

**Roads, Infrastructure and Public Works Committee**  
**May 19, 2026**  
**3:30 p.m.**  
**Council Committee Room at 301 University Ridge, Greenville, SC 29601**

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place, and agenda was posted online, at 301 University Ridge, Greenville, and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations, and concerned citizens.

**Members Present:** C. McGahhey; R. Bradley; L. Seman; F. Farmer; A. Mitchell

**Members Absent:**

**Councilors Present:**

**Staff Present:** A. Price; H. Gamble; D. Sanders

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman McGahhey called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

**2. Invocation**

Mr. Bradley provided the invocation.

**3. Approval of the minutes of the April 21, 2026, Committee Meeting**

**Motion:** by Ms. Seman, to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2026, Committee meeting. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**4. Commission of Animal Control Officer – Daniel Custer**

**Discussion:** Ms. Gamble submitted a nomination for Daniel Custer to be commissioned as a code enforcement officer and animal control officer

**Motion:** by Ms. Seman, to approve and forward to full Council. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**5. Cell Tower Regulations**

**Discussion: None**

**Motion:** by Mr. Bradley, to hold the Cell Tower Regulations. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**6. Roads Presentation**

**Discussion:** Ms. Gamble reported that Greenville County is the largest county in the state, approaching 600,000 residents and supporting 300,000 jobs. The total infrastructure system covers 4,000 lane miles across state, county, and municipal jurisdictions. She stated that 75% of arterial and collector roads are in fair or poor condition, making up 60% of all roads overall. Furthermore, 15% of county bridges are load-restricted or closed entirely. She noted that resurfacing costs have doubled since 2019 due to rising oil prices. The county maintains more road miles than the state, but receives the lowest funding per capita compared to peer counties in South Carolina.

Ms. Gamble presented a diagram illustrating that federal gas tax and state gas tax revenues are divided across multiple mandated categories, including transit, maintenance, and safety. County funds account for approximately 18% of the funding pool, which is primarily focused on road maintenance. She reported that the county evaluates its roads every four years using the Overall Condition Index (OCI) from 0 to 100. The average OCI of the county's entire inventory sits at 61, while the average OCI for roads currently undergoing paving drops to 32. District 17 contains the highest mileage network, followed closely by District 26. She highlighted that the county is currently running two active paving contracts covering roughly 35 miles each.

Mr. Bradley brought up Chandler Road as a successful example of oversight. Ms. Gamble explained that internal inspection teams caught an inadequate base layer paved by a contractor. The county forced the contractor to redo the work to standard at no cost to taxpayers, and the specific crew was reassigned.

Ms. Seman requested a future data chart showing municipal and state road ownership broken down by district. She also requested that the county look at regional pain points, without putting itself in an "owner-agnostic" box regarding road boundaries. Ms. Gamble explained that many local state roads will never qualify for state gas tax funding under Act 114. She noted Act 114 uses strict statewide volume criteria that require thousands of cars per day, which local rural collectors rarely meet.

Mr. Bradley cited Dunklin Bridge Road as a prime example of a state-owned road that remains in terrible condition despite news broadcasts in 2017 and 2025. He mentioned the road fails to meet the state traffic requirements for paving, yet looks pristine once it crosses over into Laurens County.

Mr. Mitchell inquired if there is a formal cross-jurisdictional cooperation between the state and county. Ms. Gamble confirmed that no formal written agreement exists. However, she stated that the county would formalize targeted agreements with the state if a local funding initiative moved forward, similar to penny tax systems in peer counties.

Mr. Mitchell noted an increase in citizen complaints regarding speeding once a road is repaired. Ms. Gamble replied that speeding is fundamentally a driver behavior and education issue. She noted that law enforcement cannot monitor all 4,000 miles of roads simultaneously, though the county utilizes its speed hump program and signage where appropriate.

Chairman McGahhey emphasized on the record that only 43% of total tax revenue goes specifically toward road maintenance, with the county's direct share being even smaller. He clarified that Greenville County acts as a "donor county," sending more tax revenue to Columbia than it receives back in state road allocations. He pointed out that the current budget allocates \$27.5 million for roads, down from a temporary shift of \$36 million. He noted that according to the South Carolina Association of Counties, Greenville County is the leanest operating county per capita in the state. He argued that cutting 10% across all county departments would only generate \$80 million, failing to meet the \$120 million infrastructure gap while crippling core services. Chairman McGahhey alerted the committee to South Carolina Senate Bill 866 (the Municipal Tax Relief Act), introduced by local senators. The bill allows municipalities to enact a 1% sales tax if the home county does not have a transportation penny tax in place. He stated that the City of Greenville generates 40% of the county's tax revenue and will likely put this tax on its ballot this fall to fix city-only roads. He warned that if the city passes it first, county voters will never double-tax themselves, leaving unincorporated county roads entirely without a funding solution. He expressed his explicit support for a countywide transportation penny tax, noting it is legally restricted to roads and cannot be diverted to capital projects like convention centers or courthouses.

Ms. Seman agreed with the Chairman's assessment, noting that a unified countywide penny initiative would prompt the city to withdraw its localized ballot measure, allowing for a shared revenue split.

She emphasized that the county is working under severe time constraints to draft an ordinance and launch public hearings.

Ms. Gamble confirmed that between 30% and 40% of the proposed penny tax revenue would be paid by visitors living outside Greenville County. The Chairman added that data from the South Carolina Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office shows net taxable sales would generate roughly \$1 billion to \$1.6 billion over a 10-year period.

The committee requested staff to prepare and transmit a formal draft of a transportation penny ordinance by the following week, for all five committee members to review.

**7. Adjourn**

Mr. Bradley made a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Dakota Sanders  
Recording Secretary