

---

# IMPLEMENTATION & FUNDING

---





Funding Sources & Strategies..... 220  
Prioritizing Projects ..... 225  
Policy Actions ..... 244  
Measuring Performance ..... 252



# funding sources & strategies

## Purpose

Changing personal preferences on where individuals work, live and play has had a profound impact on transportation investments. The things that people tend to look for in their community of choice do change, but only very slowly. A considerable amount of attention is currently given to young, upwardly mobile professionals since it is this cohort of the population that is most closely associated with the media-friendly technology sector and new start-up companies. Some elements of this group's lifestyle preferences have caught on in a bigger way: living closer to work, less emphasis on housing size than on location, and access to shopping and recreational pursuits, are some examples. In fact, according to the National Association of REALTORS 2017 Survey, 53% of Americans would prefer to live in smaller homes that have easy access to amenities.

Some of these trends in transportation needs reflect favorably towards local control, since towns, cities and counties tend to direct development patterns and densities that support those elements that are the most desirable from these recent surveys. (More information on these surveys can be found here: <https://www.nar.realtor/newsroom/real-estate-story-ideas/more-homebuyers-are-looking-for-walkable-communities>)

A second major theme concerning transportation implementation is the availability, or lack thereof, of funding for major capital improvements. Nearly 70% of transportation revenues in South Carolina originate with motor fuels taxes imposed at the state and federal levels. However, more fuel-efficient vehicles and more people waiting longer to obtain their driver's license, translate into fewer dollars generated through fuel sales. The difficulties of developing new roadway capacity extend beyond financing, as federal and state environmental and community consequences are increasingly seen as barriers to traditional new location and widening projects. A federal directive has responded to these fiscal pressures in part by moving to a performance-based priority system. In addition, South Carolina is fortunate to have county-level transportation construction and maintenance functions which provide the ability of local sources (i.e., Sales Tax) to cover some of the gaps created by declining federal revenues. Private and public road tolling, once thought to be a non-starter in South Carolina, have now appeared in its metropolitan markets with more on the way or being reviewed.

## Funding Sources & Strategies

In today's financial environment it has become apparent that traditional transportation funding sources, like State DOT revenues, alone will not sufficiently fund all transportation needs for the region. That said, the region's three member counties have strived to offset the need for transportation improvements by supplementing state and federal funding resources through implementation of Local Transportation Sales Tax programs and Impact Fees. CHATS and other local decision-makers within the region must consider alternative funding sources if there is a local desire to expand its investment in transportation. The following highlight's the most common funding sources utilized in the region:

### I/IJA/BIL

The Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (I/IJA) (Public Law 117-58, also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law or "BIL") was signed into law on November 15, 2021 and authorized \$550 billion over fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to fund new surface transportation infrastructure, water infrastructure, resiliency, and broadband. This legislation invests more than \$350 billion in Federal highway programs including roads, bridges and mass transit, creates 12 new highway programs which expand surface transportation priorities to address the rehabilitation of bridges in critical need of repair, reduce carbon emissions, increase system reliability, remove barriers to connecting communities and improve mobility and access to economic opportunity, and creates more opportunities for local governments, MPOs, and other public authorities to obtain funding directly.

The State receives Federal formula funding apportioned through the Federal-Aid Highway Program (FAHP) which, under BIL, re-authorizes the core federal surface transportation program areas (the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), and National Highway Freight Program (NHFP)), as well as expands

core programs to include the Carbon Reduction and PROTECT Formula Programs. Implementation of these programs are left at the responsibility of the state department of transportation (SCDOT) and further requires the state to provide the necessary matching funds. The estimated FAHP apportionment to South Carolina for the five-year funding period under I/IJA/BIL is estimated at \$4.6 billion through 2026.

### RAISE

The Rebuilding America's Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Transportation Discretionary Grant program replaces the preceding Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) discretionary grant program. The national funding level or appropriations to RAISE is \$7.5 billion over the 5-year period from 2022-2026. Roughly \$1.5 billion is awarded annually, to selected participants for investments in road, rail, transit and port projects that help achieve national objectives.

The region has had some success in securing RAISE grant funds to help fund much needed transportation improvements in communities. In 2018, the City of Charleston received a \$7 million RAISE grant award to conduct preliminary planning of the Lowcountry Lowline - an abandoned rail line conversion into a linear park. The City was also awarded an \$18 million BUILD grant to construct the Ashley River Crossing (ARC) pedestrian bridge which, when complete, will connect Charleston's peninsula to the West Ashley community. Both projects will be critical in developing a well-balanced transportation system that offers an alternative mode of travel to residents.

### SCDOT Infrastructure Maintenance Trust Fund

In 2017, the South Carolina State Legislature passed a highway bill (Act 40) that increased the state's gasoline tax and imposed fee increases on taxpayers when they lease, buy, register, obtain license tags for, and pay property taxes on items that were not previously taxed. Act 40 mandated the revenues from these higher taxes and fees be placed in a special account called the "Infrastructure Maintenance Trust Fund" and used only to repair, maintain, and improve South Carolina's existing

highway system. Coordination with SCDOT officials by CHATS staff should continue seeking to get qualified regional projects included for funding from this source. SCDOT's main focus for projects include: rural road safety, paving, bridge replacements, and interstate widening. Total committed funds from Act 40 as of November 30, 2023 for CHATS study counties were: Berkeley - \$82.6 million, Charleston - \$104.1 million, and Dorchester - \$144.6 million.

### **"C" Program**

The "C" Fund program is a partnership between the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) and the counties to fund improvements of state roads, local, county and city roadways that are not on the state highway system, and other local transportation projects provided for under South Carolina Code of Laws. Funding for the program is derived from a portion of the state gasoline tax, and distributed to each of South Carolina's 46 counties based on population, land area, and rural mileage. The State's Act 40 of 2017 includes authorization of additional funding for the "C" program, which increases the portion of the State gasoline fee dedicated to the program from 2.66 cents-per-gallon to 3.99 cents-per-gallon once fully phased in by 2021. Beginning fiscal year 2021-2022, each county is required to dedicate 33.3% of their "C" funds to improvement of the State highway system. State law further requires that the additional funds derived from Act 40 are used exclusively for repairs, maintenance, and alterations to the State's highway system. Beyond these restrictions, CTCs can use funds for local road improvements including paving or improvements to county roads or streets, enhancement projects, traffic sign improvements, restriping and other road and bridge projects, as well as carry forward uncommitted funds from one year to the next, as long as the carryover amount does not exceed 300% of the county's "C" fund apportionment for the most recent year.

Approximately \$4.3 million, \$4.8 million, and \$2.5 million in "C" funds, not including donor bonuses, were apportioned to Berkeley County, Charleston County and Dorchester County respectively, to plan and develop projects for fiscal year (FY) 2023.

### **Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TA) Program**

The Transportation Alternative Set-Aside (TA) Program is a federally funded grant for State and MPOs to use to build on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized users of the transportation system. The Federal government will pay for up to 80% of eligible project costs for a TAP project. A local match is required to pay for 20% or more of the remaining project costs. With the passage of BIL, CHATS' annual TA allocation almost doubled to \$1.97 million, up from FAST Act annual allocation levels of approximately \$899,000. By 2024 annual allocations have increased to approximately \$2.1 million and it is anticipated that the CHATS region will continue to receive this on average annually for non-motorized transportation projects. This would generate TAP funding totaling \$42 million over the next twenty years.

### **Transportation Bonds**

Transportation bonds have been instrumental in the strategic implementation of local roadways and non-motorized travel throughout South Carolina. The rate of interest charged against bonds is dependent on the financial stability and rating of the community. Hence, increased tax revenues from quality development helps create a "virtuous cycle" between increasing private sector revenues and supportive public investments in infrastructure. Financing of transportation bonds can happen in several ways: 1. General obligation bonds, 2. Revenue bonds, and 3. Private - public partnerships. Currently the CHATS planning area's counties utilize revenue bonds to assist in financing transportation projects.

### **Transportation Sales Tax**

Counties and municipalities across South Carolina have successfully implemented sales taxes to generate additional funding for transportation projects. Sales tax revenues can be used to implement roadway and bridge projects, Complete Streets and streetscape type projects, safety improvements, or access management priorities. To successfully enact a transportation sales tax, the public must vote in favor of the tax through the election process. As a result, it is vitally important that a public education process be employed to explain the benefits that would result from the tax.

### **Berkeley County Transportation Sales Tax (TST)**

In 2022 Berkeley County residents voted for the second time to extend a one-cent sales and use tax that was originally levied in 2008. The “penny sales tax” funds a mix of locally approved transportation infrastructure improvements, including highway capacity, intersection, bridge, pedestrian facility and drainage improvements, major roadway resurfacing and local road paving projects, as well as greenbelt preservation projects. The approved tax levy is not to exceed a period of 7 years at a maximum cost of \$587 million of which no more than 10% or \$58.7 million can be used to finance greenbelt initiatives.

### **Charleston County Transportation Sales Tax (TST)**

Charleston County currently has a one-cent transportation sales tax in place to finance local transportation projects. County residents passed an initial half-cent tax referendum in 2004, which is anticipated to collect \$1.3 billion in revenue over 25 years, to fund various roadway, greenbelt and transit projects. In 2016 residents voted to “complete the penny” by approving an additional half-cent sales tax which is projected to finance roughly \$2.1 billion in highways, roads, streets, bridges, and other transportation-related facilities including mass transit, associated drainage improvements, and greenbelts. This tax levy also has a 25-year maximum collection period, and no more than 10% of collected revenues or \$210 million can be expended on greenbelts.

Although each of the sales tax referendums are already tied to an approved priority list of major transportation projects, the County allocates \$9 million of revenues for the Half-Cent Sales Tax Annual Allocation Program which allows for a more discretionary sub-allocation of funds to resurfacing (\$4 million), local paving (\$2 million), bike and pedestrian (\$1 million), and intersection improvement (\$2 million) projects. Annual allocation requests can be submitted for consideration by municipalities within Charleston County, SCDOT, Charleston County Parks and Recreation Committee (CCPRC), Charleston County Aviation Authority (CCAA), Charleston County Public Works Department, Charleston County School District (CCSD) and the BCDCOG. The County’s TST program has undoubtedly been successful in providing a much-needed revenue stream to address many on-going and future local transportation needs. With the 2004 Referendum approaching its sunset,

the County is considering putting a new half-cent transportation sales tax on the ballot to secure continued funding at its expiration.

### **Dorchester County Transportation Sales Tax (TST)**

In 2004, residents of Dorchester County voted for a one-cent increase in local sales tax to provide funding for multiple transportation projects. As a result of this action, the Dorchester County Transportation Authority (DCTA) was created to manage the funding and administer projects. Projects completed with this funding include new roadway construction, existing roadway widening, dirt road paving, intersection improvements, street resurfacing, and sidewalk repairs. In 2022 Dorchester County residents once again voted in favor of extending the transportation sales tax by 15-years to finance approximately \$735 million in highway, roadways, bridges, mass transit and greenbelt initiatives.

### **Impact Fees**

Developer impact fees are one-time charges assessed to new development to help local municipalities pay for new infrastructure needed to accommodate that development. The use of impact fees requires special authorization by the South Carolina General Assembly. This is currently utilized by a number of communities across South Carolina. While these funds are most commonly used for water and wastewater system connections, police and fire protection services, school systems and other public services or community facilities, they can also pay for roadway and bike and pedestrian improvements to offset a portion of the impacts generated by increased traffic generated by a development. Impact fees place the costs of new development directly on developers and indirectly on those who buy property in the new developments, while freeing other taxpayers from the obligation to fund costly public services that do not directly benefit them.

Currently, Dorchester County and Charleston County utilize transportation impact fees to assist in funding projects; Berkeley County eliminated its impact fee program. The fee collected on new developments can potentially fund a portion of a project. Impact fees can be used with transportation sales tax dollars within three years of being collected.

## Developer Contributions

Developer contributions are another mechanism used to mitigate against some of the burden or impact generated by development; however, the true or full impact of development rarely is fully covered by these contributions. Contributions are typically assessed on a case-by-case basis and may not follow a set fee schedule. In some cases, developers may be required to make improvements to an impacted roadway or intersection, construct bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, such as sidewalks and greenways, or make connections to existing facilities. Projects that a developer would be mandated to complete are on a much smaller scale than those undertaken by a local or state agency, and are typically delivered at a lower overall cost in comparison to local or state agencies completing the project. To accomplish this goal, it will take a cooperative effort between local planning staff, SCDOT planning staff, and the development community.

## Discretionary Federal Transportation Programs

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) makes over \$150 billion worth of discretionary grant programs available directly to MPOs and local jurisdictions, to fund projects that will advance the safety, equity, and climate goals outlined in the IIJA. The following, while not all inclusive, highlights select examples of the discretionary programs available under IIJA that CHATS and the region's local jurisdictions are already pursuing or may consider pursuing in the future:

- INFRA
- Safe Streets & Roads for All (SS4A)
- FTA State of Good Repair Grant (5337)
- FTA Low or No Emission (Low-No) Program (5339c)
- FTA Buses & Bus Facilities Program
- FTA Areas of Persistent Poverty (AoPP) Program
- FRA Consolidated Rail Infrastructure & Safety Improvements (CRISI) Program
- FRA Railroad Crossing Elimination Program
- FTA Capital Investment Grants (CIG) (5309)



# prioritizing projects

## Prioritizing Projects

The CHATS project prioritization process was an extensive and collaborative process that brought together priorities of regional decision-makers with preferences by the general public. Projects were evaluated and ultimately prioritized across 11 project criteria, based on State Act 114, in accordance with SCDOT policy. Each criterion was assigned a “weight” based on its relative importance, designated by the CHATS Study Team and Policy Committee members. The methodology used in determining the ranking was approved by the SCDOT Commission. The project criteria and associated “weighting” (percent priority) are listed as follows:

- Congestion Relief (20%)
- Supports Transit (10%)
- Improves Freight Mobility (10%)
- Improves Existing Infrastructure (10%)
- Addresses Safety (8%)
- Evacuation Route (4%)
- Financial Viability (10%)
- Environmental Impact Mitigation (8%)
- Supports Walking & Bicycling (6%)
- Supports Land Use (7%)
- Supports Economic Development (7%)

## Project Rankings

The 2045 LRTP evaluated 147 candidate projects grouped into four major project categories: Capacity Enhancement projects (existing and new roadway facilities) (52), Corridor Studies (8), Access Management projects (23) and Intersection Improvement projects (62).

Projects were evaluated and scored against projects within the same project grouping or category. Projects are, however, ranked against each other, regardless of category, based on their overall weighted score. The following Tables 6-1 through 6-4 presents the scoring and rankings of projects grouped by category. The ranked results for all projects combined is provided thereafter in Table 6-5.

- **Table 6-1 - Ranked Capacity Enhancement Projects**
- **Table 6-2 - Ranked Access Management Projects**
- **Table 6-3 - Ranked Corridor Study Projects**
- **Table 6-4 - Ranked Intersection Improvement Projects**
- **Table 6-5 - Ranked Candidate Projects**

**Table 6-1: Ranked Capacity Enhancement Projects**

ID	Location	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$ (1000s)	Rank
L-138	Rivers Avenue Overpass at Durant	Durant Avenue to Aragon Street	0.13	\$76,500	3
L-110	Montague Avenue	International Boulevard to I-26 Interchange	0.50	\$12,293	16
L-31	North Rhett Avenue	I-526 Interchange to Yeamans Hall Road	1.93	\$51,856	24
L-112b	US-17 / Ravenel Bridge Southbound Approach	Magrath Darby Boulevard to Wingo Way On-Ramp	0.27	\$3,730	26
L-107	Mall Drive Improvements	Lacross Road to Rivers Avenue	0.40	\$72,000	36
L-142	Johnnie Dodds Corridor Improvements	Houston Northcutt Boulevard to Bowman Road	2.20	\$168,000	40
L-105	Folly Road	SC-30 Off-Ramp to Highland Avenue	0.64	\$12,293	43
L-141	Meeting Street	At Milford Street	-	\$65,000	44
L-95	Mall Drive / Centre Pointe Drive Extension	Centre Pointe Drive to Mall Drive	0.23	\$12,618	45
L-33	Remount Road	Yeamans Hall Road to Rivers Avenue	0.35	\$10,359	46
L-109	Michaux Parkway	International Boulevard to Dorchester Road	0.97	\$9,592	48
L-28	College Park Road	Crowfield Boulevard to I-26 Interchange	1.34	\$17,864	49
L-140a	Ashley River Road Improvements	Bees Ferry Road to Paul Cantrell Boulevard	3.20	\$144,000	52
L-112a	US-17 / Ravenel Bridge Northbound Off-Ramp	US-17 & Coleman Boulevard Split to Sessions Way	0.35	\$4,640	53
L-102b	Cross County Road	Hill Park Drive to Ashley Phosphate Road	0.68	\$8,148	55
L-129	Old Fort Drive Extension	Wallace Ackerman Drive to Palmetto Commerce Parkway	0.67	\$4,257	57
L-104	Folly Road	Maybank Highway to Johnson Road (Northbound Only)	0.76	\$17,512	58
L-137	Long Point Road Corridor Improvements	US-17 to Whipple Road	2.00	\$126,000	62
L-94	Hagood Avenue Extension	Spring Street to Cannon Street	0.12	\$2,275	63
L-102a	Cross County Road	Dorchester Road to Hill Park Drive	1.47	\$14,870	66
L-98	Sandlapper Parkway Extension	Palmetto Commerce Parkway to Ashley Phosphate Road	1.79	\$32,460	67
L-140b	Ashley River Road Improvements	Bees Ferry Road to West Bridge Road	1.50	\$56,000	73
L-32	Red Bank Road	Deke Giles Boulevard to Bushy Park Road	3.02	\$63,921	74
L-139	South US-17 Corridor Improvements	SC-162 to Dobbin Road	6.30	\$327,500	79
L-131	Stallsville Loop	Bacons Bridge Road to Miles Jamison Road	0.15	\$4,917	80
L-89	Glenn McConnell Overpass	-	-	\$194,000	81
L-90	US-17 & Houston Northcutt Boulevard Intersection	-	-	\$64,583	83
L-135	US-17A / Boone Hill Road	Luden Drive to Greenwave Boulevard	0.50	\$3,452	84
L-111	US-17	Northbound Mainline at Bowman Road Interchange	0.51	\$47,850	86
L-101	Windsor Hill Parkway	Sandlapper Parkway Extn. to Dorchester Road	3.24	\$49,357	87
L-24b	Bell Wright Road Extension	Bell Wright Road to Frontage Road	0.24	\$452	89
L-30	Nexton Parkway	Nexton Elementary School to US-176	4.86	\$20,897	91
L-128	North Gum Street Extension	E. 9th North Street to Marymeade Drive	0.21	\$1,242	95
L-92	Ashley Phosphate Road Extension	Rivers Avenue to Railroad Avenue Extension	0.42	\$9,902	96
L-130	Summers Corner Connector	Beech Hill Road to Dorchester Road	2.18	\$26,655	99
L-91a	All-American Boulevard Extension (Phase 3)	Silent Harbor Court to Brickyard Parkway	1.10	\$10,274	101
L-127b	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension (Phase 2)	US-17A to Old Beech Hill Road	2.61	\$24,425	103
L-29b	Jedburg Road	Drop Off Drive to US-176	4.80	\$37,312	106
L-133	Jedburg Road	US-78 to Berkeley County Line	1.73	\$13,448	109
L-24a	Frontage Road (Pseudonym)	Marymeade Drive to Frank Jones Road	4.42	\$26,484	114
L-91b	All-American Boulevard Extension (Phase 3)	Brickyard Parkway to SC-41 Service Road	0.53	\$4,950	115
L-96	Memorial Drive Extension	Memorial Drive to US-17 / Savannah Highway	0.60	\$4,886	116

**Table 6-1: Ranked Capacity Enhancement Projects (cont.)**

ID	Location	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$ (1000s)	Rank
L-34	St. Thomas Island Drive	Clements Ferry Road to Harvest Time Place	0.22	\$3,762	117
L-29a	Jedburg Road	Dorchester County Line to Business Park Road	0.75	\$5,830	119
L-108b	Maybank Highway Improvements (Eastern Portion)	River Road to Stono River Bridge	0.87	\$51,550	120
L-97	Michaux Parkway Extension	Dorchester Road to Ashley River Road	1.91	\$57,801	121
L-136	US-17A / Walterboro Road	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Ext to Sandpit Drive	4.54	\$29,747	122
L-132	Beech Hill Road	US-17A to Delemar Highway	4.57	\$65,948	124
L-108a	Maybank Highway Improvements (Western Portion)	Bohicket Road to River Road	2.99	\$126,000	125
L-23	College Park Road Extension	College Park Road to Nexton Parkway	2.64	\$26,640	126
L-25	Henry Brown Boulevard Extension	Henry Brown Boulevard (Brick Park) to US-52	4.40	\$29,634	129
L-35	Wildgame Road	Jedburg Road to Sheep Island Road	2.78	\$26,948	130
L-27	Cane Bay Boulevard	Day Break Boulevard to Black Tom Road	2.35	\$11,405	131
L-99	Sea Island Parkway/Greenway	River Road to Betsy Kerrison Parkway	9.39	\$127,157	132
L-93	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension (Phase 1)	Bees Ferry Road to Charleston County Line	6.99	\$368,777	134
L-134	Orangeburg Road	Mallard Road to US-78	2.19	\$19,543	138
L-106	Harbor View Road Improvements	Harbor View Circle to North Shore Drive	0.70	\$110,000	140
L-127a	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension (Phase 1)	Charleston County Line to US-17A	11.04	\$577,750	141
L-103a	Folly Beach Road	E. Indian Avenue to Little Oak Island Drive	0.46	\$20,407	142
L-103b	Folly Beach Road	Little Oak Island Drive to Bowens Island Road	1.20	\$34,328	143
L-100	West Bridge Connector Road	SC-61 to Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension	1.54	\$6,832	144
L-26	Black Tom Road	US-176 to US-17A	5.90	\$43,248	147

**Table 6-2: Ranked Access Management Projects**

ID	Location	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$ (1000s)	Rank
L-01	Daniel Island Drive	Barfield Street to Fairchild Street	0.67	\$1,229	22
L-45	US-17 / Savannah Highway	Wesley Drive to I-526	3.49	\$6,440	27
L-40	Long Point Road	I-526 to Whipple Road	0.97	\$1,786	31
L-04b	US-52	Central Avenue to Red Bank Road	0.74	\$1,015	35
L-115b	US-17A / South Main Street	US-78 / 5th Street to Carolina Avenue	1.67	\$3,088	37
L-02	US-176 / St. James Avenue	Old Mt. Holly Road to US-52 / N. Goose Creek Blvd.	2.86	\$5,275	39
L-115a	US-17A / North Main Street	Berlin Myers Parkway to US-78 / 5th Street	0.81	\$1,490	47
L-46	US-52 / Rivers Avenue	Camelot Drive to Greenridge Road	2.62	\$4,831	50
L-04c	US-52	Montague Plantation Road / Old Mt. Holly Road to Oakley Road	6.45	\$11,891	61
L-113	Old Trolley Road	Dorchester Road to Bacons Bridge Road	3.48	\$6,422	69
L-47	SC-61 / St. Andrews Boulevard	Wesley Drive to Old Towne Road	1.60	\$19,866	70
L-44	Sam Rittenberg Boulevard	Old Towne Road to Northbridge Park	1.06	\$1,948	75
L-48	SC-61 / Ashley River Road	St. Andrews Boulevard to Paul Cantrell Boulevard	2.81	\$5,176	76
L-04a	US-52	N. Live Oak Drive to Gaillard Road	4.94	\$9,106	78
L-38	Folly Road	Tides End Road to Brantley Drive	4.58	\$8,436	90
L-37	East Bay Street	Chapel Street to Hasell Street	1.42	\$2,622	93
L-41	Mathis Ferry Road	US-17 to I-526	2.93	\$5,396	97
L-43	Rutledge Avenue	Peachtree Street to Sumter Street	0.97	\$1,786	98

**Table 6-2: Ranked Access Management Projects (cont.)**

ID	Location	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$ (1000s)	Rank
L-36	Broad Street	Lockwood Drive to East Bay Street	1.18	\$2,176	100
L-39	Hagood Avenue	Moultrie Street to Fishburne Street	0.64	\$1,171	113
L-42	Old Towne Road	Sam Rittenburg Boulevard to Gunn Avenue	1.90	\$3,503	118
L-03	US-17A / Live Oak Road	US-176 / St. James Avenue to E. Main Street	10.59	\$19,529	136
L-114	SC-61	Charleston County Line to Bacons Bridge Road	4.35	\$23,593	145

**Table 6-3: Ranked Corridor Study Projects**

ID	Location	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$ (1000s)	Rank
L-07	US-17A / North Main Street	I-26 Interchange to Berlin Myers Parkway (Eastbound Only)	0.77	\$10,701	11
L-50	Ashley Phosphate Road	Cross County Road to Rivers Avenue	2.01	\$17,380	19
L-05	Clements Ferry Road	I-526 Interchange to St. Thomas Island Drive	0.39	\$3,420	28
L-49a	SC-61 / Ashley River Road	Raoul Wallenberg Boulevard to Bees Ferry Road	3.18	\$24,441	33
L-117	US-78 / 5th Street	Berlin G. Myers Parkway to County Line (Benchmark Drive)	3.84	\$74,549	110
L-116	Ladson Road	US-78 to Dorchester Road	4.67	\$64,413	112
L-49b	SC-61 / Ashley River Road	Bees Ferry Road to Charleston County Line	2.22	\$65,675	128
L-06	Old Highway 52 / Old Fort Road	US-52 to Cypress Gardens Road	9.64	\$77,192	146

**Table 6-4: Ranked Intersection Improvement Project**

ID	Location	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$ (1000s)	Rank
L-87	US-78 & Ladson Road / Ancrum Road	-	-	\$4,917	1
L-17	US-17A & US-176	-	-	\$6,146	2
L-118	Dorchester Road & Ladson Road	-	-	\$2,459	4
L-79	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Avondale Avenue	-	-	\$3,688	5
L-86b	US-17 & West Oak Forest Drive	-	-	\$1,844	6
L-86a	US-17 & Farmfield Avenue	-	-	\$1,844	7
L-80	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Carolina Bay Drive	-	-	\$3,688	8
L-119	Dorchester Road & Old Trolley Road	-	-	\$6,146	9
L-71	Rivers Avenue & Greenridge Road	-	-	\$3,688	10
L-68	Remount Road & Rhett Avenue	-	-	\$4,917	12
L-83	US-17 & Shelmore Boulevard	-	-	\$1,844	13
L-72	Rivers Avenue & Remount Road	-	-	\$6,146	14
L-84	US-17 & Stinson Drive / Dupont Road	-	-	\$1,844	15
L-88	US-78 / King Street & Mt Pleasant Street	-	-	\$6,146	17
L-19	US-52 & Liberty Hall Road	-	-	\$2,459	18
L-85	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Wappoo Road	-	-	\$1,844	20
L-120	Ladson Road & Lincolville Road	-	-	\$2,459	21
L-82	US-17 & Porcher's Bluff Road	-	-	\$4,917	23
L-09	College Park Road & Treeland Drive	-	-	\$4,917	25

**Table 6-4: Ranked Intersection Improvement Projects (cont.)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Delimits</b>	<b>Length (Miles)</b>	<b>Cost in Y2024 \$ (1000s)</b>	<b>Rank</b>
L-55	Dorchester Road & West Hill Boulevard	-	-	\$2,459	29
L-81	US-17 & Long Point Road	-	-	\$3,688	30
L-78	US-17 / SC-61 Exit Ramp Improvements	-	-	\$36,500	32
L-56	Folly Road & Wesley Drive	-	-	\$6,146	34
L-74	SC-61 & Glendale Drive	-	-	\$6,146	38
L-73	Sam Rittenberg & Old Towne Road	-	-	\$4,917	41
L-18	US-52 & Cypress Gardens Road	-	-	\$1,229	42
L-60	Magwood Drive & Ashley Crossing Drive	-	-	\$6,146	51
L-54	Cosgrove Avenue & Azalea Drive	-	-	\$2,459	54
L-65	Morrison Drive & Romney Street	-	-	\$6,146	56
L-77	St. Andrews Boulevard & 5th Avenue	-	-	\$2,459	59
L-53	Chuck Dawley Boulevard & Coleman Boulevard/ Ben Sawyer Boulevard Intersection Improvements	-	-	\$29,500	60
L-58	Jasper Boulevard & Station 22-1/2 Street	-	-	\$2,459	64
L-59	Jasper Boulevard & Station 23 Street	-	-	\$2,459	64
L-75	SC-61 & Magwood Drive	-	-	\$1,844	68
L-64	Middle Street & Station 22-1/2 Street	-	-	\$2,459	71
L-76	SC-61 & Shadowmoss Pkwy.	-	-	\$1,844	72
L-124	US-17A & Central Avenue	-	-	\$2,459	77
L-69	Rifle Range Road & Bowman Road	-	-	\$3,688	82
L-90	US-17 & Houston Northcutt Boulevard Intersection	-	-	\$64,583	83
L-125	US-17A & Tupperway Drive	-	-	\$6,146	85
L-67	Noisette Boulevard & Virginia Avenue	-	-	\$3,688	88
L-66	Morrison Drive & Grace Bridge Street	-	-	\$1,229	92
L-62	Maybank Highway & River Road	-	-	\$2,459	94
L-57	IOP Connector & Rifle Range Road	-	-	\$2,459	102
L-70	Rifle Range Road & Venning Road	-	-	\$3,688	104
L-51	Ben Sawyer Boulevard & Rifle Range Road	-	-	\$1,844	105
L-126	Wescott Blvd. & Patriot Blvd.	-	-	\$4,917	107
L-121	Miles Jamison Road & Gahagan Road	-	-	\$4,917	108
L-11	Old Highway 52 & Gaillard Road	-	-	\$2,459	111
L-61	Maybank Highway & Main Road	-	-	\$4,917	123
L-63	Maybank Highway & Riverland Drive	-	-	\$6,146	127
L-52	Betsy Kerrison Pkwy. / Bohicket Road & River Road	-	-	\$2,459	133
L-122	Orangeburg Road & E. Butternut Road / Mallard Road	-	-	\$4,917	135
L-123	SC-165 & County Line Road	-	-	\$4,917	137
L-16	US-176 & Black Tom Road	-	-	\$6,146	139

Table 6-5: Ranked Candidate Projects

ID	Location	Project Category	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$\$ (1000s)	SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA											Weighted Score	RANK	
						Congestion Relief	Existing Infrastructure	Transit	Freight Mobility	Financial Viability	Safety	Environment Impact	Land Use	Economic Development	Walking/ Bicycling	Evacuation Route			
						WEIGHT =	20%	10%	10%	10%	10%	8%	8%	7%	7%	6%	4%	100%	
L-87	US-78 & Ladson Road / Ancrum Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	5.76	10.00	10.00	6.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	4.08	6.08	0.91	10.00	7.519	1
L-17	US-17A & US-176	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	8.33	10.00	7.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	2.72	4.72	1.00	10.00	7.448	2	
L-138	Rivers Avenue Overpass at Durant	Railroad Overpass	Durant Avenue to Aragon Street	0.13	\$76,500	5.84	10.00	10.00	7.00	7.86	5.00	7.14	4.90	6.90	4.23	10.00	7.104	3	
L-118	Dorchester Road & Ladson Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	7.06	5.00	9.00	6.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	3.85	3.85	0.50	10.00	6.982	4	
L-79	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Avondale Avenue	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$3,688	3.43	10.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	7.78	10.00	4.59	6.59	1.33	10.00	6.870	5	
L-86b	US-17 & West Oak Forest Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	3.43	10.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	5.56	10.00	4.45	9.45	1.00	10.00	6.864	6	
L-86a	US-17 & Farmfield Avenue	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	3.43	10.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	5.56	10.00	4.32	9.32	1.00	10.00	6.845	7	
L-80	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Carolina Bay Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$3,688	5.10	10.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	6.67	10.00	3.68	3.68	1.00	10.00	6.829	8	
L-119	Dorchester Road & Old Trolley Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	6.31	5.00	9.00	6.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	3.72	3.72	0.58	10.00	6.817	9	
L-71	Rivers Avenue & Greenridge Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$3,688	6.85	3.00	10.00	3.00	10.00	7.78	10.00	4.18	6.18	4.82	10.00	6.806	10	
L-07	US-17A / North Main Street	Corridor Study	I-26 Interchange to Berlin Myers Parkway (Eastbound Only)	0.77	\$10,701	3.79	3.00	7.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	4.17	6.17	8.79	10.00	6.710	11	
L-68	Remount Road & Rhet Avenue	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	8.77	5.00	3.00	8.00	10.00	10.00	5.00	4.41	4.41	1.00	10.00	6.631	12	
L-83	US-17 & Shelmore Boulevard	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	5.05	3.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	8.89	10.00	4.89	6.89	1.38	10.00	6.629	13	
L-72	Rivers Avenue & Remount Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	5.92	3.00	10.00	8.00	10.00	6.67	8.00	3.72	3.72	1.49	10.00	6.468	14	
L-84	US-17 & Stinson Drive / Dupont Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	5.10	3.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	7.78	10.00	4.06	6.06	1.09	10.00	6.417	15	
L-110	Montague Avenue	Capacity Enhancement	International Boulevard to I-26 Interchange	0.50	\$12,293	3.17	3.00	7.00	7.00	10.00	7.50	9.71	4.98	4.98	10.00	10.00	6.409	16	
L-88	US-78 / King Street & Mt Pleasant Street	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	2.06	5.00	10.00	2.00	10.00	8.89	10.00	4.57	6.57	10.00	10.00	6.402	17	
L-19	US-52 & Liberty Hall Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	3.69	5.00	8.00	6.00	10.00	8.89	10.00	4.44	6.44	0.84	10.00	6.360	18	
L-50	Ashley Phosphate Road	Corridor Study	Cross County Road to Rivers Avenue	2.01	\$17,380	1.00	5.00	9.00	8.00	9.30	9.17	7.40	5.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	6.355	19	
L-85	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Wappoo Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	5.10	3.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	8.89	5.00	4.25	9.25	1.09	10.00	6.343	20	
L-120	Ladson Road & Lincolnville Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	9.80	5.00	2.00	3.00	10.00	8.89	8.00	4.05	4.05	0.70	10.00	6.320	21	
L-01	Daniel Island Drive	Access Management	Barfield Street to Fairchild Street	0.67	\$1,229	10.00	10.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	4.11	4.11	1.00	10.00	6.116	22	
L-82	US-17 & Porcher's Bluff Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	6.77	5.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	3.01	3.01	1.00	10.00	6.116	23	
L-31	North Rhet Avenue	Capacity Enhancement	I-526 Interchange to Yeamans Hall Road	1.93	\$51,856	5.70	5.00	7.00	6.00	9.66	7.50	5.86	4.58	4.58	1.42	10.00	6.099	24	
L-09	College Park Road & Treeland Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	10.00	10.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	8.89	5.00	3.69	3.69	1.00	5.00	6.088	25	
L-112b	US-17 / Ravenel Bridge Southbound Approach	Capacity Enhancement	Magrath Darby Boulevard to Wingo Way On-Ramp	0.27	\$3,730	2.94	10.00	8.00	6.00	10.00	1.67	10.00	4.73	4.73	1.42	10.00	6.069	26	
L-45	US-17 / Savannah Highway	Access Management	Wesley Drive to I-526	3.49	\$6,440	4.73	5.00	8.00	8.00	8.84	6.36	6.50	4.64	4.64	0.62	10.00	6.047	27	
L-05	Clements Ferry Road	Corridor Study	I-526 Interchange to St. Thomas Island Drive	0.39	\$3,420	7.54	3.00	7.00	8.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	3.06	5.06	1.00	5.00	6.016	28	
L-55	Dorchester Road & West Hill Boulevard	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	5.56	5.00	9.00	5.00	10.00	5.56	8.00	3.18	3.18	1.00	10.00	6.001	29	
L-81	US-17 & Long Point Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$3,688	5.83	5.00	8.00	2.00	10.00	5.56	10.00	4.27	4.27	1.00	10.00	5.967	30	
L-40	Long Point Road	Access Management	I-526 to Whipple Road	0.97	\$1,786	8.41	3.00	7.00	3.00	10.00	0.91	10.00	4.64	4.64	1.00	10.00	5.964	31	
L-78	US-17 / SC-61 Exit Ramp Improvements	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$36,500	4.84	10.00	7.00	7.00	9.35	6.67	5.00	4.72	4.72	1.00	0.00	5.958	32	
L-49a	SC-61 / Ashley River Road	Corridor Study	Raoul Wallenberg Boulevard to Bees Ferry Road	3.18	\$24,441	10.00	5.00	3.00	6.00	8.44	1.67	2.00	3.91	3.91	7.84	10.00	5.955	33	
L-56	Folly Road & Wesley Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	5.34	5.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	7.78	5.00	4.35	4.35	0.82	10.00	5.949	34	

Table 6-5: Ranked Candidate Projects (cont.)

ID	Location	Project Category	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$\$ (1000s)	SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA											Weighted Score	RANK
						Congestion Relief	Existing Infrastructure	Transit	Freight Mobility	Financial Viability	Safety	Environment Impact	Land Use	Economic Development	Walking/ Bicycling	Evacuation Route		
L-04b	US-52	Access Management	Central Avenue to Red Bank Road	0.74	\$1,015	0.50	3.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	9.50	4.75	9.75	1.00	10.00	5.935	35
L-107	Mall Drive Improvements	Capacity Enhancement	Lacross Road to Rivers Avenue	0.40	\$72,000	1.18	10.00	9.00	2.00	9.10	6.67	5.86	4.86	4.86	10.00	10.00	5.929	36
L-115b	US-17A / South Main Street	Access Management	US-78 / 5th Street to Carolina Avenue	1.67	\$3,088	1.37	5.00	10.00	6.00	10.00	9.09	8.00	4.48	4.48	1.57	10.00	5.863	37
L-74	SC-61 & Glendale Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	6.55	10.00	3.00	3.00	10.00	5.56	8.00	3.92	3.92	1.00	5.00	5.803	38
L-02	US-176 / St. James Avenue	Access Management	Old Mt. Holly Road to US-52 / N. Goose Creek Blvd.	2.86	\$5,275	4.94	10.00	3.00	3.00	9.30	6.36	8.00	4.52	4.52	1.00	10.00	5.759	39
L-142	Johnnie Dodds Corridor Improvements	Corridor Improvement	Houston Northcutt Boulevard to Bowman Road	2.20	\$168,000	3.78	3.00	8.00	7.00	6.43	6.67	9.71	5.00	5.00	5.16	5.00	5.719	40
L-73	Sam Rittenberg & Old Towne Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	6.08	3.00	3.00	4.00	10.00	5.56	10.00	4.33	6.33	1.33	10.00	5.686	41
L-18	US-52 & Cypress Gardens Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,229	3.59	5.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	5.56	10.00	2.23	4.23	0.79	10.00	5.661	42
L-105	Folly Road	Capacity Enhancement	SC-30 Off-Ramp to Highland Avenue	0.64	\$12,293	3.72	5.00	8.00	3.00	10.00	9.17	4.57	4.59	6.59	0.59	10.00	5.661	43
L-141	Meeting Street	Railroad Overpass	At Milford Street	-	\$65,000	2.35	10.00	4.00	7.00	9.29	0.83	8.43	4.57	6.57	3.25	10.00	5.615	44
L-95	Mall Drive / Centre Pointe Drive Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Centre Pointe Drive to Mall Drive	0.23	\$12,618	3.41	1.00	5.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	9.71	4.95	9.95	10.00	10.00	5.603	45
L-33	Remount Road	Capacity Enhancement	Yeamans Hall Road to Rivers Avenue	0.35	\$10,359	2.05	3.00	4.00	8.00	10.00	8.33	8.43	4.53	6.53	2.83	10.00	5.595	46
L-115a	US- 17A / North Main Street	Access Management	Berlin Myers Parkway to US-78 / 5th Street	0.81	\$1,490	1.20	5.00	7.00	6.00	10.00	8.18	9.50	4.57	4.57	1.57	10.00	5.588	47
L-109	Michaux Parkway	Capacity Enhancement	International Boulevard to Dorchester Road	0.97	\$9,592	1.18	10.00	9.00	2.00	10.00	6.67	5.86	4.64	4.64	2.41	10.00	5.533	48
L-28	College Park Road	Capacity Enhancement	Crowfield Boulevard to I-26 Interchange	1.34	\$17,864	3.86	5.00	7.00	2.00	10.00	8.33	7.14	4.26	4.26	1.50	10.00	5.495	49
L-46	US-52 / Rivers Avenue	Access Management	Camelot Drive to Greenridge Road	2.62	\$4,831	3.26	3.00	10.00	5.00	9.48	4.55	6.50	4.03	6.03	1.27	10.00	5.464	50
L-60	Magwood Drive & Ashley Crossing Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	6.55	3.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	1.11	10.00	3.73	5.73	1.07	10.00	5.425	51
L-140a	Ashley River Road Improvements	Corridor Improvement	Bees Ferry Road to Paul Cantrell Boulevard	3.20	\$144,000	7.79	5.00	3.00	6.00	7.10	2.50	4.57	4.11	4.11	3.31	10.00	5.407	52
L-112a	US-17 / Ravenel Bridge Northbound Off-Ramp	Capacity Enhancement	US-17 & Coleman Boulevard Split to Sessions Way	0.35	\$4,640	2.81	10.00	8.00	6.00	10.00	1.67	8.43	3.95	3.95	1.03	0.00	5.386	53
L-54	Cosgrove Avenue & Azalea Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	4.10	5.00	4.00	7.00	10.00	8.89	2.00	4.38	4.38	1.00	10.00	5.365	54
L-102b	Cross County Road	Capacity Enhancement	Hill Park Drive to Ashley Phosphate Road	0.68	\$8,148	3.68	10.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	1.67	9.71	4.40	4.40	3.05	10.00	5.344	55
L-65	Morrison Drive & Romney Street	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	2.06	5.00	9.00	4.00	10.00	5.56	5.00	4.37	6.37	5.34	5.00	5.329	56
L-129	Old Fort Drive Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Wallace Ackerman Drive to Palmetto Commerce Parkway	0.67	\$4,257	10.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	9.71	3.80	3.80	0.65	5.00	5.248	57
L-104	Folly Road	Capacity Enhancement	Maybank Highway to Johnson Road (Northbound Only)	0.76	\$17,512	2.38	5.00	8.00	3.00	10.00	8.33	2.00	4.50	6.50	1.57	10.00	5.166	58
L-77	St. Andrews Boulevard & 5th Avenue	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	4.84	3.00	3.00	3.00	10.00	5.56	8.00	4.16	6.16	0.51	10.00	5.106	59
L-53	Chuck Dawley Boulevard & Coleman Boulevard/ Ben Sawyer Boulevard Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$29,500	1.82	5.00	4.00	4.00	9.68	6.67	10.00	4.63	4.63	0.69	10.00	5.055	60
L-04c	US-52	Access Management	Montague Plantation Road / Old Mt. Holly Road to Oakley Road	6.45	\$11,891	2.39	5.00	8.00	7.00	6.66	4.55	6.50	1.53	6.53	1.00	10.00	5.053	61
L-137	Long Point Road Corridor Improvements	Corridor Improvement	US-17 to Whipple Road	2.00	\$126,000	10.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	7.60	1.67	3.29	4.26	4.26	1.00	10.00	5.012	62
L-94	Hagood Avenue Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Spring Street to Cannon Street	0.12	\$2,275	3.26	1.00	8.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	8.43	5.00	7.00	4.01	5.00	5.006	63
L-58	Jasper Boulevard & Station 22-1/2 Street	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	6.77	5.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	4.34	4.34	1.00	10.00	5.002	64
L-59	Jasper Boulevard & Station 23 Street	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	6.77	5.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	4.34	4.34	1.00	10.00	5.002	64
L-102a	Cross County Road	Capacity Enhancement	Dorchester Road to Hill Park Drive	1.47	\$14,870	4.95	10.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	1.67	7.14	4.31	4.31	3.05	0.00	4.981	66
L-98	Sandlapper Parkway Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Palmetto Commerce Parkway to Ashley Phosphate Road	1.79	\$32,460	7.81	1.00	3.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	5.86	3.92	3.92	1.08	10.00	4.945	67
L-75	SC-61 & Magwood Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	6.55	5.00	3.00	3.00	10.00	5.56	2.00	3.27	3.27	1.07	10.00	4.936	68

Table 6-5: Ranked Candidate Projects (cont.)

ID	Location	Project Category	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$\$ (1000s)	SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA											Weighted Score	RANK
						Congestion Relief	Existing Infrastructure	Transit	Freight Mobility	Financial Viability	Safety	Environment Impact	Land Use	Economic Development	Walking/Bicycling	Evacuation Route		
L-113	Old Trolley Road	Access Management	Dorchester Road to Bacons Bridge Road	3.48	\$6,422	1.68	5.00	9.00	3.00	8.84	5.45	6.50	4.12	4.12	1.00	10.00	4.913	69
L-47	SC-61 / St. Andrews Boulevard	Access Management	Wesley Drive to Old Towne Road	1.60	\$19,866	5.95	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.49	7.27	5.00	4.79	6.79	1.00	10.00	4.891	70
L-64	Middle Street & Station 22-1/2 Street	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	6.77	5.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	4.34	4.34	1.00	5.00	4.802	71
L-76	SC-61 & Shadowmoss Pkwy.	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	6.55	10.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	5.00	3.92	3.92	1.00	5.00	4.799	72
L-140b	Ashley River Road Improvements	Corridor Improvement	Bees Ferry Road to West Bridge Road	1.50	\$56,000	6.00	5.00	1.00	6.00	9.54	0.83	4.57	3.89	3.89	1.00	10.00	4.791	73
L-32	Red Bank Road	Capacity Enhancement	Deke Giles Boulevard to Bushy Park Road	3.02	\$63,921	4.31	10.00	3.00	2.00	9.32	1.67	8.43	2.96	2.96	1.00	5.00	4.777	74
L-44	Sam Rittenberg Boulevard	Access Management	Old Towne Road to Northbridge Park	1.06	\$1,948	4.17	3.00	3.00	5.00	10.00	1.00	8.00	4.64	4.64	1.00	10.00	4.764	75
L-48	SC-61 / Ashley River Road	Access Management	St. Andrews Boulevard to Paul Cantrell Boulevard	2.81	\$5,176	3.71	3.00	4.00	3.00	9.34	7.27	5.00	4.61	4.61	1.00	10.00	4.763	76
L-124	US-17A & Central Avenue	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	5.21	3.00	7.00	5.00	10.00	1.00	5.00	2.37	4.37	1.00	5.00	4.754	77
L-04a	US-52	Access Management	N. Live Oak Drive to Gaillard Road	4.94	\$9,106	1.00	5.00	8.00	7.00	7.77	4.55	5.00	1.03	6.03	0.97	10.00	4.694	78
L-139	South US-17 Corridor Improvements	Corridor Improvement	SC-162 to Dobbin Road	6.30	\$327,500	7.07	5.00	2.00	6.00	2.00	6.67	3.29	3.44	3.44	0.80	10.00	4.639	79
L-131	Stallville Loop	Capacity Enhancement	Bacons Bridge Road to Miles Jamison Road	0.15	\$4,917	3.26	1.00	8.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	8.43	4.62	4.62	1.00	5.00	4.633	80
L-89	Glenn McConnell Overpass	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$194,000	1.00	1.00	8.00	7.00	2.00	5.56	10.00	5.00	7.00	2.19	10.00	4.616	81
L-69	Rifle Range Road & Bowman Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$3,688	4.77	5.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	4.43	4.43	1.00	10.00	4.615	82
L-90	US-17 & Houston Northcutt Boulevard Intersection	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$64,583	1.00	1.00	8.00	7.00	8.04	5.56	10.00	4.01	6.01	1.07	0.00	4.613	83
L-135	US-17A / Boone Hill Road	Capacity Enhancement	Luden Drive to Greenwave Boulevard	0.50	\$3,452	1.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	8.43	4.01	4.01	1.00	10.00	4.596	84
L-125	US-17A & Tupperway Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	0.63	3.00	7.00	5.00	10.00	2.22	8.00	3.71	5.71	1.00	10.00	4.563	85
L-111	US-17	Capacity Enhancement	Northbound Mainline at Bowman Road Interchange	0.51	\$47,850	1.31	3.00	8.00	6.00	9.77	1.67	7.14	4.58	4.58	4.55	0.00	4.557	86
L-101	Windsor Hill Parkway	Capacity Enhancement	Sandlapper Parkway Extn. to Dorchester Road	3.24	\$49,357	6.26	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	5.86	3.53	5.53	1.08	10.00	4.520	87
L-67	Noisette Boulevard & Virginia Avenue	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$3,688	2.06	10.00	4.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	8.00	4.35	4.35	1.00	5.00	4.500	88
L-24b	Bell Wright Road Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Bell Wright Road to Frontage Road	0.24	\$452	3.86	1.00	7.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	8.43	4.59	4.59	1.79	0.00	4.497	89
L-38	Folly Road	Access Management	Tides End Road to Brantley Drive	4.58	\$8,436	1.00	5.00	8.00	5.00	8.04	0.91	6.50	3.45	5.45	1.00	10.00	4.480	90
L-30	Nexton Parkway	Capacity Enhancement	Nexton Elementary School to US-176	4.86	\$20,897	1.30	10.00	1.00	6.00	10.00	4.17	7.14	1.46	3.46	1.00	5.00	4.469	91
L-66	Morrison Drive & Grace Bridge Street	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,229	2.06	5.00	5.00	4.00	10.00	2.22	2.00	4.45	6.45	2.39	10.00	4.456	92
L-37	East Bay Street	Access Management	Chapel Street to Hasell Street	1.42	\$2,622	1.59	5.00	4.00	5.00	10.00	1.00	6.50	4.89	4.89	0.63	10.00	4.441	93
L-62	Maybank Highway & River Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	4.52	5.00	2.00	1.00	10.00	1.11	10.00	3.05	5.05	1.00	5.00	4.419	94
L-128	North Gum Street Extension	Capacity Enhancement	E. 9th North Street to Marymeade Drive	0.21	\$1,242	2.79	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.74	4.74	7.73	5.00	4.385	95
L-92	Ashley Phosphate Road Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Rivers Avenue to Railroad Avenue Extension	0.42	\$9,902	2.28	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	5.86	4.70	4.70	2.93	0.00	4.358	96
L-41	Mathis Ferry Road	Access Management	US-17 to I-526	2.93	\$5,396	2.81	5.00	4.00	1.00	9.25	1.00	8.00	4.66	4.66	1.00	10.00	4.320	97
L-43	Rutledge Avenue	Access Management	Peachtree Street to Sumter Street	0.97	\$1,786	1.00	10.00	2.00	2.00	10.00	0.91	6.50	4.80	4.80	0.91	10.00	4.319	98
L-130	Summers Corner Connector	Capacity Enhancement	Beech Hill Road to Dorchester Road	2.18	\$26,655	7.07	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	7.14	2.08	2.08	1.00	5.00	4.237	99
L-36	Broad Street	Access Management	Lockwood Drive to East Bay Street	1.18	\$2,176	0.86	5.00	4.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	4.231	100
L-91a	All-American Boulevard Extension (Phase 3)	Capacity Enhancement	Silent Harbor Court to Brickyard Parkway	1.10	\$10,274	4.21	1.00	4.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	8.43	3.61	5.61	1.00	0.00	4.221	101
L-57	IOP Connector & Rifle Range Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	3.25	3.00	1.00	2.00	10.00	1.11	10.00	4.39	4.39	1.00	10.00	4.214	102
L-127b	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension (Phase 2)	Capacity Enhancement	US-17A to Old Beech Hill Road	2.61	\$24,425	8.33	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	7.14	1.47	1.47	1.00	0.00	4.203	103

Table 6-5: Ranked Candidate Projects (cont.)

ID	Location	Project Category	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$\$ (1000s)	SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA											Weighted Score	RANK
						Congestion Relief	Existing Infrastructure	Transit	Freight Mobility	Financial Viability	Safety	Environment Impact	Land Use	Economic Development	Walking/ Bicycling	Evacuation Route		
L-70	Rifle Range Road & Venning Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$3,688	2.88	5.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	4.13	4.13	1.00	10.00	4.195	104
L-51	Ben Sawyer Boulevard & Rifle Range Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$1,844	2.67	3.00	2.00	1.00	10.00	2.22	10.00	4.56	4.56	0.69	10.00	4.193	105
L-29b	Jedburg Road	Capacity Enhancement	Drop Off Drive to US-176	4.80	\$37,312	5.22	3.00	4.00	3.00	10.00	1.67	5.86	1.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	4.185	106
L-126	Wescott Blvd. & Patriot Blvd.	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	3.16	10.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	5.00	2.84	2.84	1.00	10.00	4.169	107
L-121	Miles Jamison Road & Gahagan Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	3.27	10.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	5.00	4.09	4.09	1.00	5.00	4.166	108
L-133	Jedburg Road	Capacity Enhancement	US-78 to Berkeley County Line	1.73	\$13,448	2.81	5.00	2.00	3.00	10.00	1.67	5.86	1.36	3.36	3.88	10.00	4.128	109
L-117	US-78 / 5th Street	Corridor Study	Berlin G. Myers Parkway to County Line (Benchmark Drive)	3.84	\$74,549	1.61	3.00	10.00	6.00	2.32	1.00	3.80	4.99	4.99	6.14	5.00	4.105	110
L-11	Old Highway 52 & Gaillard Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	1.37	3.00	1.00	3.00	10.00	5.56	10.00	2.09	4.09	0.59	10.00	4.085	111
L-116	Ladson Road	Corridor Study	US-78 to Dorchester Road	4.67	\$64,413	2.77	5.00	2.00	3.00	3.56	5.83	3.80	4.23	4.23	6.60	10.00	4.068	112
L-39	Hagood Avenue	Access Management	Moultrie Street to Fishburne Street	0.64	\$1,171	1.00	10.00	2.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	2.00	4.73	6.73	0.97	10.00	4.001	113
L-24a	Frontage Road (Pseudonym)	Capacity Enhancement	Marymeade Drive to Frank Jones Road	4.42	\$26,484	1.72	1.00	7.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	7.14	4.43	4.43	2.36	0.00	3.977	114
L-91b	All-American Boulevard Extension (Phase 3)	Capacity Enhancement	Brickyard Parkway to SC-41 Service Road	0.53	\$4,950	3.20	1.00	3.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	8.43	3.87	5.87	1.00	0.00	3.956	115
L-96	Memorial Drive Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Memorial Drive to US-17 / Savannah Highway	0.60	\$4,886	4.79	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	8.43	4.01	4.01	1.00	0.00	3.954	116
L-34	St. Thomas Island Drive	Capacity Enhancement	Clements Ferry Road to Harvest Time Place	0.22	\$3,762	2.84	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.67	8.43	3.99	3.99	1.00	10.00	3.895	117
L-42	Old Towne Road	Access Management	Sam Rittenburg Boulevard to Gunn Avenue	1.90	\$3,503	1.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	10.00	4.55	5.00	4.60	4.60	1.00	10.00	3.868	118
L-29a	Jedburg Road	Capacity Enhancement	Dorchester County Line to Business Park Road	0.75	\$5,830	2.81	5.00	2.00	3.00	10.00	1.67	5.86	0.91	2.91	3.88	5.00	3.865	119
L-108b	Maybank Highway Improvements (Eastern Portion)	Capacity Enhancement	River Road to Stono River Bridge	0.87	\$51,550	1.58	3.00	3.00	1.00	9.66	1.67	10.00	2.35	4.35	1.00	10.00	3.844	120
L-97	Michaux Parkway Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Dorchester Road to Ashley River Road	1.91	\$57,801	3.74	1.00	9.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	3.808	121
L-136	US-17A / Walterboro Road	Capacity Enhancement	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension to Sandpit Drive	4.54	\$29,747	2.27	3.00	7.00	5.00	10.00	1.67	5.86	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	3.755	122
L-61	Maybank Highway & Main Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	2.82	5.00	3.00	1.00	10.00	1.11	5.00	2.78	4.78	1.00	5.00	3.742	123
L-132	Beech Hill Road	Capacity Enhancement	US-17A to Delemar Highway	4.57	\$65,948	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	9.26	1.67	7.14	1.50	3.50	1.00	10.00	3.741	124
L-108a	Maybank Highway Improvements (Western Portion)	Capacity Enhancement	Bohicket Road to River Road	2.99	\$126,000	1.58	3.00	3.00	1.00	7.60	1.67	10.00	3.24	5.24	0.57	10.00	3.736	125
L-23	College Park Road Extension	Capacity Enhancement	College Park Road to Nexton Parkway	2.64	\$26,640	5.07	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	7.14	2.47	2.47	1.00	0.00	3.692	126
L-63	Maybank Highway & Riverland Drive	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	3.04	3.00	2.00	1.00	10.00	1.11	5.00	3.87	5.87	1.00	5.00	3.639	127
L-49b	SC-61 / Ashley River Road	Corridor Study	Bees Ferry Road to Charleston County Line	2.22	\$65,675	7.38	3.00	1.00	6.00	3.41	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.65	10.00	3.635	128
L-25	Henry Brown Boulevard Extension	Capacity Enhancement	Henry Brown Boulevard (Brick Park) to US-52	4.40	\$29,634	4.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	7.14	0.75	0.75	1.00	5.00	3.596	129
L-35	Wildgame Road	Capacity Enhancement	Jedburg Road to Sheep Island Road	2.78	\$26,948	4.44	3.00	4.00	1.00	10.00	1.67	7.14	0.93	0.93	1.00	0.00	3.582	130
L-27	Cane Bay Boulevard	Capacity Enhancement	Day Break Boulevard to Black Tom Road	2.35	\$11,405	1.61	10.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	7.14	1.05	1.05	1.00	5.00	3.580	131
L-99	Sea Island Parkway/Greenway	Capacity Enhancement	River Road to Betsy Kerrison Parkway	9.39	\$127,157	4.82	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.02	5.00	8.43	2.16	2.16	0.56	0.00	3.576	132
L-52	Betsy Kerrison Pkwy. / Bohicket Road & River Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$2,459	2.47	5.00	3.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	1.28	1.28	1.00	1.00	3.552	133
L-93	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension (Phase 1)	Capacity Enhancement	Bees Ferry Road to Charleston County Line	6.99	\$368,777	2.10	1.00	7.00	1.00	5.26	5.00	7.14	2.27	4.27	1.00	5.00	3.535	134
L-122	Orangeburg Road & E. Butternut Road / Mallard Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	2.81	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	2.23	2.23	1.00	5.00	3.516	135
L-03	US-17A / Live Oak Road	Access Management	US-176 / St. James Avenue to E. Main Street	10.59	\$19,529	0.91	3.00	7.00	5.00	3.62	4.55	5.00	0.74	0.74	3.11	10.00	3.498	136

Table 6-5: Ranked Candidate Projects (cont.)

ID	Location	Project Category	Delimits	Length (Miles)	Cost in Y2024 \$\$ (1000s)	SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA											Weighted Score	RANK
						Congestion Relief	Existing Infrastructure	Transit	Freight Mobility	Financial Viability	Safety	Environment Impact	Land Use	Economic Development	Walking/Bicycling	Evacuation Route		
L-123	SC-165 & County Line Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$4,917	3.15	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	3.411	137
L-134	Orangeburg Road	Capacity Enhancement	Mallard Road to US-78	2.19	\$19,543	1.54	3.00	1.00	2.00	10.00	1.67	5.86	2.04	4.04	1.00	10.00	3.396	138
L-16	US-176 & Black Tom Road	Intersection Improvement	-	-	\$6,146	4.01	5.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	3.383	139
L-106	Harbor View Road Improvements	Capacity Enhancement	Harbor View Circle to North Shore Drive	0.70	\$110,000	4.33	3.00	1.00	1.00	8.04	1.67	4.57	3.03	3.03	1.00	5.00	3.353	140
L-127a	Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension (Phase 1)	Capacity Enhancement	Charleston County Line to US-17A	11.04	\$577,750	3.46	1.00	7.00	1.00	2.00	5.00	7.14	1.31	3.31	1.00	0.00	3.146	141
L-103a	Folly Beach Road	Capacity Enhancement	E. Indian Avenue to Little Oak Island Drive	0.46	\$20,407	2.63	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.67	4.57	1.05	1.05	1.00	10.00	3.133	142
L-103b	Folly Beach Road	Capacity Enhancement	Little Oak Island Drive to Bowens Island Road	1.20	\$34,328	2.49	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.67	4.57	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	3.098	143
L-100	West Bridge Connector Road	Capacity Enhancement	SC-61 to Glenn McConnell Pkwy Extension	1.54	\$6,832	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	5.00	8.43	2.18	2.18	1.00	0.00	2.940	144
L-114	SC-61	Access Management	Charleston County Line to Bacons Bridge Road	4.35	\$23,593	3.47	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	6.50	1.00	3.00	1.00	10.00	2.734	145
L-06	Old Highway 52 / Old Fort Road	Corridor Study	US-52 to Cypress Gardens Road	9.64	\$77,192	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.17	5.60	1.00	3.00	0.74	10.00	2.605	146
L-26	Black Tom Road	Capacity Enhancement	US-176 to US-17A	5.90	\$43,248	1.26	3.00	1.00	1.00	9.89	1.67	7.14	0.53	0.53	1.00	0.00	2.581	147

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

# Revenue Assumptions

The CHATS MPO’s primary source of funding comes from the federal and state blended Regional Mobility Program (RMP). RMP funds are distributed from SCDOT to the twenty-one MPOs and Councils of Governments throughout the state. Allocation of RMP funds to the various planning regions are formulae based, and are proportional to the regional population within each area. The Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA) authorized more than \$350 billion in Federal highway programs including roads, bridges and mass transit.

In 2022 the SCDOT Commission approved an \$100 million increase in the RMP funding level to be distributed to all MPOs and COGs across the state. This increase was phased in incrementally over four years with the fully phased-in increase in place by FY 2025. The CHATS RMP annual allocation will be \$33.515 million, which reflects a 76% increase over pre-IIJA/BIL levels. Traditionally these allocations have remained fairly constant and as a result funding levels are not expected to increase substantially over the life of this Plan.

While these are not the only funding sources that are currently being used within the CHATS planning area for transportation improvements, RMP funds are assumed as the only funding source committed to funding CHATS’ long-range transportation plan projects and programs. CHATS assumes this conservative approach to developing a fiscally constrained plan, however the MPO works closely with its member counties and local jurisdictions to leverage non-federal funds to support implementation of the LRTP recommendations where possible. The MPO also actively pursues federal grant opportunities and provides technical support to eligible entities to pursue and develop competitive grant applications for initiatives that aligns with the MPO’s regional goals and objectives.

The following summarizes the plan’s revenue sources and total funds available to allocate to long-range plan recommendations.

## Current Funding Sources (through 2024)

Based on the current projects, programs, and on-going initiatives programmed in the CHATS Transportation Improvements Program (TIP) through FY 2024, a portion of CHATS RMP funds in the amount of \$33.6 million is anticipated to carryover into FY 2025 for allocation to existing or new projects identified in this LRTP process.

## CHATS Regional Mobility Program (RMP) Funding (2025 - 2045)

Between 2025 and 2035, RMP allocated funds of \$33.515 million annually or a total of \$743 million over the 20 year period, will be available for funding existing or new transportation projects or programs. With the recent update to the CHATS TIP to a ten-year plan window through FY 2033, CHATS has programmed or committed RMP funds to complete projects already under development and to maintain on-going planning activities and programs approved by the MPO’s Policy Committee. These commitments include funding to complete major roadway projects under development, support the continuation of on-going planning activities undertaken by the MPO to maintain and implement recommendations from regional planning initiatives, and set-aside of \$1 million annually to fund the region’s Complete Streets program. With the exception of the Complete Streets set-aside, funding programmed for planning support and program implementation are not maintained beyond FY 2033 until approved by CHATS and budgeted in the CHATS TIP. The Table below provides a summary of the LRTP’s total plan revenues.

<b>CHATS RMP Funding 2025 - 2045</b>	<b>\$ (in millions)</b>
RMP 2024 Carryover Funds (Anticipated)	\$33.6
2025-2045 RMP Annual Allocations (\$33.5 M Annually)	\$703.8
<b>Funding Revenue Grand Total</b>	<b>\$743.4</b>


# Estimated Cost Assumptions

The Year-of-Expenditure (YOE) conversion, as required by federal regulation, is an inflated value of present dollars to reflect changes in the purchasing power of construction, right-of-way acquisition, and planning/design services to the mid-point of the future year scenarios of 2035 and 2045 in this plan instance; as recommended by FHWA's Major Project Program Cost Estimating Guidance: [www.fhwa.dot.gov/majorprojects/cost\\_estimating/guidance.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/majorprojects/cost_estimating/guidance.cfm). Following the COVID-19 Pandemic and its impact on the supply chain, the construction sector was greatly impacted by material supply disruptions, project delays, and hyper-inflated material costs. Prior to 2021, construction cost inflation was on average 3% - 4% over the last decade. However, in recent times inflation rates have risen to levels as high as 8% - 10% and have not shown signs of slowing.

Using the historic quarterly inflation index provided by the FHWA's National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI: [www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/otps/nhcci](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/otps/nhcci)) between March 2019 and June 2023, an inflation trend was established to forecast an inflation rate to be used through the plan's proposed horizons. An inflation rate of 6.55% per annum was calculated which reflects the average between the forecasted rate through the midpoint of the first plan horizon period 2025-2035 (5.91%) and the forecasted rate through the midpoint of the 2035-2045 horizon (7.2%).

This inflation rate was compounded annually over the Plan's twenty year horizon and converted to the final inflation factors, shown below, which will be applied to current year cost estimates to account for inflation and reflect final plan costs in the assumed Year-of-Expenditure dollars.

**Figure 6-1: National Highway Construction Cost Index Trend (March 2019 - June 2023)**



**Figure 6-2: LRTP Cost Estimate Inflation Factor**

2029	2028-2029	1.3765	2025-2035	1.498
2030	2029-2030	1.4674		
2031	2030-2031	1.5642		
2032	2031-2032	1.6675		
2033	2032-2033	1.7775		
2034	2033-2034	1.8948		
2035	2034-2035	2.0199		
2036	2035-2036	2.1532	2036-2045	2.9194
2037	2036-2037	2.2953		
2038	2037-2038	2.4468		
2039	2038-2039	2.6083		
2040	2039-2040	2.7805		
2041	2040-2041	2.9640		
2042	2041-2042	3.1596		
2043	2042-2043	3.3681		
2044	2043-2044	3.5904		
2045	2044-2045	3.8274		

Table 6-6 outlines the CHATS RMP LRTP revenues and distribution of funds anticipated over the plan period 2025-2045.

**Table 6-6: CHATS RMP Funding and Distributions**

CHATS RMP Funding 2025 - 2045	2024 \$ (in millions) - Projected	
Carryover RMP Funds (2024 Anticipated)	\$33.6	
2025-2045 Annual RMP Allocations (\$33.5 M Annually)	\$703.8	
Funding Revenue Grand Total	\$743.4	
CHATS RMP Funding Distribution 2025 - 2045	2024 \$ (in millions)	YOE \$ (in millions)
RMP Allocation to committed projects, programs, planning programmed in TIP (2025-2033)	\$75	\$113.1
Complete Streets Annual Allocation (\$1M) (2034 - 2045)	\$12	\$18
RMP Allocation to LRTP Projects (2025-2035)	\$185.1	\$277.2
RMP Allocation to LRTP Projects (2036-2045)	\$114.8	\$335.1
<b>Funding Distribution Grant Total</b>	<b>\$386.9</b>	<b>\$743.4</b>

## Fiscally-Constrained Plan

### Horizon Year Projects (2035 & 2045)

This section highlights the projects selected for RMP funding for the 2025-2035 and 2036-2045 plan periods. The total amount dedicated to Capacity Enhancement, Corridor Studies, Access Management, and Intersection Improvement projects for the period 2025-2045 is \$612.3 million, of which \$277.2 million is applied between 2025-2035, and approximately \$335.1 million is applied between 2036-2045. Through the SCDOT approved prioritization process, the projects in the LRTP are allocated in the financial plan based on the ranking of each project. With this in mind, there are several assumptions that were required. All projects selected were based on the project prioritization described earlier. Additional assumptions and methodology included:

1. Annual allocations of RMP funding is adjusted or reduced to account for funds committed to any project or planning activities programmed in the CHATS TIP for the updated TIP window through 2033;
2. Capacity Enhancement, Corridor Study, Access Management and Intersection Improvement projects were selected based on their priority as ranked and in order;


3. Projects identified for inclusion in the constrained projects list were based on its overall project ranking, regardless of project category. Available RMP funds were applied to projects in sequence until available funds were exhausted;
4. If a project overlapped Horizon Years, then that project would be fully funded in the subsequent Horizon Year;
5. If there is a surplus of funds at the end of the Horizon Year that is not able to fund the next ranked project in full, funds will be allocated in the next plan horizon.

Following the stated assumptions, the top 32 ranked projects were identified for funding and included on the LRTP fiscally-constrained project list. Tables 6-7 and 6-8 provide the fiscally-constrained projects broken down by horizon years. It is important to note that projects not on the fiscally-constrained project list (i.e. LRTP vision projects) will be considered for RMP funding if other project funding is identified and the project is actively being developed. In this event, the LRTP fiscally-constrained project list will be adjusted to reflect the advancement of such projects.

**Table 6-7: Fiscally-Constrained Projects for Period 2025 - 2035**

ID	Facility	Project Category	Delimits		Cost 2024	Cost (YOES)	Rank
L-87	US-78 & Ladson Road / Ancrum Road	Intersection	-	-	\$4,917	\$7,363	1
L-17	US-17A & US-176	Intersection	-	-	\$6,146	\$9,204	2
L-138	Rivers Avenue Overpass	Railroad Overpass	Durant Avenue to Aragon Street	0.13	\$2,459	\$114,561	3
L-118	Dorchester Road & Ladson Road	Intersection	-	-	\$3,688	\$3,682	4
L-79	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Avondale Avenue	Intersection	-	-	\$12,293	\$5,523	5
L-86b	US-17 & West Oak Forest Drive	Intersection	-	-	\$1,844	\$2,761	6
L-86a	US-17 & Farmfield Avenue	Intersection	-	-	\$1,844	\$2,761	7
L-80	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Carolina Bay Drive	Intersection	-	-	\$3,688	\$5,523	8
L-119	Dorchester Road & Old Trolley Road	Intersection	-	-	\$6,146	\$9,204	9
L-71	Rivers Avenue & Greenridge Road	Intersection	-	-	\$3,688	\$5,523	10
L-07	US-17A / North Main Street	Corridor Study	I-26 Interchange to Berlin Myers Parkway (Eastbound Only)	0.77	\$6,146	\$16,025	11
L-68	Remount Road & Rhett Avenue	Intersection	-	-	\$10,701	\$7,363	12
L-83	US-17 & Shelmore Boulevard	Intersection	-	-	\$4,917	\$2,761	13
L-72	Rivers Avenue & Remount Road	Intersection	-	-	\$1,844	\$9,204	14
L-84	US-17 & Stinson Drive / Dupont Road	Intersection	-	-	\$3,730	\$2,761	15
L-110	Montague Avenue	Widening	International Boulevard to I-26 Interchange	0.50	\$6,146	\$18,409	16
L-88	US-78 / King Street & Mt Pleasant Street	Intersection	-	-	\$1,844	\$9,204	17
L-19	US-52 & Liberty Hall Road	Intersection	-	-	\$51,856	\$3,682	18
L-50	Ashley Phosphate Road	Corridor Study	Cross County Road to Rivers Avenue	2.01	\$6,146	\$26,028	19
L-85	US-17 / Savannah Highway & Wappoo Road	Intersection	-	-	\$2,459	\$2,761	20
L-120	Ladson Road & Lincolville Road	Intersection	-	-	\$17,380	\$3,682	21
L-01	Daniel Island Drive	Access Management	Barfield Street to Fairchild Street	0.67	\$1,844	\$1,841	22
L-82	US-17 & Porcher's Bluff Road	Intersection	-	-	\$2,459	\$7,363	23


Map 6-1: Fiscally-Constrained Projects for Period 2025-2035



**Table 6-8: Fiscally-Constrained Projects for Period 2036 - 2045**

ID	Facility	Project Category	Delimits		Cost 2024	Cost (YOES)	Rank
L-31	North Rhett Avenue	Widening	I-526 Interchange to Yeamans Hall Road	1.93	\$6,146	\$151,368	24
L-09	College Park Road & Treeland Drive	Intersection	-	-	\$12,293	\$14,353	25
L-112	US-17 / Ravenel Bridge Southbound Approach	Widening	Magrath Darby Boulevard to Wingo Way On-Ramp	0.27	\$4,917	\$10,887	26
L-45	US-17 / Savannah Highway	Access Management	Wesley Drive to I-526	3.49	\$1,229	\$18,799	27
L-05	Clements Ferry Road	Corridor Study	I-526 Interchange to St. Thomas Island Drive	0.39	\$4,917	\$9,982	28
L-55	Dorchester Road & West Hill Boulevard	Intersection	-	-	\$6,440	\$7,176	29
L-81	US-17 & Long Point Road	Intersection	-	-	\$7,376	\$10,765	30
L-40	Long Point Road	Access Management	I-526 to Whipple Road	0.97	\$3,420	\$5,214	31
L-78	US-17 SB Off-Ramp / SC-61 & Woodward Road	Intersection	-	-	\$2,459		32

Map 6-2: Fiscally-Constrained Projects for Period 2036-2045





# policy actions

Image: NACTO,  
*Urban Street  
Design Guide*

Updates of transportation and comprehensive plans occur at various intervals, often five years or longer. In between these major update cycles, agencies can continue building on the recommendations contained in the plan, not only in terms of funding, design, and construction, but working with their many partners to improve local practices that can make an even larger shift towards a healthy, vibrant, and active transportation system and community.

The BCDCOG and partnering organizations within the CHATS planning area already have many policies describing communication practices, design standards, and other items discussed in this section. However, during the course of the planning process, some places where enhancements to policies can be made, were inevitably discussed. The purpose of the policy and practices section is to ensure that projects are implemented with best practices in mind and offers guidance to issues that may arise during project development. The following are not intended to critique current practices, or supersede them, but instead to suggest enhanced practices that would support the physical recommendations contained in this plan.

A few guiding principles should be followed to identify and describe the policy topics:

- Acknowledge what is being done now;
- Create specific and actionable steps that, even if they are not followed to the letter, are achievable, get people thinking, and get them excited about their work and their community; and
- Develop the policy topics consistently, with issues, importance, and strategies for each topic, as well as examples of best practices that can provide insight from other places.

Lastly, linkages between some of the topics, such as communication, performance, and equitable engagement, occur frequently. Pursuing and achieving multiple action items on some topics as a “package” will enhance the return on investment.

Appendix B of this document includes detailed policy recommendations for stormwater best management practices (BMPs), complete street design and policy implementation, and access management BMPs and policy strategies.

This section was developed in accordance to comments received during the public input phase of the project. Areas of improvement that were identified included the need for complete streets, detailed sidewalk policies, connectivity, greenway/trail requirements, traffic impact studies and the importance of partnerships and equitable public engagement. Lastly, the topic of resiliency was added since it is a premier discussion happening across the country, particularly in coastal communities.

A comprehensive treatise on each topic is not warranted or possible, but specific, actionable practices are suggested as well as examples of where good practices are already being applied.

*“Yet no matter how good it may be, a plan by itself cannot bring about immediate transformation. Almost always, it is a spark that sets off a current that begins to spread.”*



—Jaime Lerner, Author,  
Urban Acupuncture:  
Celebrating Pinpricks of  
Change that Enrich City Life

## REGIONAL POLICY NEEDS

### Priorities for Long-Term Viability

*In fast-growing places like the CHATS planning area, few tasks are as important as aligning policy with infrastructure needs. The private sector plays a major, ongoing role in terms of financing improvements through property taxes as well as indirectly through sales, income, and other taxes levied on employees, residents, and workers that support them with everything from lawn care to lending services.*

*Because of their importance, the project team undertook a survey of both municipal and county policies in place around the CHATS planning area. The findings painted a picture of varying practices even within a fairly narrow geographic range: impact fees, greenway requirements, and site development can all vary across the landscape.*

*Here are the top policy needs identified by the 13 jurisdictions that were surveyed (three tiers of respondent importance):*

- ▶ Sidewalks
- ▶ Complete Streets
- ▶ Connectivity
- ▶ Greenways/Trails
- ▶ Traffic Impact Study Requirement
- ▶ Transit
- ▶ Parking
- ▶ Streetscape
- ▶ Roadways
- ▶ Driveway / Access Management
- ▶ Commercial Development Design
- ▶ Corridor Overlay Districts
- ▶ Impact Fees
- ▶ Setbacks Associated with Transportation Plan

▶ Thanks to our respondents!

Berkeley County  
Charleston County  
Dorchester County  
City of Charleston  
Folly Beach  
Hanahan  
James Island  
Monck's Corner  
Mt. Pleasant  
North Charleston  
Seabrook Island  
Summerville  
Sullivan's Island

# sidewalk development

## Why It Is Important:

Perhaps no other piece of infrastructure is as observable as the ubiquitous sidewalk. But sidewalks are not created equally, or cheaply. Here are some concepts and practices to consider as the role of the pedestrian continues to grow in the urban landscape.

## Issues and Barriers to Success:

At the time of this plan preparation, one of the biggest economic splashes being made was by Amazon, which announced that it was commencing its search for a second headquarters location. One of the big factors in Amazon's search was locating in a place that was really urban: walkable, bikeable, and possessing great public transit access just like the first headquarters in Seattle. Market analysts have commented well before the Amazon HQ2 craze on the trend for young talent pools to form in the environments where owning a car isn't a foregone conclusion.

But in many communities, including those in the CHATS planning area, there are barriers that increase cost and decrease constructability of sidewalks along roadways.

- **Narrow Streets or Limited Rights-of-Way.** Although narrow streets are capable of slowing cars, narrow rights-of-way make land acquisition for sidewalks expensive, especially if buildings and parking lots are in the way.
- **Utility Relocation.** If power lines or storm drain inlets have to be relocated, costs for construction go up - fast.
- **More Pavement = More Stormwater Runoff.** Alternative pavement technologies or allocating space to allow rainwater to infiltrate work, but will change initial and lifecycle costs.
- **Desire may be Lacking.** If adjacent property owners do not want them, sidewalks usually do not happen.

## Strategies for Improvement:

There are several considerations for developing sidewalks that work:

- The sidewalk width and choice of material should be flexible to meet the needs of the environment; 10' and wider sidewalks in commercial and high-traffic areas are appropriate; brick pavers and integrated streetscaping can fit into historical environmental contexts.
- Sidewalks should be required to be constructed by new development on both sides of the street, every time except in very low-density (e.g., less than two units per acre) residential communities.
- No room for sidewalks? Consider a shared street instead. Shared streets balance cars, pedestrians, and cyclists in primarily residential and highly mixed-use communities.
- Accessibility is key to an aging population, so installing curb ramps and pedestrian signals - even during routine utility construction - is important.
- Work with SCDOT on repaving work (in advance) to ensure that sidewalk construction efforts are coordinated with the plan.



Source: Stantec, Ashley Bonawitz

## Where to Start Walking?

Shared Streets: <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-design-guide/streets/residential-shared-street>

Sidewalk Standards: [www.planning.org/pas/reports/report95.htm](http://www.planning.org/pas/reports/report95.htm)

Economic Impacts: <https://americas.uli.org/report/active-transportation-real-estate-next-frontier>

# traffic impact studies

## Why It Is Important:


Most communities in the CHATS planning area do not require the submission of a traffic impact study (TIS) to assess the potential impacts of a new or expanded development. This is one tool that can be implemented to assist municipalities in determining how new development impacts the transportation system.

## Issues and Barriers to Success:

Traffic studies are nothing new, and are expected by developers of private properties over a certain size (or trips that are expected to be generated). However, the analysis and thresholds should be context-sensitive: a Level-of-Service-only standard will not be desirable, or even possible, in a downtown area. Further, all TIS documents and processes should contemplate all modes of travel, including transit access/stops, connectivity by sidewalks, and requirements for connecting on-site pedestrian networks to the nearest intersection, even if that connection requires going off-site (off-site signal and intersection improvements are commonplace requirements).

## Strategies for Improvement:

- **Start off right** by requiring the site location map to extend to the nearest intersections, and display both existing and planned future transit routes/stops, historic / overlay districts, pedestrian facilities (including greenways), and bicycle accommodations - crucial particularly for major (over 100 units) residential developments.
- **Conduct a scoping meeting** with the developer and their engineer to be certain that the TIS study area, intersections, phasing of development, growth/peak hour factors, and thresholds are established.
- **List the performance measures** by area and/or by street and mode to ensure that service standards respond to the needs of individual communities. Also make sure that connectivity and design standards for transit facilities, biking connections, and other provisions tied to historic preservation districts, zoning, land use plans, and this transportation plan are understood and enforced. Do not forget about accommodating all users during construction with signs and detours.



Source: Zanetta Illustrations



## TIS Better to Give...:

### Fort Collins, CO

Chapter 4 of the Urban Area Street Standards (well worth reviewing in general) addresses TIS guidance and requirements. Unlike most, Fort Collins emphasizes multi-modal impacts and assessment.

Fort Collins, Co: [www.larimer.org/sites/default/files/ch04\\_2016.pdf](http://www.larimer.org/sites/default/files/ch04_2016.pdf)

Calgary TIS Guidelines: [www.tccs.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/991989/Transport-Impact-Assessment-Guidelines.pdf](http://www.tccs.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/991989/Transport-Impact-Assessment-Guidelines.pdf)  
Practice (Book): ITE, Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development. 2010.

SCDOT: [www.scdot.org/doing/technicalPDFs/publicationsManuals/trafficEngineering/ARMS\\_2008.pdf](http://www.scdot.org/doing/technicalPDFs/publicationsManuals/trafficEngineering/ARMS_2008.pdf)

In Depth: [https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/nchrp\\_rpt\\_616\\_dowling.pdf](https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/nchrp_rpt_616_dowling.pdf)  
Easy Tool to Calculate Multi-modal LOS: [www.fdot.gov/planning/systems/programs/sm/los](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/systems/programs/sm/los)

# greenways & trails

## Why It Is Important:

People always say they prefer to bike and walk away from traffic - always. In the CHATS planning area, trails and greenways allow for connections between neighboring communities and benefit stormwater management.

## Issues and Barriers to Success:

As with connecting streets, connecting greenways and off-road trails can be daunting through existing neighborhoods and across streets, so it is better to plan ahead and map out the network in an adopted greenway, comprehensive, or transportation plan. The “corridor of crime” argument is still there, even if there is little justification for it. If push comes to shove, enforcing eminent domain across private property requires careful thought and preparation.

## Strategies for Improvement:

- **Honor the “green” in greenway** by remembering that the term was intended to connect islands of green space and parks together for habitat conservation - an important consideration in a rapidly developing area. Mapping out key conservation areas is a crucial first step to preserving and connecting them as part of a regional conservation plan.
- **Incorporating greenways** into private developments by allowing an equal or even double amount of area be applied towards open space requirements or provide other incentives like density bonuses. This can help smooth the policy pathway for private sector greenway construction and connections.
- **Fostering Partnerships** between community stakeholders. One of this plan’s authors worked with a local high school to clear a “soft trail” behind the school to delineate a three-foot-wide clear space for a future hard surface trail to be funded later. Local engineering companies helped provide expertise on stream crossing permits and pedestrian bridge design - which was built and moved by the high school’s shop class. Nature conservation areas, public trail art, and butterfly or rain gardens can - and should - be done in concert with the community to get their support and help.



Source: Scott Lane

## A Trail, Softly: Wake Forest, NC

The Town of Wake Forest worked with Heritage High School to clear a narrow “soft trail” through the wooded property behind the school to a major intersection, a distance of about 0.8 miles. Students were shown safety tips on using tools first, then led out in a group to work together on the trail. The school’s shop class built a pedestrian bridge over a creek with permit and design help donated by a local engineering firm.

Wake Forest’s Soft Trail Site: [www.wakeforestnc.gov/heritage-high-soft-trail.aspx](http://www.wakeforestnc.gov/heritage-high-soft-trail.aspx)

Book: Randolph T. Hester, Design for Ecological Democracy. 2006.  
Book: Hellmund and Smith, Designing Greenways: Sustainable Landscapes for Nature and People. 2006.



# connectivity

## Why It Is Important:

The pace of growth in both the urban and rural portions of the CHATS planning area requires more than wider arterial roads. Trip lengths and number depend on a well-connected system.

## Issues and Barriers to Success:

It is much easier to create connectivity in a greenfield (not developed) situation than to connect existing neighborhoods to each other or commercial areas. Fears of “cut-thru” traffic are real, although they can be mitigated by better, slower street design. Ensuring that local policies require one or more “stub-out” connections to the edges of property lines helps make future connections possible - but not inevitable: people will still vocalize concerns about connections to neighborhoods or uses that they perceive as driving traffic into and through their neighborhood, even on public streets.

## Strategies for Improvement:

- **Great connectivity doesn't happen by accident.** A secondary street plan, sometimes called a collector street plan, shows where road connections have to be made as a prerequisite of new private development or future public investment. These plans should show cross sections, streetscaping, and traffic calming (including required frequency of curves and small curb radii standards) tied to residential and commercial properties.
- **The number of stub-outs** required by new development should be scaled to the number of units or square footage being constructed at full build out (e.g., all phases.)
- **Stub-out connections** have to be signed (prominently) and noted on plats and deeds.
- **Real estate agents are required by law to disclose features of properties** that they sell. Conduct an annual meeting of invited real estate agents (or have a “traveling road show” that can be conducted for real estate agencies periodically) to impart information about future road connections.
- **Shorter block faces** - less than 500' - helps to slow traffic and promote walking and transit use.



Source: CNU

## The Benefits of Making Connections

- ▶ Street systems with greater degrees of connectivity offer greater resiliency and possibilities for rerouting traffic during an emergency
- ▶ Higher degrees of connectivity imply a more robust transportation system, one that is able to provide users with greater degrees of freedom in making travel choices during periods of heavy traffic and accommodating trip chaining (making brief stops at different places during a trip) in areas with lower-income populations
- ▶ Greater connectivity typically equates to a greater capacity for moving and distributing traffic, thereby reducing congestion levels
- ▶ Areas with greater connectivity have better land access to local businesses, with implications for the diversity and intensity of potential developments in those areas

## Way to Go Ohio:

### OKI Regional Council of Governments

Regional bodies can promote connectivity by creating standards and policies for their member agencies to follow. The OKI version talks benefits, model code, and block lengths.  
<http://rpf.oki.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/OKI-Street-Connectivity.pdf>  
CNU: [www.cnu.org/our-projects/street-networks/street-networks-101](http://www.cnu.org/our-projects/street-networks/street-networks-101)



# activating partnerships: slicing the silos

## Why It Is Important:


The BCDCOG is a large, diverse organization that collaborates with the counties and municipalities in the planning area. Each of these agencies in the CHATS planning area must work cooperatively and effectively with each other and other large, diverse organizations to plan, implement, and maintain transportation projects and services.

## Issues and Barriers to Success:

Each municipality has its own leadership and multiple departments are busy agencies working toward internal objectives, some of which represent core missions. It is easy to misunderstand, lose track of, and delay projects that require cross-collaboration among the staff of different municipalities. For example, the Transportation Department in the City of Charleston has a mission that depends on close cooperation with the Counties, SCDOT, and the BCDCOG for short-

and long-range planning, design/construction, and maintenance of Charleston's core transportation infrastructure. This is similar for all the smaller towns and communities in the CHATS planning area. Discussing these issues, much less doing the things necessary to make improvements, require time from busy professionals. The purpose of establishing ongoing communication is to create a more efficient delivery of services to the community in the future. Few people realize how many agencies and departments are required to deliver common public services. The figure below illustrates how many entities are potentially engaged in providing typical services and emergency responses in a street corridor.

**Figure 6-2: Typical Street Services**



- A** Traffic Signals and Signs: Traffic & Transportation (Municipality, SCDOT)
- B** Buses and Public Transportation including Carpool/Vanpool: BCDCOG (Regional/Private Contractor)
- C** Street Maintenance and Drainage Issues: Stormwater (Municipality)
- D** On-Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Repairs: Streets & Sidewalks (Municipality)
- E** Street Trees and Furniture: Parks & Recreation (Municipality)
- F** Traffic Enforcement: Police Departments (State, Municipality)
- G** Water/Sewer Repairs: Public Works, Solid Waste (County/Private Utility Providers)
- H** Internet Issues: AT&T or other provider (Private)
- I** Electrical Outrage or Downed Power Lines: SC Electric & Gas or Berkeley Coop (Private)
- J** Planning/Permitting: Planning, Engineering, Inspections (Municipality)

## Strategies for Improvement

The following are a few ideas for working collaboratively across municipalities in the CHATS planning area.

- **Foster a performance-based atmosphere.** The more an organization focuses on performance, the more its people realize the need for effective and efficient collaboration. An era of top-down, “cascade” goal-setting is being replaced by transparency and performance-based planning. Leaders work with their staffs to collectively identify objectives, how to reach them, and measure progress of projects (performance measures). While beyond the scope of this study, this process should be ongoing, with clear metrics related to performance readily available to a broad audience. Common measures that could be considered when determining the success of a project may include number of issues resolved, time taken from reporting to closing out the issue, and various costs. Bonus: the public can access this information (see box) and realize that the leadership in the planning area is doing a lot more for them than they realized.
- **Team Understanding.** Create a quarterly meeting where team leaders spend a half-day discussing one or two common and cross-cutting (at least two departments or divisions are involved) issues and steps to take to resolve or at least improve the situation – and report the next quarter on what seems to be working or not.
- **Joint Review Committees: Let the outside in.** Site plan review committees, emergency response personnel, and other collaborations are areas where cities, states, counties, and other agencies have to work together to be successful. The project team notes that in every city or region where they have worked, people from different entities that come together in focus groups invariably exchange valuable information that they would not have been likely to do otherwise. If internal groups meet quarterly, then action-oriented groups with external partners should happen at least twice each year with the same standards for coordination and follow-up as the quarterly internal meetings.

**Communicating:**

**Boyne City, MI**

The Boyne City municipal dashboard is straightforward, fitting on a single screen on their website. Clicking any item provides a yearly trend line.

[www.accessmygov.com](http://www.accessmygov.com)

# measuring performance

## **Performance-Based Planning and Programming**

Performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) applies system data to inform investment and policy decisions to achieve desired outcomes set for the region's multi-modal transportation system. It is a federal requirement that PBPP be applied as a standard state of the practice in the planning and programming process and should be integrated throughout the decision-making process and within the development of an area's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP); other plans and processes including those federally mandated such as Strategic Highway Safety Plans, Asset Management Plans, Congestion Management Process, Transit Agency Asset Management Plans and Transit Agency's Safety Plans; as well as in programming documents such as the statewide and metropolitan transportation investment plans (STIPs and TIPs).

The goal of PBPP is to ensure efficient investment of federal transportation funds by increasing accountability and transparency to the public, and provide for better investment decisions that focus on advancing the key outcomes related to established national goals.

## **National Goal Areas and Federal Requirements Highway Performance**

Through the federal rule-making process, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is requiring state DOTs and MPOs to monitor the transportation system using specific performance measures. These measures are associated with the national goal areas prescribed in MAP-21 and the FAST Act, and maintained under the I/JA/BIL. The following table describes these national goal areas, performance areas, and prescribed performance measures. It should be noted that CHATS can choose to adopt additional measures beyond what is described in the following, however, what is outlined must be addressed at a minimum.

**Table 6-9: National Goal Areas and Performance Measures**

National Goal Area	Performance Area	Performance Measure
<p><b>Safety:</b> To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.</p>	Injuries and Fatalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Number of Fatalities</li> <li>■ Fatality rate (per 100 million VMT)</li> <li>■ Number of serious injuries</li> <li>■ Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries</li> </ul>
<p><b>Infrastructure Condition:</b> To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of goods repair.</p>	Pavement Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Percent of pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition</li> <li>■ Percent of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition</li> <li>■ Percent of pavements on the non-Interstate System in Good Condition</li> <li>■ Percent of pavements on the non-Interstate System in Poor Condition</li> </ul>
	Bridge Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Percent of NHS bridges classified as in Good Condition</li> <li>■ Percent of NHS bridges classified as in Poor Condition</li> </ul>
<p><b>System Reliability:</b> To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.</p>	Performance of the National Highway System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Percent of person miles traveled on the Interstate System that are reliable</li> <li>■ Percent of person miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable</li> </ul>
<p><b>Freight Movement and Economic Vitality:</b> To improve the National Highway Freight Network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.</p>	Freight Movement on the Interstate System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Truck Travel Time Reliability</li> </ul>
<p><b>Congestion Reduction:</b> To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the Nation Highway System.</p>	Traffic Congestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay per capita</li> <li>■ Percent of non-single-occupant vehicle traffic</li> </ul>
<p><b>Environmental Sustainability:</b> To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.</p>	On-Road Mobile Source Emissions*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Total emissions reduction*</li> </ul>
<p><i>*Note: This measure only applies to non-attainment or maintenance areas over a prescribed population threshold. This measure does not apply to the CHATS planning area since the area is an attainment area.</i></p>		

## Transit Performance Measures

Recipients of public transit funds—which can include states, local authorities, and public transportation operators—are required to establish performance targets for safety and state of good repair; to develop transit asset management and transit safety plans; and to report on their progress toward achieving targets. Public transportation operators are directed to share information with MPOs and states so that all plans and performance reports are coordinated. Table 6-10 identifies performance measures outlined in the National Public Safety Transportation Plan, released by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and in the final rule for transit asset management. The CHATS MPO will coordinate with public transit providers to set targets for these measures.

**Table 6-10: National Goal Areas and Performance Measures for Transit**

National Goal Area	Transit Performance Area or Asset Category	Performance Measure
Safety	Fatalities	■ Total number of reportable fatalities and rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode
	Injuries	■ Total number of reportable injuries and rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode
	Safety Events	■ Total number of reportable events and rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode
	System Reliability	■ Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode
Infrastructure Condition (State of Good Repair: Transit Asset Management)	Equipment	■ Percent of vehicles that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)
	Rolling Stock	■ Percent of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their ULB
	Facilities	■ Percent of facilities within an asset class rated below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirement Model scale

## Additional Federal PBPP Requirements

Additional federal requirements as it pertain to target setting, reporting and performance assessments are as follows:

### Targets -

- The MPO is required to establish performance targets no later than 180 days after SCDOT or a public transportation operator sets performance targets.
- For each performance measure, the Policy Committee will decide whether to support a statewide target, or to establish a quantifiable target specific to the CHATS area.
- SCDOT, MPOs and public transit operators must coordinate targets for performance measures to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable.

### Reporting -

- The LRTP must describe the performance measures and targets, evaluate the performance of the transportation system, and report on progress made.
- The TIP must link investment priorities to the targets in the LRTPs and describe, to the maximum extent practicable, the anticipated effect of the program toward achieving established targets.
- The MPO must also report baseline roadway transportation system condition and performance data and progress toward the achievement of targets to SCDOT.

Assessments -

- FHWA and FTA will not directly evaluate CHATS progress toward meeting targets for required performance measures.
- FHWA will determine if SCDOT has met or made significant progress towards attaining the selected targets for the highway system.

The CHATS MPO has elected to accept and support the targets set by the State for the safety, infrastructure condition and system reliability performance measures. Performance reports will be added to the LRTP as data becomes available.

**Highway Performance Measures and Targets**

The following summarizes Highway performance measures and targets set by SCDOT.

**PM-1: SAFETY**

The State of South Carolina has the highest fatality rate in the nation; it is 67% higher than the national rate and 40% higher than the states in the southeast. Reducing the number of transportation-related collisions, injuries, and fatalities is the SCDOT’s highest priority and makes safety everyone’s business. In 2011, the Director of the SC Department of Public Safety (SCDPS), who also serves as the Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety in South Carolina, announced the Agency’s goal of zero traffic related deaths for the State. This goal, also strongly supported by the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) and the South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles,

became the starting point for the State’s update of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), entitled Target Zero. Target zero is an aspirational target for South Carolina based on the philosophy that no fatalities are acceptable for any household. The state will set targets advancing towards this goal over the next 20-years.

The following table shows the baseline information for the CHATS area, and the State of South Carolina, as well as the targets set for the State that are accepted by the CHATS Policy Committee.

For the 2022 performance period, the CHATS MPO has elected to accept and support the State of South Carolina’s safety targets for all five safety performance measures. This means CHATS will:

- Address areas of concern for fatalities or serious injuries within the metropolitan planning area through coordination with SCDOT and incorporation of safety considerations on all projects;
- Integrate safety goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets into the planning process;
- Integrate Complete Streets concepts into the development and implementation of projects; and
- Include the anticipated effect toward achieving the targets noted above within the TIP, effectively linking investment priorities to safety target achievement.

**Table 6-11: Safety Measures Baseline and Target**

Measure	Traffic Fatalities	Fatality Rate*	Severe Injuries	Severe Injuries Rate*	NMU Fatalities & Severe Injuries
State Baseline (2018-2022 Average)	1,079.6	1.9	2,802	4.93	457
State Targets (2020-2024 Approved)	1,079	1.87	2,549	4.41	454.8
<b>CHATS Baseline (2018-2022 Average)</b>	<b>93.6</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>353.4</b>	<b>5.99</b>	<b>81.2</b>

*Note: \*Rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled*

## Safety Strategies

The CHATS MPO has identified that improving the safety of the area's transportation system across all modes is of great importance. The 2045 LRTP has identified and allocated RMP funds to intersection and corridor study projects which were identified and ranked based, in part, by the safety benefits that can be gained by implementing these projects, and if they are identified as a state priority in the Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Action Plan (2022) to address a high crash location. The proportion of RMP funds allocated to intersection and safety related projects is increased over LRTP 2040 levels.

The 2045 LRTP continues to support the Complete Streets strategy by setting aside \$1 million in RMP funds annually to implement multi-modal projects. Complete Street funds could be employed for intersection improvements, access management improvements, as well as additional pedestrian and bicycle improvements and transit projects that contribute to creation of a complete street.

The MPO has also established a Safety Improvements Committee, comprised of county and municipal government staff, public safety personnel, public transportation service representatives, school district staff, active transportation advocacy group representatives, and SCDOT staff, in an effort to collectively identify locations with high safety concerns for both motorized and non-motorized users, and propose appropriate safety countermeasures to mitigate them. The CHATS MPO, through the Safety Improvements Committee, will also actively seek out opportunities to work with regional partners to improve safety through education, enforcement and encouragement programs.

The BCDCOG was also awarded a Safe Streets & Roads For All (SS4A) planning grant to develop a comprehensive regional safety action plan which will serve help set direction to region's approach to achieve Target Zero.

These projects and programs should help support or advance the safety targets set by the State.

## PM-2: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION

### Existing System and Baseline Conditions

SCDOT owns and maintains over 41,000 centerline miles, encompassing over 90,000 lane-miles, of roadway and approximately 8,400 bridges on its network.

For federal purposes, FHWA only requires targets for the interstate and non-interstate NHS pavement systems and the NHS bridge system.

### Pavements

SCDOT implements a combination of pavement investment strategies based on system conditions, funding, and risk. The current policy of SCDOT is to allocate funding to the different pavement strategies based on the ratio of pavements eligible for that type of strategy. The three strategies SCDOT follows include pavement preservation, pavement rehabilitation, and pavement reconstruction/replacement.

Due to SCDOT owning and maintaining all but 4.2 centerline miles of the NHS in South Carolina, and collecting condition data for the entire NHS, almost all infrastructure improvement projects are developed and managed by SCDOT. However, because SCDOT does not currently have an off-interstate NHS widening program, it depends on coordination and efficient collaboration with CHATS and other MPOs and COGs within the State of South Carolina.

### Bridges

Similar to pavements, SCDOT owns and maintains most of the federal-aid eligible bridges on the South Carolina Highway System. SCDOT adopts cost-effective bridge investment strategies, such as bridge preservation, which includes preventative condition-driven maintenance and bridge replacement as integral components of its bridge asset management program.

Table 6-12 outlines both the State and CHATS pavement and bridge baselines as well as the 2- and 4-year statewide targets SCDOT established for its interstate and non-interstate NHS pavement, and NHS bridge systems. These targets are projected conditions of the respective systems during 2023 and 2025.

**Table 6-12: Pavement & Bridge Condition Statewide and CHATS Baselines, and State 2-Yr and 4-Yr Targets**

Measure	State Baseline	2-Yr Target	4-Yr Target	CHATS Baseline
% of Pavements on Interstate System in Good Condition	75.8%	77.0%	78%	60.0%
% of Pavements on Interstate System in Poor Condition	0.2%	2.5%	2.5%	1.2%
% of Pavements on Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition	38.8%	36.0%	38.0%	31.43%
% of Pavements on Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition	1.6%	10.0%	10.0%	1.78%
% of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition	38.5%	35.0%	34.0%	22.61%
% of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition	4.3%	6.0%	6.0%	0.86%

CHATS has agreed to adopt SCDOT’s statewide targets by supporting planned and programmed projects that SCDOT has identified for inclusion in the CHATS LRTP and Transportation Improvement Plan.

**PM-3: SYSTEM RELIABILITY**

The Federal Highway Administration developed three measures to track travel reliability on the road networks: percent of reliable person-miles traveled on the interstate; percent of reliable person-miles traveled on the non-interstate NHS; and an index of truck travel time reliability. These measures collectively report reliability of the NHS network as required by MAP-21.

SCDOT staff explored the relationship between reliability and other data measures such as vehicle miles traveled to develop a model that predicts system reliability in 2- and 4-year periods. The methodology also examined the effect of construction projects on the NHS and completion of any widening projects within the timeframe.

Table 6-13 on the following page outlines statewide and CHATS system reliability baselines, as well as the State’s 2-Yr and 4-Yr targets for the 2022 performance period.

CHATS has agreed to adopt and support SCDOT’s statewide targets by supporting planned and programmed projects that SCDOT has identified for inclusion in the CHATS LRTP and Transportation Improvement Plan.

**System Reliability Strategies**

The CHATS 2045 LRTP allocates RMP funding to access management projects which are identified for corridors that may benefit from applied access management strategies to improve safety, and increase capacity and reliability.

The CHATS MPO, Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Council of Governments, in partnership with the SCDOT and FHWA, and major employers and stakeholders in the region is currently facilitating the “Lowcountry Go” Vanpool program.

Working together, the program focuses on reducing traffic congestion and improving quality of life for our region. Lowcountry Go connects real people with real solutions and supports carpools, vanpools, public transit, walking, biking, emergency ride home, and many other programs that encourage behavior changes among commuters. In addition, Lowcountry Go works with regional employers to promote sustainable commute options in the workplace, such as work flextime, staggered shifts, and incentives.

CHATS has also committed a portion of RMP funding that will be used for transit related projects to enhance the current system, including park-and-ride facilities, to promote greater use of alternative transportation modes, as well implement ITS solutions on poorly performing corridors where appropriate.

These projects and programs should help support or advance the system reliability targets set.

**Table 6-13: System Performance & Freight Movement Statewide and CHATS Baselines, and State 2-Yr and 4-Yr Targets**

Measure	State Baseline	2-Yr Targete	4-Yr Target	CHATS Baseline
% of Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable	95.9%	89.1%	89.1%	71.0%
% of Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable	95.0%	85.0%	85.0%	78.8%
Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (TTRI)	1.31	1.45	1.45	2.07

**PM-5: TRANSIT SAFETY PERFORMANCE**

The Charleston Area Regional Transportation Authority (CARTA) and TriCounty Link (TCL), as required by the federal Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) final rule issued on June 19, 2019, has each developed a PTASP including processes and procedures implementing a Safety Management Systems (SMS) for the respective local transit agencies. The CARTA Board of Directors certified the agency's Safety Plan on June 17, 2020, and adopted its annual Plan update on August 19, 2022. The BCDCOG Board of Directors certified TriCounty Link's Safety Plan, and adopted its annual Plan update on September 30, 2023. Included in Tables 6-14 & 6-15 below, are summaries of safety performance for each transit agency for the 2023 period, and the updated targets set for the performance period 2024. Each agency will continue to report on progress and update targets on an annual basis, and coordinate with the CHATS MPO to ensure that the goals, objectives, measures and targets set in the PTASP are integrated into the MPO's planning processes.

**Table 6-14: CARTA Transit Safety Performance & Safety Targets**

Mode of Transit Service	Fatalities (Total)	Fatality Rate*	Injuries (Total)	Injury Rate*	Serious Events (Total)	Safety Events Rate*	System Reliability**
All Bus Service (2019 Baseline)	0	0	6	2.02	50	16.72	18,000
All Bus Service (2023 Actual Performance)	0	0	6	1.77	12	3.54	25,823
All Bus Service (2024 Target)	0	0	5	1.47	10	2.95	30,000

Note - \*Rate per 1,000,000 vehicle revenue miles (VRM); \*\*Average distance (VRM) between major mechanical failures

**Table 6-15: TCL Transit Safety Performance & Safety Targets**

Mode of Transit Service	Fatalities (Total)	Fatality Rate*	Injuries (Total)	Injury Rate*	Serious Events (Total)	Safety Events Rate*	System Reliability**
All Bus Service (2019 Baseline)	0	0	5	5.35	10	10.7	25,000
All Bus Service (2023 Actual Performance)	0	0	1	0.15	5	0.75	71,321
All Bus Service (2024 Target)	0	0	2	0.42	5	0.75	65,000

Note - \*Rate per 1,00,000 vehicle revenue miles (VRM); \*\*Average distance (VRM) between major mechanical failures



