

CPST Commission Meeting Minutes 2-8-2016 – 5:00 P.M.

Commission Members Present: Dave Waldrop
Renee Joiner
Phil Spotts
Jimmie Coggins
Lisa Toland
Bob McCartha (alternate)

Commission Member Absent: Pat Caldwell
Willie Morris (alternate)

Staff Present: Wayne Adams, County Administrator
Karen Brehmer, Assistant to County Administrator

Others Present: Theodore DuBose, Esquire
Jamie Frost, Alliance Consulting Engineers
Jamil Ibreak, Alliance Consulting Engineers

Media Present: Andrew Wigger, Newberry Observer

Chairman Waldrop called the meeting to order and opened with a prayer.

Minutes from the October 19, 2016 meeting were presented for approval. Commissioner Coggins motioned to adopt, seconded by Commissioner Spotts. Motioned was unanimously approved.

Jamie Frost, Alliance Consulting Engineers, was introduced by Chairman Waldrop. Mr. Frost presented the Commission with binders that included the project cost information for all projects that had been submitted. Projects from the Newberry County Water and Sewer Authority (NCWSA) were not included. NCWSA would be utilizing another engineering firm for their cost estimates.

The first item of business was to adopt Project Presentation Procedures. Commissioner Coggins motioned that the same procedure be followed as the prior iteration. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Joiner and unanimously approved by the members.

The second item of business was to adopt the Project Scoring/Ballot Development Procedures. Commissioner Coggins motioned to utilize the attached Ballot Consideration Scoring Sheet. Motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Joiner and unanimously approved.

Order of presentations was the next topic of discussion. Chairman Waldrop would meet with Mr. Adams and Mrs. Brehmer on 3-15-16 to draw numbers for the presentation schedule.

Mr. Adams reminded the Commission the government had limitations on promoting the ballot. No public dollars or time could be used for speaking engagements, nor could county phones, computers or vehicles be used. Last iteration, the Chamber of Commerce and the Newberry Business Alliance raised funds for advertising. Commissioner Coggins anticipated that they would do this again.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:56PM.

The next meeting for the CPST Commission will be March 28, 2016 at 5:00 PM.

2016 CAPITAL PROJECT SALES TAX COMMISSION

BALLOT CONSIDERATION SCORING SHEET

Project Name/Number: _____

Sponsoring Entity Name: _____

Project Cost Estimate: \$_____

Ranking by Project Sponsor: [ranked # ___ of ___ projects submitted by this sponsoring entity]

Commission Member Name: _____

This scoring sheet is not binding and will only be used to assist the Commission with its final determination as to which projects it will include on the November 2016 CPST ballot. The amount of available funding, the sponsoring entities' rankings of projects, and other factors will also be considered in making the Commission's final ballot recommendation to County Council.

| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Project Necessity | Service Impacts | Location Advantages | Return on Investment | Totals Points |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Above, assign a number **1 through 10** for each of the five categories. A score of 1 is least favorable to the project's ballot chances; a score of 10 is most favorable.

See **sample considerations** for each scoring category below.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

- Would the project create post-construction costs for the sponsoring entity without creating sufficient revenue offsets or shedding existing costs?
- Are projections for operating costs and revenue generation associated with the project realistic?
- What realistic opportunities are there for the sponsoring entity to capture revenue from the project?

- Do the service enhancements associated with the project justify increased expenditures?

Project Necessity

- Does the project fulfill a need that has been previously identified by the sponsoring entity or the community?
- How are the service needs associated with this project currently being fulfilled?
- What role, if any, does changing technology play in the need for the project?
- Are state or federal mandates requiring construction of the project?

Service Impacts

- What is the primary service the proposed project would facilitate?
- How would service level improvements be verified if the project is approved and funded?
- By what methods does the proposed project change service delivery for the better?
- How would the proposed project improve such aspects of service delivery as safety, capacity, and efficiency?

Location Advantages

- Is the location proposed for the project best described as suitable, optimal, poorly chosen, or immaterial?
- As proposed, how accessible is the project to the service users it intends to reach?
- By what modes will service users most commonly avail themselves of the project?
- Are location-specific costs reasonable?

Return on Investment

- Will the project provide present and future benefits that justify its costs?

