McCall, Betsy D

From: Giovanetti, Douglas
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 10:50 AM
To: McCall, Betsy D
Cc: Hinson, Ron E
Subject: FW: I95 MM0-18 FR Path
Attachments: Exit 8 - Dual lefts + 3 lanes east - Layout.pdf

Betsy,

The interchange recommendations are below. Exit 8 is the only interchange we looked at alternatives for. Based on the fact that we are maintaining the US 278 bridge and ROW constraints, the existing diamond interchange appears to be the best alternative to move forward with. The following are recommended improvements with the layout attached:

- Restriping WB US 278 for dual lefts onto SB On-Ramp and a single through.
- Dual receiving lanes to SB On-Ramp for approximately 1000', tapering to a single lane ramp before merging with I-95.
- Beyond the interchange, recommend widening US 278 to 3 lanes in each direction from NB On/Off Ramps to 1000' east of Henry Moss intersection (without the capacity increase on US 278, NB Off-Ramp queues may extend onto the interstate, requiring additional 600' of parallel decel length on I-95 for the NB Off-ramp)
- Improvements to US 278 @ Henry Moss intersection to provided minimum 150' exclusive left turn lanes on the side roads.

Please call me if you have any questions or would like to discuss.

Thanks,
Doug Giovanetti, PE, PTOE
Traffic Engineering
(803) 737-1868

From: Giovanetti, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 3:41 PM
To: McCall, Betsy D; Winn, Craig L.; Harmon, Jeremiah; Taylor, Eugene A.; Kelly, David P.; Beckham, Chris; Turner, Michael K.; Riley, Jason T; Kelly, Christopher S.; Scott, Katherine D.; Frate, Douglas W.; Lackey, Diane M.; Grate, LaToya E.; Kim, Dahae; Pleasant, Mark (FHWA); Keitt, Cedric C.
Cc: Necker, Jennifer L.; Thomas, Emily G.; Hinson, Ron E
Subject: RE: I95 MM0-18 FR Path

Betsy,

We have done a broad analysis of the interchanges along the I-95 MM 0-18 and have the following recommendations to address any operational deficiencies.

Exit 5: Relocate frontage road, remove connection at the I-95 NB On/Off-ramps. Otherwise, this interchange does not have operational deficiencies and no other improvements are recommended. Exit 5 is being studied as a part of the proposed Exit 3 and Jasper Port development.

Exit 8: Due to right of way constraints, a Parc-lo A interchange is not a viable alternative. Further analysis shows the existing diamond interchange can operate at an acceptable LOS with some enhancements. Recommend restriping, signing, and signal work on WB US 278 to provide dual left turn lanes and a single through lane at the I-95 SB Ramps intersection. The I-95 SB On-ramp will require dual receiving lanes for 1000 ft, then tapering to a single lane ramp before the merge onto I-95 SB mainline. Additionally, due to possible queuing on EB US 278 at Henry Moss Rd intersection spilling back to the I-95 NB Off-ramp, recommend increasing the decel length for the I-95 NB Off-ramp by 600 ft parallel to the mainline. This is a worst case if no improvements are made on US 278 at Henry Moss Rd in the future.

Exit 18: No operational deficiencies. Remove road connection S-13 from the ramps, this will create a 4 mile detour for the properties at the end of S-13. The I-95 NB On-ramp loop could potentially be removed if width for widening is needed under the bridge. This ramp carries very low volumes which could be diverted to Exit 21.

Please don't hesitate to call me if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Thanks,

Doug Giovanetti, PE, PTOE
Assistant Traffic Design Engineer
Traffic Engineering
955 Park Street
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 737-1868
giovanetd@scdot.org

From: McCall, Betsy D
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 8:40 AM
To: Winn, Craig L.; Harmon, Jeremiah; Giovanetti, Douglas; Taylor, Eugene A.; Kelly, David P.; Beckham, Chris; Turner, Michael K.; Riley, Jason T; Kelly, Christopher S.; Scott, Katherine D.; Frate, Douglas W.; Lackey, Diane M.; Grate, LaToya E.; Kim, Dahae; Pleasant, Mark (FHWA); Keitt, Cedric C.
Cc: Necker, Jennifer L.; Thomas, Emily G.
Subject: RE: I95 MM0-18 FR Path

The Purpose and Need was simplified based on feedback. Please review by Friday and let know if you have any issues.

DB FR items I95 MM0_18

Thanks,
Betsy

Safety 1st – Live By It!
Let 'em Work, Let 'em Live!

From: McCall, Betsy D
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2019 1:15 PM
To: Winn, Craig L. <WinnCL@scdot.org>; Harmon, Jeremy (HarmonJR@scdot.org) <HarmonJR@scdot.org>; Giovanetti, Douglas <GiovanetD@scdot.org>; Taylor, Eugene A. <TaylorEA@scdot.org>; Kelly, David P. <KellyDP@scdot.org>; Beckham, Chris <BeckhamJC@scdot.org>; Turner, Michael K. <TurnerMK@scdot.org>; Riley, Jason T <RileyJT@scdot.org>; Kelly, Christopher S. <KellyCS@scdot.org>; Scott, Katherine D. <ScottKD@scdot.org>; 'Doug Frate (Director, Intermodal & Freight)' <fratedw@scdot.org>; Lackey, Diane M. <LackeyDM@scdot.org>; Grate, LaToya E. (GrateLE@scdot.org) <GrateLE@scdot.org>; Kim, Dahae <KimD@scdot.org>; Pleasant, Mark (FHWA) <mark.pleasant@dot.gov>; Keitt, Cedric C. <KeittCC@scdot.org>
Cc: Necker, Jennifer L. <NeckerJL@scdot.org>; Thomas, Emily G. <ThomasEG@scdot.org>
Subject: RE: I95 MM0-18 FR Path

Sorry, the file was corrupted before.

Safety 1st – Live By It!
Let 'em Work, Let 'em Live!

From: McCall, Betsy D
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2019 9:12 AM
To: Winn, Craig L. <WinnCL@scdot.org>; Harmon, Jeremy (HarmonJR@scdot.org) <HarmonJR@scdot.org>; Giovanetti, Douglas <GiovanetD@scdot.org>; Taylor, Eugene A. <TaylorEA@scdot.org>; Kelly, David P. <KellyDP@scdot.org>; Beckham, Chris <BeckhamJC@scdot.org>; Turner, Michael K. <TurnerMK@scdot.org>; Riley, Jason T <RileyJT@scdot.org>; Kelly, Christopher S. <KellyCS@scdot.org>; Scott, Katherine D. <ScottKD@scdot.org>; Doug Frate (Director, Intermodal & Freight) <fratedw@scdot.org>; Lackey, Diane M. <LackeyDM@scdot.org>; Grate, LaToya E. (GrateLE@scdot.org) <GrateLE@scdot.org>; Kim, Dahae <KimD@scdot.org>; Pleasant, Mark (FHWA) <mark.pleasant@dot.gov>; Keitt, Cedric C. <KeittCC@scdot.org>
Cc: Necker, Jennifer L. <NeckerJL@scdot.org>; Thomas, Emily G. <ThomasEG@scdot.org>
Subject: I95 MM0-18 FR Path

All,

The Steering Committee has reviewed our proposed path for this project plus answered our outstanding questions. Attached is the meeting minutes from the meeting. From this, the path was altered. I need feedback on the highlighted line in the P&N. The committee asked us to add a statement concerning truck parking, so let me know if this wording is acceptable. Based on our monthly meeting yesterday truck parking may get removed from the project, but for now it is still in the path forward.

The Goals and Metrics did not change, but the scope was expanded to include the direction given by the committee. Some clarifications were made in the alternatives on the interchanges as needed.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Betsy

Safety 1st – Live By It!
Let 'em Work, Let 'em Live!