

***SOUTH CAROLINA STATEWIDE
COMPREHENSIVE MULTIMODAL
TRANSPORTATION PLAN***



South Carolina Department of Transportation

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

May 2008

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

Public involvement is a key component of the state's transportation planning process. The proactive public involvement process is one that provides complete information, timely public notice, full public access to major transportation decisions, and supports early and continuing involvement of the public in developing transportation plans.

Every citizen must have the opportunity to take part, feel entitled to participate, welcome to join in, and able to influence the transportation decisions made by SCDOT. The Public Involvement Process therefore adheres to SCDOT's Public Participation Plan to provide the necessary framework in accomplishing identified goals. Included in the Multimodal Plan's Public Involvement Process for both the rural and urban areas of the state were:

- Stakeholder Meetings
- Surveys
- Interviews
- Focus Groups
- Presentations
- Website
- Media
- Public Meetings

Each component is summarized below, and detailed in the full Plan.

Stakeholder Meetings

A kick-off meeting was held for on July 6, 2006 at SCDOT to discuss the process and elements of the Plan. This meeting was attended by members of the Multimodal Plan Resource Committee, as well as other stakeholders. Specifically for development of the Regional Human Services Transportation Coordination Plans, at least three stakeholder meetings were held in each region. These meetings were attended by transit providers, MPOs, COGs, human service agencies, private entities, and public interest groups.

Additional stakeholder meetings and conference calls were held for multiple elements of the Plan at various times throughout the Plan's development, and attended by Resource Committee and Sub-Committee members, as well as other public and private stakeholders. Other stakeholders included local officials, MPOs and COGs, and state agencies, among others. Feedback on the Plan's development was solicited at each of these meetings.

Surveys

Two separate surveys were conducted during the Plan's development. The first was a mail-out survey randomly distributed to all regions of the state. The purpose of this survey was to gather input from the state's residents to help improve public transportation in South Carolina. 2074 completed surveys were returned, at least 200 from each region, which provided an appropriate level of statistical confidence in the results. These findings are detailed in the full Plan. The second survey was distributed at the Public Meetings held in March 2008, soliciting input on the overall Plan from the general public. These survey results are detailed further in this section and also in the full Plan.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted of rural and urban local stakeholders at various stages for specific components of the Plan, with comments and concerns incorporated as appropriate.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

Focus Groups

During September 2006, a total of 20 focus groups were held across the state for the Statewide Transit Plan. The purpose of the focus groups was to gather input from residents and community leaders about public transportation issues.

Two focus groups (one with residents and one with community leaders) were conducted in each of the state's 10 regions. The cities where the focus groups were conducted included: Greenville, Columbia, Aiken, Greenwood, Rock Hill, Walterboro, Georgetown, North Charleston, Sumter, and Florence. Residents were recruited at random from the communities where the focus groups were conducted. Community leaders were recruited at random from a list of people serving in the following positions in each region where the meetings were held:

- Senior city and county staff
- City and county elected officials
- Chamber Officials
- Officials from transit agencies, COG's, and MPO's

A total of 207 people attended the 20 focus groups. There were 101 community leaders, including 22 city staff, 21 city elected officials, 18 county staff, 18 county elected officials, 12 chamber officials, and 10 COG/MPO/RPO representatives. There were 106 residents, including 52 females and 54 males. All age and racial/ethnic groups were well represented in the focus groups.

Presentations

Numerous presentations were made in various settings across the state on the Plan's development, status and interim findings, with opportunities at each of the settings for question and answer sessions and solicitation of feedback. Examples of groups to whom presentations were made (not all-inclusive but representative of the cross-section) are:

- COGs/MPOs
- Transit Agencies
- Chesterfield County Coordinating Council
- Spartanburg Transit Initiative
- League of Women Voters
- South Carolina Transportation Partnering Conference
- Transportation Association of South Carolina

And nationally,

- National Conference on Rural Public and Intercity Bus Transportation
- Federal Transit Administration State Programs Meeting

Comments and concerns from each of the settings were incorporated as appropriate.

Website

A South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan website was established at the outset, and was continually uploaded throughout the Plan's development with status reports, interim documentation and technical memorandums for

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

review. During the formal Public Comment period, the website was uploaded with all elements of the Plan in downloadable format, and a mechanism by which to submit comments electronically was included. During the Public Comment period the Plan website received over 1,700 page views from over 1,150 unique visitors.

Media

During the Plan's development, status updates and interim findings to-date were provided to various news media outlets across the state through interviews. To raise awareness of the Public Meetings and availability of Plan documents for review and comment, news releases were distributed across the state to newspapers and television and radio stations.

Public Meetings

In March 2008, SCDOT hosted a series of public involvement meetings to inform the public of the details of a statewide multimodal transportation plan. These meetings were held in the seven transportation districts across the state, each of which was comprised of several counties.

Public Meetings by Date				
District	Date	Time	Venue Name	City
7	March 24	4-7p.m.	Stevenson Auditorium	Orangeburg, SC
1	March 25	4-7p.m.	Richland County Public Library (Northeast)	Columbia, SC
6	March 25	4-7p.m.	Edmund Burns Elementary School	Charleston, SC
5	March 26	4-7p.m.	Florence County Public Library	Florence, SC
3	March 27	4-7p.m.	Phillis Wheatley Community Center	Greenville, SC
2	March 31	4-7p.m.	Nisbet Auditorium	Greenwood, SC
4	March 31	4-7p.m.	Manchester Meadows	Rock Hill, SC

To reach out to ethnic, minority, and low income groups, non-English speaking populations, and people with disabilities, a 5-step strategy for community mobilization and public involvement was employed:

- o Strategy #1: Stakeholder Database Development
- o Strategy #2: Mail-out/Email
- o Strategy #3: Site Location Visits
- o Strategy #4: Telephone Bank
- o Strategy #5: Grassroots Mobilization

There were a total of 251 community stakeholders and members of the public present at the Public Meetings. 142 surveys relating to the plan were completed along with 119 comment cards. All survey and comment card information has been tabulated, analyzed, charted and responded to as appropriate, with details available in the full Plan.

All written comments that were submitted as part of the formal Public Comment period are detailed, with responses and appropriate Plan revisions noted.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/10/08	Email - Citizen	South Carolina should develop a rail system that connects all major cities and eventually smaller cities, with each city contributing a portion of funding for construction. Environmental benefits would be realized.	Because of the complexities involved, one of the recommendations of the Statewide Transportation Plan is the conduct of a comprehensive statewide freight and passenger rail plan that will look to address, among others, the various concerns identified.	3/17/08	None required
3/11/08	Email - SLCOG	Relating to Santee-Wateree Regional Transit Plan		3/14/08	
		List counties in the region alphabetically.	This is a valid suggestion.		Editorial changes made as suggested.
		Page 9, delete "When measured in terms of operating ... "it is stated twice.	This is a valid suggestion.		Editorial changes made as suggested.
		Page 31, paragraph 5.4.2 Transit Net Operating Costs: Recommend linkage to Statewide Vision on page 19. Should spend time linking the statewide vision with the region or vise versa.	The linkage to the Statewide Public Transit Vision is a valid suggestion. Two things regarding funding allocations/ cost sharing: The Plan isn't prescribing specific funding allocations, and cannot dictate regional goals/visions of this type through this effort.		Linkages to the Statewide Public Transit Vision made as appropriate.
		Page 35, Table 20: Vehicle Needs & Cost over 25 years ... Recommend the chart mention as a footnote or however is appropriate that there is approximately \$2 million (+ / -) received in possible resale of assets over this	No, because surplus assets may be transferred rather than sold.		None
		Page 35, paragraph 5.4.3.2 Facility Needs. This section should be specific to SWRTA and the region. Currently, this section is too general. For example, if at any way possible, recommend the section outline the costs needed to maintain the new SWRTA facility. This effort by SWRTA could be a benchmark for the state on how intermodal facilities should and could be used and maintained.	This would require much more localized, detailed analysis than this overall planning scope allows for. Analysis should be addressed separately.		None
		Page 36, paragraph 5.4.4 Total Capital and Operating Costs: Recommend the sentence "Santee-Lynches Council of Governments is projected to have costs of up to 318.7 million dollars over the next 25 years." be rewritten. The reason -- it is not a Santee-Lynches COG cost to cover, it is a regional cost that must be evaluated by local and county municipalities with the COG as the facilitator of the process between local governments and SWRTA.	This is a valid suggestion.		Reference revised to Santee-Lynches region.
		Page 37, paragraph 5.5 Intercity / Interregional Transit Needs, page 38: "The State of South Carolina currently provides no subsidies for intercity bus service, but these needs should be considered in the future, especially if additional service cuts are made to current operations." First question that comes to mind is why isn't the state providing subsidy ... and at what level will the state consider subsidy ... could that question be addressed versus saying they should consider.	That question is proposed to be addressed separately and in more detail as a result of this plan.		None
		Page 42, paragraph 5.6.4 Other Potential Transit Corridors: Two are listed ... Sumter – Columbia and Manning – Sumter. Question -- what about the following potential transit corridors that are in operation now and could impact the economic development of our region? (Identified below)	This discussion is specifically tied to the Strategic Corridor element and stated as such. Inter-regional issues of this type are also addressed separately in the Plan when discussing inter-regional transit needs.		None
		Myrtle Beach corridor – (used by SWRTA – PDRTA – Williamsburg County Transit) (Hwy 378)			
		Camden – Columbia (SMARTRIDE) (Hwy 1)			
		Sumter – Camden (Hwy 527)			
		Bishopville – Sumter (Hwy 15)			
		Bishopville – Camden (Hwy 34 / Interstate 20)			

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/11/08	Email - SLCOG	<p>Page 49, paragraph 7.1: The last sentence in this section states "The pressure on closing the gap between available services and potential demand will fall squarely on the ability of agencies like SWRTA to obtain a sustainable funding stream whether through a tax or just more support from local governments." The pressure on closing the gap between available services and potential demand that are projected to increase due to our aging population, higher gas costs, congestion etc does not fall squarely on the ability of agencies like SWRTA but on the citizens of the region. The demand for services must be determined by the public in the region – this goes right back to the focus group priority of needs. The methods to cover those are thereby elaborated in the plan.</p>	<p>The point is valid, but the statement and corresponding discussion already say something similar in a different but perhaps more controlled way.</p>	3/14/08	None
		<p>Page 51, top of page: The sentence that reads "Each of the four counties in the Santee-Lynches Region and the central City of Sumter seem to be many years away from considering a local funding mechanism dedicated to transit." I recommend it be reworded. For example: Regionally, with the economic challenges being faced within the four counties in the Santee-Lynches Region and the central City of Sumter, transportation will remain a prime catalyst for economic development, and over time, both the general public and elected officials will <i>deem it essential</i> to dedicate a set funding stream for transit.</p>	<p>This is a valid suggestion, but with change noted (change highlight to "need").</p>		Editorial change made, with minor revision.
		<p>Page 51, paragraph 7.2 Increase Coordination among Providers: In this area, and else where in the report, I have not noticed what the impact of brokerage of transportation services have or could detract from public transit revenue... and under this heading it seems it should be discussed. For example, Medicaid Non-Emergency Transportation is brokered by DHHS and now TANF is brokered by DSS. If each of our state agencies start brokering their share of transportation services without looking at the public transit piece -- how will this impact public transportation?</p>	<p>This is a valid point and suggestion.</p>		Added in the Statewide Transit Plan a need for the various state agencies that are engaged in intra-agency coordination /brokerage initiatives to better integrate their efforts to draw in all reasonable partners, including public providers.
		<p>Paragraph 7.3.3 Increase in Commuter Based Services: A very positive, persuasive discussion on the benefits of employers taking part in the Federal authorized tax deduction – currently at \$115 a month for employees who use public transit or vanpools to commute (vanpooling could be sponsored or done by transit agencies). We are missing a funding stream by not putting something like this in the plan for others to see or consider.</p>	<p>This is a valid point and suggestion.</p>		Federal transit-related tax benefits included in Statewide Transit Plan.
		<p>A final comment – Recommend a Conclusion paragraph(s) / section: Section should summarize findings and tie the entire report together: \$16 million annual SWRTA operating costs with a \$318.7 million deficit over 25 years ... If the status quo is maintained, this gap will not disappear; the report provides the best analysis of what the future holds for regional public transportation. The challenges will seem insurmountable; however, the plan lays out actions items that could be tailored to meet some of the demands that will be placed on SWRTA. These demands must be mutually weighed with the acceptable level(s) of service needed to maintain the quality of life that is mandated by the region. Share the focus group needs and funding mechanisms and how it relates to offsetting financial shortfalls and if the shortfalls are allowed to continue unabated, the region will have to come to terms with accepting a substandard level of public transportation that meets only limited demand.</p>	<p>This is a valid suggestion, but after all comments received in case something materially changes.</p>		Concluding summary paragraph(s) included in Regional Transit Plans, after all comments received.
3/12/08	Email - LSCOG	<p>Given the fact that the mobility center should have a great impact on regional issues, should be more integrated into this region's plan.</p>	<p>This is a valid suggestion.</p>	3/13/08	Mobility Management activities for the region properly recognized and included in the Regional Transit Plan.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/18/08	Email - Citizen	<p>BRT is often used in case where the only competing option is LRT. If BRT is the selected one should implement it in a manner that most duplicates LRT. Exclusive busways are a must. Any mixed traffic use simply makes BRT glorified bus service, not a unique form of public transit. One should have the specialized stations that allow for minimal docking times and pre-purchase of tickets. When the busway does cross any other highways then a transit signal priority system should be utilized. The bus has a transponder that communicates with the appropriate signals and turns them green, for the bus, prior to its arrival. That maintains the Rapid part of BRT and simulates the controlled crossing gate system utilized with LRT. The vehicle should announce the stops automatically, like a LRT vehicle. And that should be the highest capacity vehicles possible, articulated to simulate the capacity of an LRT train. When one is planning to institute a BRT service, spend some marketing dollars demonstrating to the target audience how BRT is more like LRT and not bus service.</p> <p>Out of curiosity when you use the term Commuter Rail on this webpage I am unsure of what you mean. On the CATS webpage Commuter Rail is a train that is Diesel powered. They distinguish that from the LYNX, which is LRT, and electrically powered by an overhead wire.</p>	<p>Regarding ideas on BRT, they are certainly valid and appropriate depending upon both the nature of an affected corridor and capital resources. The intent of BRT is to simulate LRT-like transit service on a dedicated guideway, but at a combination of less cost and ridership. Should actual passenger ridership dictate and resources be made available, then the dedicated BRT guideway could easily be transformed into LRT. Where BRT is chosen over LRT, and where BRT may operate in mixed-use traffic for specific segments of the corridor, the reasons are typically either cost or engineering or construction related. In some cases modified BRT may be appropriate. TDM strategies mentioned could also be utilized in a defined fixed-route bus corridor, along with queue-jumping for transit vehicles, in congested corridors where a dedicated guideway such as BRT or LRT may not be appropriate. With respect to our Plan, any perceived suggestions of transit mode choice would not be finalized until detailed corridor analyses have been completed. Our Plan speaks more generally.</p> <p>Commuter rail uses vehicles with steel wheels on steel rails using tracks that are part of a general rail network. Service typically operates between a central city terminal and outlying suburbs and trains can be diesel or electric-powered. Commuter rail services may share track with railroad freight trains, or have separate tracks. Many commuter lines are primarily used for peak hour work trips while others have extended off-peak and weekend services. Some systems use locomotives for power and others have self-propelled cars (DMUs or Diesel Multiple Unit). Stations are typically 2-5 miles apart, with service at 20-30 minute frequencies (but varying). Costs are typically in a range of \$3 million to \$25 million per mile. Thus, while CATS may be looking to use DMUs to power commuter rail in their region, diesel</p> <p>By comparison, light rail operates with an overhead power supply and has the flexibility to operate in mixed traffic. Services are urban and/or regional and their alignments are in the center of streets, on the side of streets, or in separate right-of-ways. Stations are spaced approximately one mile apart, and station types vary from simple sidewalk signs to more elaborate station platforms. Light rail alignments typically range from 5-15 miles (CATS Lynx Blue Line is currently 9.6 miles), and service frequencies range from 5-30 minutes with speeds of between 20-60 mph. Cities with light rail are mainly large metropolitan areas with continued population and employment growth in defined corridors.</p>	3/25/08	None required.
3/19/08	Email - Upstate Forever	Not seeing the appendix that lists the stakeholders or committee members.	Attached the Multimodal Transportation Plan Resource Committee member listing with subcommittee assignments. Noted that while the attached listing represents the core committee members, depending upon the Plan element and appropriate input desired the stakeholder list was expanded to other organizations and individuals to insure a good cross-representation of feedback and ideas.	3/21/08	None required.
3/20/08	Email - Citizen	Starting a Container-on barge intermodal service on The Savannah River from Charleston and Savannah to Augusta. Sent hard copies of plans.	SCDOT appreciates the interest in the Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan, and the specific interest in opening and maintaining the Savannah River for container-on-barge freight traffic. SCDOT is aware of inland-waterborne freight operations in neighboring states and elsewhere, and while the Plan does not address waterborne freight traffic in South Carolina, the issues outlined are noted.	4/18/08	None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/24/08	Email - Citizen	The 2 rail lines I see most prominently mentioned (Columbia-Newberry & Summerville-Charleston): are those going to be diesel trains or electric trains, like the Charlotte LYNX, with an overhead wire?	Regarding the mentioned Columbia area and Summerville-Charleston rail studies, these are proposed commuter rail corridors, which are entirely different than Charlotte's Lynx system which is light rail. Thus, the power source would be entirely different, as detailed above, and if actually developed would share existing trackage with freight rail service. Again, though, any decisions on the extent to which these corridors move forward would require much greater and more detailed analyses.	3/25/08	None required.
3/24/08	Email - Environmentalists, Inc.	What is the purpose of the meetings?	Seven public information meetings have been scheduled throughout the state to provided additional opportunities for the public to review and comment on the draft plan. Although the draft plan is available on the SCDOT webpage, not everyone has access to the internet and the meetings provide additional outreach.	3/26/08	None required.
		What process of public notices was carried out?	The draft plan was advertised through news releases provided to TV and print media throughout the state. To reach traditionally underserved populations, releases were sent to minority media, including a Spanish version of the release to Hispanic media outlets.		None required.
		In what ways was the general public involved in developing the materials to be presented in these meetings?	The process, estimated timeline, and overview of the scope of work for updating the plan has been posted on the SCDOT website shortly after the inception of the project, which to date would be over 18 months.		None required.
		What groups, organizations and individuals were involved in developing the materials to be presented in these meetings?	A Resource Committee has been involved with the update since the project started. Attachment provided.		None required.
		Are printed copies available, and if so, in what ways, of the materials developed to date?	To date, summary documents of the plan are available to down load from the SCDOT website. All printed copies of the draft plan have been produced in-house. Once the plan is adopted, an executive summary and brochure will be available for public distribution.		None required.
		What will be the process by which public response at the meetings is processed and provided to the participants?	The general public can provide comments on the draft Plan through the SCDOT webpage. In addition, the public has the opportunity to provide written comments at each of the seven public information meetings. All substantive comments will be reviewed and considered in relation to goals, recommendations and overall content of the Plan. A summary of those comments will be made available to our Commission before the plan is adopted. If requested, the actual comment letters will be made available for each Commissioner to review.		None required.
		Will there be a written-comments process and, if so, what is the time-frame for that?	As appropriate, SCDOT will provide written responses to comments received during the 30-day public involvement that ends April 11th.		None required.
		If written-comments are accepted, relative to question # 6, how will those be provided to participants?	A cumulative summary of all written comments and SCDOT responses will be included as an addendum to the Plan.		A cumulative summary of all written comments and SCDOT responses was included as an addendum to the Plan.
		What will be the review process, in time, actions and participants, for comments at these meetings and in written-comments?	SCDOT will consider all substantive comments relating to the Plan.		None required.
		Will such review, relative to question # 9, be open to public involvement?	A cumulative summary of all written comments and SCDOT responses will be included as an addendum to the Plan.		A cumulative summary of all written comments and SCDOT responses was included as an addendum to the Plan.
What is the intended conclusion date for the SC-DOT Multimodal Transportation Plan?	Following the public period, the draft plan will be finalized and we anticipate adoption of the Plan in May.		None required.		
In what ways will the finalized materials of the SC-DOT Multimodal Transportation Plan be presented?	Summaries of the final Plan will available on the SCDOT webpage.		None required.		

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan					
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate					
Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/24/08	Email - Environmentalists, Inc.	Request both the current and previous budgets for SC-DOT, overall and for this specific project, in printed forms.	The federal program administered by SCDOT is currently \$632 million dollars including the required state match. Current state funding is approximately \$440 million annually. As stated in the Plan's Executive Summary, \$48 billion dollars in transportation needs have been identified for the next 20 years. Based on current revenues, this translates to a projected \$30 billion dollar shortfall. Based on available funding and priority, projects are included in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction. The 2007 and 2008 federal STIP budgets are located on our website. Click on the header "Inside SCDOT", then under publications click STIP report. Please note that the federal apportionment to SC changes each year based on the yearly federal Appropriations Bill signed by the President. This usually happens in November/December, and if necessary, our budget is adjusted up or down based on our percentage of that years USDOT appropriation.	3/26/08	None required.
3/26/08	Email - Environmentalists, Inc.	Suggest having all the materials loaded onto a CD or DVD. Make that available to organizations with permission for them to duplicate without modification. That will solve several concerns. Specifically requested such a copy for Environmentalists, Inc.	CD with all requested materials provided as requested. Capabilities to satisfy similar requests from others already established.	3/27/08	None required.
3/31/08	Letter - Citizens	Letter with attached petition requesting paving of Dairy Street in Ware Shoals.	The request has been forwarded to the appropriate person(s); the request is not related to this Plan.	4/18/08	None required.
4/2/08	Email - Citizen	Map 2 of the proposed SCDOT Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan shows the significant corridors. This plan is very similar to the original SHIMS plan except that it shows no North/South Corridor from the Upstate to the Aiken/ North Augusta area. Some of the counties along the Savannah River are among the poorest in the state. Would it not be wise to reconsider the importance of a North/South Corridor from the Upstate to the Aiken/North Augusta area?	Based on data, US 178 emerged as a corridor, not just in the Upper Savannah region, but also in the Appalachian, Lower Savannah, and Berkely-Charleston-Dorchester regions. Every county, including those along the Savannah River, are traversed by at least one of the corridors. As the Plan is updated and travel conditions change, additional corridors such as US 25 will be considered for the statewide network.	4/14/08	None required.
4/2/08	Email - Sierra Club	When (Mo/Yr) did the process officially begin?	The formal kick-off meeting for the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan was held on July 6, 2006.	4/3/08	None required.
		What was the original target date (Mo/Yr) for completion of the plan?	The original target completion date for receipt of final documents prior to initiation of the public involvement process was September 2007.		None required.
		What is the total budget for consultant services?	The total consultant contract budget for this project is \$2,048,690.59.		None required.
		Does SCDOT have a single contract with the consultant team? If so, which firm is the lead contractor? If not, how many separate contracts are here and with which firms?	SCDOT has a single contract with a consultant team led by TranSystems.		None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
4/2/08	Email - RFATS MPO	Asked that the bus rapid transit LPA for US 21 be reflected in the regional transit plan along with the related feeder services from York and Chester counties. Also have the commuter bus service between downtown Rock Hill and uptown Charlotte and the local demand response service for most of York County. The US 21 LPA may need to be reflected in the Rock Hill urban area on the Lowcountry to York strategic corridor action plan also. Cost projections for transit need to reflect the US 21 BRT, which is estimated to cost approximately 515 million dollars over the next 20 years.	The US21 project is reflected in the overall Statewide Transit Plan, with the cost projections you mention already included. In the overall Multimodal Plan Executive Summary (provided in response, provided on our website, available at public meetings and for distribution), note the specific discussion of the As regarding better reflecting the US21 service and associated feeder service in the regional transit plan, as well as other issues noted, those will be more clearly addressed.	4/3/08	Regional and statewide transit plans reviewed and revised (where appropriate) to sufficiently address localized public transportation initiatives in the respective regional transit plans. This includes narrative to address, but not limited to, the following: Appalachian: BRT corridors (N-S, E-W) as identified in unfunded, illustrative portion of GPATS LRTP; Commuter rail feasibility analysis from Anderson-Clemson BCD: Regional commuter rail feasibility analyses Catawba: US21 BRT project Central Midlands: Regional commuter rail feasibility analyses Lowcountry: US278 corridor Lower Savannah: Mobility management / coordination efforts Santee-Lynches: SmartRide / coordination efforts
4/3/08	Email - Citizen	Are any of our local interstates, and higher volume secondary roads, being considered for expansion with an HOV lane? My previous, limited observations in the Charlotte area, DC area and others with HOV lanes is they seem to operate better than just a large number of general travel lanes. It seems that the carpoolers tend to stay in the HOV lane and not weave back and forth through traffic. Thus I tend to believe, and I am curious if research bears this out, that HOV lanes seem to better conduct traffic on busy roads than just adding a standard lanes that traffic just utilizes for additional high speed weaving. I am unsure if I have been clear I am not	There is interest and have been discussions related to introducing managed lane concepts (inclusive of HOV facilities) in the state. However, no corridors have been specifically endorsed for such purposes. Our agency is also a partner in the current Charlotte Region Fast Lanes [managed lanes] Study, which identified a portion of I-77 in South Carolina as a promising corridor requiring detailed analysis in that study's upcoming Phase 2. In short, all viable and reasonable alternatives are being explored	4/3/08	None required.
4/8/08	Email - Citizen	In the Interstate Plan, I-385 widening to 6 lanes in Greenville probably should be described as "north of US 276", it is already 6 lanes north of S-272 to US 276. Three of the "unconstrained" I-385 interchange capacity needs you list were just improved, at SC 291, at Roper Mountain Road, and at Haywood Road (your report misspells it as Heywood). I'm also confused about the reference to substandard conditions on the westbound I-385 mainline overpass at US 276. The only location where "westbound" lanes overpass US 276 is just before the freeway ends at downtown Greenville, this overpass also has just been reconstructed in the last 4 years. It would be worthwhile to note that I-85 through the Greenville area is also being considered as a possible High Speed Rail alignment, in the current study by Volpe Center.	Comment noted. The Interactive Interchange Management System (IIMS) used to rank interchanges considers passenger and truck delay, travel costs, truck detour distance, and accident data. In some cases, recently improved interchanges still rank relatively high because of significant volume. In terms of project selection, those interchanges would not be candidates for reconstruction. It is our understanding that the description for the US 276 crossing is near Simpsonville. The bridge section is in the process of verifying the description and any necessary changes will be made to the Plan. Comment noted.	4/16/08	Revision made as appropriate. Spelling correction made. Revision made as appropriate. None required. The Statewide Transit Plan has a full subsection/discussion focused on Intercity High Speed and Passenger Rail that addresses in detail the upstate portion of the high-speed rail corridor, and the projected costs of the upstate portion are included in the Plan's overall needs figures.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
4/11/08	Email - Upstate Forever	<p>We were first notified of the opportunity to comment on the Plan through an email received from another conservation organization on March 14th. We were never officially notified by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations: Spartanburg Area Transportation Study, Greenville Area Transportation Study, or Anderson Area Transportation Study. Neither did the Appalachian Council of Governments send us notice of the the Plan and opportunity to comment. We did not also see any public notice of the meetings in local upstate newspapers. Had it not been for the email from a colleague in the conservation community we would not have been aware of The Plan, the public meetings, or the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>One of the biggest challenges for a planning process that covers an entire state is public awareness and participation. For the Upstate region, we provided news releases to the following media outlets announcing that the draft was available for public comment through the SCDOT website, as well as the public information meeting in Greenville:</p> <p>Oconee - Journal Tribune, Keowee Courier, The Westminster News, WGOG-AM</p> <p>Pickens - Clemson Messenger, Easley Progress, Liberty Monitor, WCCP-AM, The Sentinel</p> <p>Anderson - The Greenville News, Powdersville Post, The Journal, WAIM-AM, WRIX-AM-FM,</p> <p>WSPA-TV, WYFF-TV</p> <p>Greenville - The Golden Strip Times, Greenville News, Greer Citizens, GSA Business, Herald Journal, Metro Network, Tribune Time, WDAB-AM, WESC-FM/AM, WFIS-AM, WGGG-TV, WHNS-TV, WLFJ-FM, WLOS-TV, WMUU TV, WMYI FM, WROQ-FM, WSAP-TV, WSSL-FM/AM, WFFF-TV</p> <p>Express Lane Traffic</p> <p>Spartanburg - Chesnee Tribune, Cowpens Packet, Greenville News, INMAN Times, Landrum News, Leader, The Spartanburg Herald-Journal, WASA-AM, WORD-AM/WSPA FM, WSPA-TV.</p>	4/16/08	None required.
		<p>Although there is a realization that vehicle miles traveled are outpacing population growth, that substantial time is being lost to traffic congestion, and that many transportation needs cannot be solved by highway expansion, there does not follow specific implementation strategies that align with this reality.</p>	<p>The ongoing trend of VMT growth is consistent throughout the country. The Plan attempts to quantify the overall needs based on this trend. Within the cost constrained elements of the Plan, additional road capacity and improved mass transit services are identified.</p>	4/21/08	None required.
		<p>Typo on page 6: last sentence should say "17,000 lane miles" instead of "lanes" miles. Actually there are many typos throughout the documents.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Correction(s) made as appropriate.
		<p>The Plan lacks clear outlined implementation strategies for any of the challenges stated. Primary and secondary highway needs are addressed, interstate highway needs are addressed, highway maintenance needs are addressed, transit needs are addressed, and on and on but there are no clear strategies defined to address any of the needs listed. Any statements that point out problems should be followed by a strategy to remedy this problem with a definitive time frame for implementation. Otherwise we have another document on a shelf in Columbia that evaluates a broken system in need of repair without any proposal for change. For instance, one of the transit goals is "to increase statewide public transit ridership on average by 5% annually through 2030." How will this be tracked and accomplished?</p>	<p>Statewide transit ridership and statistics have been and continue to be tracked on an annual basis. Thus, we will be able to measure any increases in overall ridership along with other performance characteristics each year. To address the transit challenges facing the state, the Executive Summary presents 15 key action items from the Statewide Transit Plan, and as stated in the Executive Summary, specific implementation details are identified in the Statewide Transit Plan as an element of the full Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan. The ten separate Regional Transit Plans go into more localized detail as well.</p>		None required.
		<p>States that "where requested by local governments and where feasible, 4-ft wide paved shoulders have been included in highway improvement projects (which it notes can be used for bike lanes). Why should this request fall onto the local government? The state has a "Complete Streets" resolution that should be initiated from the top down.</p>	<p>The provision of bike and pedestrian accommodations is a consideration in the preliminary development of a project, but in some cases, the impacts or cost associated with the improvement may require that projects design or scope be modified.</p>		None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
4/11/08	Email - Upstate Forever	This section mentions the SC Transportation Infrastructure Bank (SCTIB), but does not explain what it is and how it plays into the Plan. How is this Bank funded and administered? Should a goal of The Plan include getting the Bank more funding?	The SCTIB is funded through truck registration fees, a portion of vehicle license fees, a portion of the state gas tax, a portion of the federal-aid allocation from SCDOT, and external sources, such as local hospitality and sales taxes. Any significant increase in dedicated funding for the SCTIB would likely come through the South Carolina General Assembly. The SCTIB is a separate entity from SCDOT.	4/21/08	None required.
		States that "Expanded mass transit services and improved facilities for pedestrians and bicycles offer alternatives to expanded highway construction, and should play an important role in SCDOT's long-range strategy to maintain mobility and accessibility." Since this Plan is from SCDOT, such statements should say "shall" and thus show the true commitment of the Department to making transit and bike/ped access a priority.	The commitment of the Department to addressing alternative transportation needs should not be in question. However, when addressing these needs the Department must take into consideration not only source funding programmatic limitations, but certainly funding availability limitations for the state's transportation infrastructure in its entirety.		None required.
		A very positive statement discusses System Management and states that SCDOT will "work with local governments to manage driveway access to principal arterial routes and develop collector street plans to help keep local trips off of regional principal arterial routes." However, how will this be done, especially when SCDOT doesn't have authority over local land use decisions? How aggressively will SCDOT initiate collector street plans with local governments? Some strategies that would be helpful for SCDOT to use for implementation include:	SCDOT recently updated the access management standards and coordinates with local governments during the encroachment permit process. Local governments also have the ability to adopt more restrictive access standards. Your reference to "collector streets" or what would generally be considered local access roads can be incorporated into the MPO and COG long-range planning process; however, to be eligible for federal funds a road must be "functionally" classified as a collector in urban areas and a major collector in rural areas. A typical access road may not meet the federal functional classification of a collector. At present, there are no state funds available to construct new roads.		None required.
		Limiting curb cuts allowed on state roads, which would reduce strip-style development along these roads (e.g. the Boiling Springs section of Highway 9 in Spartanburg)			
		Not only helping develop but help fund the implementation of collector street plans to bring greater connectivity to areas and keep congestion off of arterial routes (e.g. funding acquisition of right of way).			
		States that the full membership of the Resource Group is found in the Appendix. However, the appendix is not available online.	Now available online.		Resource Committee Roster added as appendix.
		The Rail [ROW Element] briefly discusses potential transit use along four different transit routes. The route description for the connection from Clemson to Greenville and Spartanburg (p. 3 of this section), is inaccurate and rather a duplicate of the route description for Chester to Rock Hill. This section should be reviewed and clarified to ensure it contains accurate information.	Comment noted and correction made.		The route description for the connection from Clemson to Greenville and Spartanburg has been revised.
		The Plan states that "During the design phase, all interstate mainline widening projects will be evaluated in terms of mass transit alternatives. Mass transit, in the form of high-occupancy lanes or rail service will be considered in addition to or in place of adding additional travel lanes on the interstate system." Yet, the one page Potential Interstate Financial Plan chart shows that many road widenings are scheduled to be engineered in the very near future per the State Transportation Improvement Plan (e.g. I-85 in 2009). What is the timeline for each of these road widenings, especially in terms of when they will hit the design phase (where transit would be evaluated)?	Transit alternatives would be evaluated as part of the Preliminary Engineering phase, and thus would follow the timeline identified for initiating that phase of each project. The financial chart for the Interstate Plan provides a schedule for all planned capacity upgrades over the next twenty years. In the case of widening I-85, the anticipated cost for the widening is beyond the financial capacity of the interstate program; however, design funds are in the Plan to develop preliminary engineering plans and a better defined cost estimate. With design and cost information for I-85, I-526, and I-26/I-20, these "significant" projects could be considered by the General Assembly or the SIB for extraordinary funding.		None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
4/11/08	Email - Upstate Forever	There doesn't seem to be mention of a statewide commuter line that connects the Upstate to Columbia to the Coast. Each of these hubs is integral for business and tourism, and seems like clear origination and destination points for statewide travel.	The potential alignments noted were derived from recent planning and/or feasibility studies. No study has been completed that addresses an Upstate-to-Coast corridor alignment. While there may not be a specific mention of a statewide commuter (perhaps you more appropriately intended to say high-speed) rail line connecting the Upstate to the Coast, the Plan recommends placing a greater focus on and increasing commuter-based services, as well upgrading passenger rail service. However, the Plan also recommends an incremental approach, such as first improving intercity bus service as a first step. This, combined with the recommended development of a comprehensive statewide rail plan addressing intercity and interregional passenger and freight rail needs, would help determine the areas of greatest need and focus.	4/21/08	None required.
		It's good that the Plan states "Recognizing that transit, like all other modes of transportation, does not pay for itself, public transportation in SC is funded through a combination of sources." The Plan should continually recognize that highways are almost always a money-losing endeavor, and this factor should play heavily into decisions about whether or not to expand highways or pursue alternative transportation strategies (e.g. Bus Rapid Transit or rail service). Transit and rail should not be easily dismissed as money-losing strategies when highways do the same. SCDOT should stand by other statements in the Plan to truly advocate for transit, especially when simple cost-benefit analyses point against transit. Such statements include: Despite the limited service and funding, Amtrak ridership in South Carolina increased significantly between FY2005 and FY 2006 by 20%, and many transportation needs cannot be solved by highway expansion.	Point noted.		None required.
		Along those same lines, the Plan mentions that "transit propensity" will be used to determine "more detailed transit-based alternatives analysis would be warranted." It's important that SCDOT clearly defines "transit propensity" and ensures that any propensity measures can not easily dismiss transit based on factors such as rural populations or cost. As mentioned before, the fact that Amtrak ridership jumped 20% in one year despite limited funding and service shows the potential for "if you build it, they will come."	Transit propensity has been developed and defined separate from this Plan, with the process for determining articulated to MPOs, COGs, and SCDOT ourselves as potential project sponsors. However, this process can be further summarized in the Plan.		The transit propensity determination process has been explained in greater detail.
		The Plan notes that "State funding for transit in SC is restricted to ¼ of one cent from the motor fuel users fee. This level of funding generates approximately \$6 million per year for public transit in the state, not enough to sufficiently match federal transit funding." The Plan also notes this funding for transit is much lower than in other states, such as North Carolina. Does this statement mean that South Carolina misses out on federal funding sources because we do not generate enough money? If so, the Plan needs to determine a strategy to increase this funding. This is also a place where it needs to be re-emphasized that highways and roads are also money-losing endeavors, and that it's simply not reasonable or defensible that so much of the motor fuel tax goes to roads.	There is no documentation that South Carolina has had to return or lapse Federal funding specifically because of a lack of local match. However, the state's transit providers have not been able to draw down all available federal funding in a timely manner on some occasions because of match issues. South Carolina does miss out to some degree of federal funding because of ridership numbers, which in some cases is due to funding concerns. As stated in a previous response, the Statewide Transit Plan presents 15 key action items with specific implementation details, which specifically address funding strategies.		None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan					
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate					
Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
4/11/08	Email - Upstate Forever	The Plan states in reference to local funding: "A concerted effort among transit providers and SCDOT, perhaps in conjunction with TASC, should be undertaken to research these barriers and approach the State Legislature about changes in the restrictions place on local funding mechanisms. TASC annually prepares a legislative agenda for law makers regarding transit and relaxing these restrictions could be included with the agenda." This statement is another example of the need for SCDOT to use the word "shall" in the Plan, since it's SCDOT's plan. A timetable should be included at the end of the Plan that implements these statements, such as putting this legislative agenda on the 2009 session.	The word "shall" in place of "should" is not justified in this case because of the potential involvement of other parties and their commitments and priorities for which SCDOT has no control. While it may be desirable to have a specific timetable, because certain implementation steps are outside of this Plan's control, that is not possible. However, specific Action Items have been developed to assist in this and other efforts.	4/21/08	None required.
		The Plan shows the very positive results from the focus group surveys of community leaders and residents that indicate a high willingness to have local taxes used for public transportation. SCDOT should be confident to go forward with these numbers and their Plan and get local funding options expanded to implement The Plan.	Point noted.		None required.
		Once again we would like to reiterate the fact that there was not ample notice to the conservation community and the public as a whole in regards to the opportunity to review, comment and attend meetings on the South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan. It would be our suggestion that the comment period be extended to allow for widespread publicity of The Plan and the scheduling of additional public meetings. However, we would also suggest that the meetings be held in a lecture style allowing the audience to hear a detailed description of each of the seven primary elements of the plan followed by a question and answer period.	At this point there are no plans to extend the public comment period.		None required.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	Clarify private road status through legislature	A private road would be one that is owned by one or more property owners but that has not been dedicated to the public through either local or State government. SCDOT would have no jurisdiction or maintenance responsibilities.	4/21/08	None required.
		Clarify railroad right of way status - accessible records	A railroad right of way inventory was completed as a part of the statewide plan. The status of rail rights of way across the state are described by the maps associated with that inventory, which are included in the statewide plan.	4/21/08	None required.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	Widening of existing two lane highways would reduce high fatality rate in Marion County.	The strategic corridor network consists of some of the most heavily traveled interregional corridors in the State. Within this network, improvements are recommended and planned to address safety based on the types of accidents and the conditions that exist in high accident areas. In some cases, this may include widening the roadway, in others it may include other types of safety improvements such as clearing, adding medians, or adding shoulders. Safety is also a factor in the formula used to prioritize projects.	4/21/08	None required.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	Where will the money come from (for the plan) and what options are available.	Funding for highways and public transit are described in the Executive Summary document of the Statewide Plan. Much of the funding for transportation is programmatic, and must be used for certain types of facilities. The statewide strategic corridor network, which does not include interstates or local roads, does not have a dedicated source of funding.	4/21/08	None required.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	Highway 52 North to Society Hill is two lane with 400 trucks entering Nucor Steel each day. Need to four lane this for 14 miles.	The Pee Dee COG has a project programmed for this area.	4/21/08	Pee Dee Corridor Plan updated to include US 52 widening near Nucor Steel in accordance with Pee Dee COG plans.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	Mass transit is not sufficiently covering the needs of the people. An example of this is no mass transit service on weekends. Scheduling times need to improve.	Transit services, given a shortfall in funding, will continue to be provided on the highest demand routes or where funding sources dictate they serve specific needs. Expansion of service will be dependant on increased funding. Shortfalls and description of services are described in more detail in the regional transit plans.	4/21/08	None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan					
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate					
Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	Too many dollars spent on multi-modal projects used by too few people would not be a good outcome of this project. State and federal legislators (need to) overhaul all transportation funding so that there is adequate funding for all needs.	The Statewide Strategic Network of highways is a demand driven network that was generated by congestion, freight volume, safety, tourism, and emergency evacuation needs. Once defined on this basis, the network of highways was evaluated based on actual projected needs. Where possible and applicable, alternative modes such as mass transit were incorporated into the recommendations for those corridors. This plan identifies deficiencies and prioritizes projects based upon a needs based formula.	4/21/08	None required.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	A paper study with no plan for implementation would not be a good outcome.	The plan includes a prioritized list of improvements to transportation systems in South Carolina. The implementation of the plan will be dependant on available funding.	4/21/08	None required.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	To encourage more "complete streets" SCDOT should provide incentives in funding. Transit technology, especially streetcars, should be given priority over street (widening).	The Statewide Strategic Network of highways was evaluated for applicable transit technologies. The methodology and evaluation can be found in each of the regional transit plans, or in the individual corridor plan. Outside of the strategic network, local planning agencies such as Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Councils of Governments may set standards for development of complete streets in their transportation improvement plans. Some agencies have done this.	4/21/08	None required.
3/26/08	Meeting Survey - Florence	Need a bus system that covers the urbanized area.	Each of the Regional Transit Plans describes the services needed, those provided, and the shortfall in funding.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Rock Hill	Need to maintain existing roads before building new ones.	Point noted.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Rock Hill	Need to reduce funnel points over the Catawba River, increase multimodal and compact growth.	Point noted.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Rock Hill	Need to make sure that all planning work results in funding transportation needs.	One means toward this end is a long range plan that demonstrates need, whether from the standpoint of congestion relief, improved safety, or other measurable factors. Projects should be based on the actual forecasted need rather than a wholesale standard applied to all locations. Application of funding should be on a prioritized basis. The Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan will be used to support funding for these needs.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Rock Hill	Failure to four lane SC 9 from Pageland to Chesterfield would not be a good outcome of this project.	SC 9 is part of the Trans Carolina Corridor in the Statewide Strategic Network. Needs based improvements have been identified, but not yet funded, for that corridor. Widening a two lane highway to four is sometimes that recommended solution. Another consideration in this area is the future Interstate 73. Studies indicate that traffic on SC 9 will be relieved to some extent by this new corridor.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Rock Hill	Need better land use planning along corridors	Access policies are included in the plan for Strategic Corridors and in the Access and Roadside Management Standards manual provides for control of access on major highways. Agencies responsible for local zoning have responsibilities for land use planning.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Rock Hill	Highway 9 from Pageland to Lancaster County line (needs to be improved).	SC 9 is part of the Trans Carolina Corridor in the Statewide Strategic Network. Needs based improvements have been identified, but not yet funded, for that corridor. Widening a two lane highway to four is sometimes that recommended solution. Another consideration in this area is the future Interstate 73. Studies indicate that traffic on SC 9 will be relieved to some extent by this new corridor.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Rock Hill	Need to explore new ways to fund projects? A.) Higher taxes, B.) Vote (bond issue), C.) Grants from U.S. Government, D.) Pay as you go.	Transportation funding is described in the Executive Summary of the Statewide Plan.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Concerned about evacuation routes from Folly Beach/Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway	Folly Road is a designated connector defined as such because of its designation as a Hurricane Evacuation Route.	4/21/08	None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan					
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate					
Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Savannah Highway (US 17) from Wesley Drive to Main Road and Highway 17 North from Ravenel Bridge to Chandler Road are our worst congestion problems.	Both of these segments are part of the Atlantic Coast Corridor of the Statewide Strategic Network. Each of these congested segments may be affected by a future project. Portions of the Savannah Highway segment should see a reduction in future volumes with the extension of Interstate 526. It is not, however, expected to reduce congestion to acceptable levels. An expansion of transit service or a more premium transit service, such as bus rapid transit, may be part of the solution for mobility along Savannah Highway in the future. The corridor plan and the regional transit plans provide a more detailed discussion on the application of transit technologies on this corridor. The most congested part of the US 17 North corridor is Johnnie Dodds Boulevard, between the Ravenel bridge and Interstate 526. This is programmed for widening, including an interchange at Bowman Road, as part of the Charleston County 1/2 cent sales tax program.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Adding more lanes to every road is not the answer. Alternative routes should be added.	The Statewide Strategic Network is comprised of non-interstate corridors and connectors. It is intended to place priority on corridors that provide a high level of connectivity between economic centers of the state, and in many cases relieve the interstate system. Some of these routes warrant additional lanes, but generally the recommended improvement is sensitive to the need of the segment. This could be congestion, safety or one or more other needs based factors. This approach is a step towards continuously widening interstates and concentrating more growth to the interstate corridors.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Overcrowding of public transportation routes leaves out underserved populations.	Certain transit technologies employ queue jumping lanes, signal preemption, and/or dedicated lanes to provide transit mobility on congested corridors. The application of those technologies is described in the corridor plans or the regional transit plans.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Higher taxes would not be a good outcome of this process.	Point noted.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	I would like to see commuter rail from Summerville to Charleston.	This is an initiative that is being studied by the regional planning agency and has been identified as a priority by local officials. Transit services on the strategic network in the Charleston area must consider this future service and connectivity with transfer stations. The selection of public transit technologies (i.e. express bus routes, bus rapid transit, commuter rail) and the potential commuter rail service between Summerville and Charleston are interdependent.	4/21/08	None required.
		Talk and no action would not be a good outcome of this project.	Valid concern.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Support the port access road.	The environmental clearance process for this new connector is complete and the project awaits funding.	4/21/08	None required.
		Support widening of U.S. 17 South to Interstate 95.	This is a segment of the Atlantic Coast Corridor, and part of the Statewide Strategic Network of corridors. Needs for this corridor have been addressed in the Corridor Plan. One widening project is currently under construction.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Need to increase rail capacity	The Statewide Multimodal Plan included a statewide rail right of way inventory. This inventory identified the status of all rail lines in the state, including active, abandoned, and a list of lines that may have not been abandoned but may not have regular service and may be at risk for abandonment. The purpose of this inventory was to highlight corridors that should be monitored to prevent their abandonment, and preserve them for future transportation use. In the evaluation of transit technologies for the strategic highway corridors, consideration was given to the proximity of rail lines. A new position has been filed at SCDOT that will improve coordination between SCDOT and railroads.	4/21/08	None required.

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan					
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate					
Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Placing alternate modes of transportation behind adding lanes would not be a good outcome of this project.	A Statewide and regional transit plans are included in the Statewide Multimodal Plan. An extensive needs assessment was completed with market research that included transit providers, citizen focus groups and approximately 2,000 surveys conducted across the State. This plan will be used to promote transit opportunities. The prioritization process for new highway projects also analyzes transit propensity as an alternative to, or in conjunction with, highway projects.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Are there too many political organizations involved in the decision making process?	The Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan included a strategic highway corridor plan, statewide and regional transit plans, and a statewide rail right of way inventory. The process for identification of strategic corridors is demand driven, based on a number of factors including congestion and safety. The projects are derived from a ranking that includes some of the same factors. Act 114 passed in 2007 has made project selection and prioritization more of a needs based decision process.	4/21/08	None required.
3/25/08	Meeting Survey - Charleston	Would like to see CNG Buses, HOV Lanes on I-26, Vanpools, and lanes dedicated to energy efficient human and electric powered cars.	Some of these ideas are among the recommendations included in the regional transit plans. In addition, as project scopes become more defined for highways on the Statewide Strategic Network, consideration will be given for including facilities that support appropriate transit technologies. These might include HOV or bus lanes.	4/21/08	None required.
3/24/08	Meeting Survey - Orangeburg	Better communication between DOT and the community. Common courtesy should be observed when SCDOT makes decisions planning projects.	The Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan was based on a framework of goals and guiding principles, which are included in the planning process document within the plan. One of the guiding principles is improved coordination between SCDOT and its agency and local government partners. The local and regional planning agencies helped develop these goals and guiding principles, and have been involved in the planning process. Local plans are incorporated in the Statewide Plan.	4/21/08	None required.
3/24/08	Meeting Survey - Orangeburg	Need more sidewalks	Sidewalks are included in projects identified to meet the needs of the Statewide Strategic Network wherever land use supports their need. Local and regional transportation planners also include pedestrian facilities in their long range plans.	4/21/08	None required.
		Need transit connections between Columbia and Lexington	The Central Midlands Regional Transit Plan describes the needs and recommended solutions for this region. The needed funding shortfall is also described in that plan.	4/21/08	None required.
3/24/08	Meeting Survey - Orangeburg	Additional lanes on Interstate 26 and improved interchanges needed.	Certain sections of Interstate 26 are currently planned for widening in the Charleston area. Construction should begin soon on a very congested segment near Aviation Avenue. Interchanges will be improved in this area.	4/21/08	None required.
		Additional multimodal - train tracks in less urbanized areas	The type of transit services that are appropriate are generally based on density and commuter patterns. Rural areas may be better served by local or intercity bus than by rail.	4/21/08	None required.
		Address bridges in Orangeburg and Statewide.	The bridge replacement program is part of the overall Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). The needs far exceed the level of funding available for bridge replacement.	4/21/08	None required.
3/24/08	Meeting Survey - Orangeburg	The plan will not be a success if projects do not encourage economic development in underserved areas.	Economic development is a component in the ranking of projects. The South Carolina Department of Commerce provides a score for each project based on a number of factors including other supporting infrastructure that would be conducive to job creation. Although the Statewide Strategic Corridor network is driven by demand, the congested segments are also connected by long stretches of rural highway and the needs in those areas have been identified as well.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Greenwood	Highway 25 needs to be in plan for four lane expansion.	Based upon demand, including volumes and congestion, this route was not included in the Statewide Strategic Network.	4/21/08	

South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Multimodal Transportation Plan
Matrix Of Written Comments With Responses And Revisions Where Appropriate

Date Submitted	Source	Comment	Response	Date Responded	Revisions to Statewide Multimodal Plan
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Greenwood	Work toward transportation for our seniors and poor sector.	The regional and Statewide transit plans were supplemented with regional and Statewide Human Service Coordination Plans that helped regional transit providers improve their services to seniors and low income passengers.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Greenwood	Need a connector between Anderson County and Columbia.	Although it is not a direct route, the Mountains to the Sea Corridor (US 178) and the Mid Carolina Corridor (IIS 378) provide an alternate and more direct route than the interstate. Plans for these corridors would eventually improve these routes to improve travel.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Greenwood	Highway 28 should be four lane from Anderson to Augusta.	Based upon demand, including volumes and congestion, this route was not included in the Statewide Strategic Network.	4/21/08	None required.
3/31/08	Meeting Survey - Greenwood	What is being done to increase the funding for maintenance on existing roads?	The needs have been identified and prioritized. Increased funding will be at the discretion of the legislature and the SCDOT Commission.	4/21/08	None required.
3/27/08	Meeting Survey - Greenville	It would be better if SCDOT would focus on the community rather than on high speed interstates benefitting limited economic development.	Much of the planning done for the local communities is done by local planning organizations; Metropolitan Planning Organizations and regional Councils of Government. A significant portion of funding goes directly to the needs identified in the long range plans of these agencies. SCDOT helps these agencies implement their plans. Interstate funding is designated for the interstate system, which as a system has federal standards which include higher speeds and controlled access.	4/21/08	None required.
3/27/08	Meeting Survey - Greenville	Wider interstates, non-attainment air quality, and limited access to communities would not be good outcomes of this plan.	The idea behind a Statewide Strategic Network is to make better use of existing facilities, reduce the need to continuously widen interstates, and promote the use of alternative modes of transportation.	4/21/08	None required.
3/27/08	Meeting Survey - Greenville	Safer roads, lower speed limits needed.	Safety is one of the factors used to identify and prioritize projects. "The Road Map to Safety" is a plan that identified accident trends and set goals and methods for making roadways more safe.	4/21/08	None required.
3/27/08	Meeting Survey - Greenville	Greenway needed as option for safe pedestrian and bike travel.	In addition to bicycle and pedestrian plans that are developed by local governments and planning agencies, the Statewide Plan addresses Greenways in two different ways. First, through input from advocacy groups, a segment of the Atlantic Coast Corridor will consider accommodating a Greenway in areas where it can not follow another route. Second, the Statewide Rail Right of Way inventory provides potential future opportunities for corridors to be preserved for these types of uses.	4/21/08	Updated the Atlantic Coast Corridor Plan to include consideration of the Greenway bicycle and pedestrian facility.
3/27/08	Meeting Survey - Greenville	Conduct a statewide bike and walkability study. Expand state funding and build a bicycle and pedestrian program.	Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are included in the scope of projects on the Statewide Strategic Network.	4/21/08	None required.
3/27/08	Meeting Survey - Greenville	Would like to see more bicycles on the road and fewer four lane roads that go nowhere. Oppose the Clyburn Connector.	The Statewide Strategic Network emphasizes the use of existing highways for the designated network, and recommended improvements are based upon needs to address safety, congestion and other important deficiencies. There is no one size fits all approach, such as four laning rural highways.	4/21/08	None required.