a Green Space Sales tax was voted on and approved. In July 2023, County Council re-established a citizens Sales Tax Advisory Committee (STAC 2.0) to develop an update list of projects for consideration. The STAC 2.0 used the STAC 1.0 recommendations as starting point. They reevaluated and adjusted the project list and presented an updated recommendation to Council in December 2023. Council then held a series of 5 informational sessions, during which citizen feedback was gathered. The Public Facilities and Safety Committee then incorporated that feedback into the modified amounts and project list you will find on the ballot this November.

What about the status of the 2018 Sales Tax Projects are not complete?

In total there are 34 projects. 4 of the projects (2 pathways complete and 2 Lady Island projects) are completed, 2 are in construction, and 20 are in design.

Infrastructure projects take a long time to develop. Even the most straightforward projects (such as pathways) have the same steps of design, permitting through state and federal agencies, property acquisition and utility coordination. Beaufort County’s collection time is much faster than the implementation time for most projects. The Boundary Street Improvement project was completed 13 years after the 2006 sales tax began and 7 years after the collection finished.

What is the status of the US 278 Corridor Project?

The US 278 Corridor Project is in the final stages of the Environmental Review process. As the environmental review process concludes, the project will move into final design, right-of-way acquisition, and utility coordination.

Visit www.beaufortcountypenny.com to review project summaries and track other referendum projects.