

Chapter 1	<i>Introduction</i>	1
1.1	Cooperating Agencies	2
1.2	Participating Agencies	2
1.3	Project Limits	4
1.4	Availability of Funding	5
Chapter 2	<i>Purpose and Need</i>	6
2.1	Project Need	6
2.1.1	Growth in Population and Employment	6
2.1.2	Decreased Mobility and Increased Traffic Congestion	7
2.1.3	Base Year Traffic Conditions	8
2.1.4	Projected Traffic Conditions	9
2.1.5	Geometric Deficiencies	12
2.1.5.1	I-526 at Paul Cantrell Boulevard	12
2.1.5.2	I-26/I-526 System Interchange	13
2.1.5.3	I-526 at Rivers Avenue	14
2.1.5.4	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue	15
2.1.6	Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity	16
2.2	USACE Purpose and Need	17
2.2.1	USACE's Purpose of the Proposed Project	17
2.2.2	Why the USACE's Project Purpose is Important	17
2.2.3	The Responsibility of USACE to Review the Statement of Need	17
2.3	Public and Agency Involvement in the Purpose and Need	17
2.4	Public Interest Review Factors	18
Chapter 3	<i>Alternatives</i>	19
3.1	What are the Steps in the Alternatives Analysis?	19
3.2	How were the Range of Alternatives Developed?	22
3.3	October 2013 Corridor Study	22

3.4	What are the Range of Alternatives?	23
3.5	Preliminary Screening of the Range of Alternatives	23
3.5.1	No-Build/No Action	25
3.5.2	Improvements to Existing Local Facilities	25
3.5.2.1	Improvements to East Montague Avenue	25
3.5.2.2	Improvements to Remount Road	25
3.5.3	New Location Alternatives	27
3.5.3.1	US 78 to Virginia Avenue	27
3.5.3.2	Ashley Phosphate Road to Virginia Avenue	27
3.5.3.3	Bees Ferry Road to Dorchester Road	28
3.5.4	Managed Lanes	28
3.5.5	Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management	29
3.5.6	Mass Transit	30
3.5.7	Existing Corridor Improvements	31
3.6	What are the Preliminary Alternatives and How were they Evaluated?	32
3.6.1	No-Build	34
3.6.2	Mainline Interstate (I-526) Alternatives	34
3.6.2.1	6-Lane Widening	34
3.6.2.2	8-Lane Widening	35
3.6.3	Interchange Alternatives	36
3.6.3.1	I-526 at Paul Cantrell Boulevard	36
3.6.3.2	Paul Cantrell Boulevard at Magwood Drive	38
3.6.3.3	I-26/I-526 System Interchange	40
3.6.3.4	I-526 at Rivers Avenue	42
3.6.3.5	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue	44
3.7	What are the Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Presented at the Public Information Meeting?	46
3.7.1	Public Input on the Proposed Reasonable Alternatives	48
3.7.2	Detailed Impact Evaluation of the Proposed Reasonable Alternatives	52
3.7.2.1	Paul Cantrell Boulevard to International Boulevard	56
3.7.2.2	International Boulevard to Rivers Avenue	58

3.7.2.3	Rivers Avenue to Virginia Avenue	60
3.8	Recommended Preferred Alternative	62
3.9	Pedestrian and Bicycle Accomodations	64
3.9.1	What Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Options were Evaluated?	64
3.9.1.1	Parallel Shared Use Path	64
3.9.1.2	Glenn McConnell Parkway	65
3.9.1.3	Ashley River Road	65
3.9.1.4	N Rhett Avenue	65
3.9.1.5	US 52/Rivers Avenue	65
3.9.2	How are Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Incorporated into the Recommended Preferred Alternative?	66
Chapter 4 Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences		67
4.1	Land Use	68
4.1.1	Who is Responsible for Land Use Plans within the Project Study Area?	68
4.1.2	What Methodology was used for Analysis of Land Use?	68
4.1.3	What is the Affected Land Use within the Project Study Area?	70
4.1.3.1	Existing Land Use	70
4.1.4	What Area Planning Documents Regualte Land Use?	71
4.1.4.1	West Ashley	71
4.1.4.2	North Charleston	71
4.1.5	Where is Development Activity Expected within the Project Study Area?	71
4.1.5.1	West Ashley	71
4.1.5.2	North Charleston	72
4.1.6	What are the Potential Environmental Consequences to Land Use?	74
4.1.6.1	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Land Use?	74
4.1.6.2	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Land Use?	74
4.1.7	How will Land Use Impacts be Mitigated?	75
4.2	Farmlands	76
4.3	Communities	77
4.3.1	Why Do We Evaluate Communities?	77
4.3.2	What Communities are in the CIA Study Area?	78
4.3.3	What Methodologies and Data Sources were used to Characterize Communities?	80

4.3.3.1	Methodology	80
4.3.3.2	Data Sources	80
4.3.4	What are the Existing Characteristics of the CIA Study Area Communities?	82
4.3.4.1	Study Area	82
4.3.4.2	Communities	83
4.3.4.3	Other Special Populations	93
4.3.5	Transportation Equity	94
4.3.6	What are the Potential Environmental Consequences to Communities?	95
4.3.6.1	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Communities?	95
4.3.6.2	How would the Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Impact Communities?	96
4.3.7	What are the Indirect Effects on Communities?	100
4.3.8	What are the Cumulative Effects on Communities?	100
4.3.9	How would Community Impacts be Mitigated?	102
4.4	Socioeconomics	104
4.4.1	What is the Business Community Profile in the CIA Study Area?	104
4.4.1.1	West Ashley	104
4.4.1.2	North Charleston	104
4.4.2	What does Employment and Income Look Like in the CIA Study Area?	105
4.4.2.1	Existing Conditions	105
4.4.2.2	Potential Environmental Consequences	106
4.4.3	What does Access and Mobility Look Like in the CIA Study Area?	106
4.4.3.1	Existing Conditions	106
4.4.3.2	Potential Environmental Consequences	108
4.5	Environmental Justice Analysis	109
4.5.1	What is an Environmental Justice Analysis?	109
4.5.2	How is an Environmental Justice Analysis Performed?	110
4.5.3	Are there Minority and/or Low-Income Populations within the Project Study Area?	111
4.5.4	Are there Limited English Proficiency Populations within the Project Study Area?	112
4.5.5	How did the Project Team Create Opportunities for Meaningful Public Involvement with EJ Populations?	112
4.5.6	Do EJ Neighborhoods Face Adverse or Disproportionate Impacts from the Project?	114
4.5.6.1	Indirect Effects	116
4.5.6.2	Cumulative Effects	116

4.5.6.3	Impact Summary	117
4.5.7	How will the Adverse and Disproportionate Impacts be Avoided, Minimized, and Mitigated?	117
4.5.7.1	Avoidance	117
4.5.7.2	Minimization	118
4.5.7.3	Mitigation	118
4.5.8	What is the Environmental Justice Analysis Conclusion?	125
4.6	Relocations	126
4.7	Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists	129
4.7.1	Is the Project Compatible with Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans?	129
4.7.2	What are the Environmental Consequences of the Ashley River Shared Use Path?	129
4.8	Air Quality	130
4.8.1	How are Air Quality Standards Regulated?	130
4.8.2	What are the Potential Environmental Consequences to Air Quality?	130
4.8.2.1	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Air Quality?	130
4.8.2.2	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Air Quality?	131
4.9	Noise	132
4.9.1	What is Noise?	132
4.9.2	How Does SCDOT Evaluate Noise Impacts?	132
4.9.3	What are the Potential Noise Environmental Consequences?	134
4.9.3.1	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Noise?	134
4.9.3.2	How would the Recommended Preferred Alternative Impact Noise?	135
4.9.4	How would Noise Impacts be Mitigated?	136
4.10	Water Quality	143
4.10.1	How is Water Quality Assessed?	143
4.10.2	In which Drainage Basin is the Project Located?	143
4.10.3	What Watersheds are within the Project Study Area?	143
4.10.4	Are any Impaired Streams Located in the Project Study Area?	145
4.10.5	Have any TMDLs been Developed in the Project Study Area?	147
4.10.6	Are any Point Sources Located within the Project Study Area?	147
4.10.7	What are the Potential Environmental Consequences to Water Quality?	149
4.10.7.1	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Water Quality?	149
4.10.7.2	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Water Quality?	149
4.10.8	How would Water Quality Impacts be Mitigated?	150

4.11	Water Resources	151
4.11.1	What Agencies are Responsible for Regulating Water Resources?	151
4.11.2	What Methodology was used for the Analysis of Water Resources?	152
4.11.2.1	What Water Resources Exist within the Project Study Area?	152
4.11.3	What Groundwater Resources Exist within the Project Study Area?	153
4.11.4	What Surface Water Resources Exist within the Project Study Area?	154
4.11.4.1	Wetlands	154
4.11.4.2	Streams	154
4.11.4.3	Drinking Water Resources	155
4.11.4.4	Wild and Scenic Rivers	155
4.11.5	What are the Potential Environmental Consequences to Water Resources?	156
4.11.5.1	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Water Resources?	156
4.11.5.2	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Water Resources?	156
4.11.5.3	Waters of the US Conditions and Impacts	157
4.11.6	What are the Indirect Impacts on Water Resources and Water Quality?	159
4.11.7	What are the Cumulative Impacts on Water Resources and Water Quality?	161
4.11.8	How would Impacts to Water Resources and Water Quality be Mitigated?	161
4.12	Floodplains	163
4.12.1	What are Floodplains?	163
4.12.2	How are Floodplains Regulated?	163
4.12.3	What Floodplains are Located within the Project Study Area?	164
4.12.4	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Floodplains?	164
4.12.5	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Floodplains?	164
4.12.6	What are the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts to Floodplains?	166
4.12.7	How would Impacts to Floodplains be Mitigated?	166
4.13	Natural Resources	167
4.13.1	How were Natural Resources within the Project Study Area Identified and Assessed?	167
4.13.2	How are Natural Resources Protected?	167
4.13.2.1	Endangered Species Act	167
4.13.2.2	Federal Protected Species	167
4.13.2.3	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act	168
4.13.2.4	State Protected Species	168

4.13.3	What Natural Resources are in the Project Study Area?	169
4.13.3.1	Landform and Soils	169
4.13.3.2	Natural Habitat Communities	169
4.13.4	General Wildlife	170
4.13.5	Federal and State Protected Species	170
4.13.5.1	Migratory Birds	172
4.13.6	Essential Fish Habitat	173
4.13.6.1	What is Essential Fish Habitat?	173
4.13.6.2	How is Essential Fish Habitat Protected?	173
4.13.6.3	How is Essential Fish Habitat within the Project Study Area Identified and Assessed?	175
4.13.7	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Natural Resources?	175
4.13.8	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Natural Resources?	175
4.13.8.1	Federal and State Protected Species	175
4.13.8.2	Agency Coordination	176
4.13.8.3	Essential Fish Habitat	176
4.13.9	How would Project Impacts to Natural Resources be Mitigated?	179
4.13.9.1	Federal and State Protected Species	179
4.13.9.2	Essential Fish Habitat	180
4.14	Cultural Resources	181
4.14.1	How are Cultural Resources Protected?	181
4.14.1.1	National Historic Preservation Act	181
4.14.1.2	Department of Transportation Act of 1966, Section 4(f), as Amended	181
4.14.2	How were Cultural Resources Identified?	181
4.14.2.1	Background Research	182
4.14.2.2	Archaeological Field Survey	182
4.14.2.3	Architectural Survey	182
4.14.2.4	NRHP Eligibility	183
4.14.2.5	How are Historic Resources Evaluated?	183
4.14.3	What Archaeological Resources were Found During the Survey?	183
4.14.4	What were the Results of the Architectural Survey?	184
4.14.5	What are the Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources?	185
4.14.6	Consultation and Coordination with Federally Recognized Tribes	186

4.14.7	Consultation and Coordination with SHPO	186
4.14.8	What Mitigation Measures would be taken to Protect Cultural Resources?	187
4.15	Section 4(f) Resources	188
4.15.1	What is Section 4(f)?	188
4.15.2	What 4(f) Recreational Resources were Impacted within the Project Study Area?	188
4.15.2.1	Highland Terrace-Liberty Park Community Center	188
4.15.2.2	Russelldale Community Center	190
4.15.2.3	Ferndale Community Center	190
4.15.2.4	Ralph M. Hendricks Park	191
4.15.2.5	North Charleston Athletic Center	191
4.15.3	What 4(f) Historic Resources were Impacted within the Project Study Area?	192
4.15.4	What 4(f) Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges were Impacted within the Project Study Area?	192
4.15.5	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Section 4(f) Resources?	192
4.15.6	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Section 4(f) Resources?	193
4.15.6.1	Highland Terrace-Liberty Park Community Center	196
4.15.6.2	Russelldale Community Center	197
4.15.7	How would Unavoidable Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties be Minimized and Mitigated?	199
4.16	Section 6(f) Resources	200
4.16.1	What Section 6(f) Resources were Identified within the Project Study Area?	200
4.16.2	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Section 6(f) Resources?	200
4.16.3	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Section 6(f) Resources?	200
4.16.4	How would Impacts to Section 6(f) Resources be Avoided, Minimized and/or Mitigated?	201
4.17	Hazardous Materials	202
4.17.1	What are Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Sites?	202
4.17.2	What is the Affected Environment within the Project Study Area?	202
4.17.3	What Methodology was used for Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Site Analysis?	202
4.17.4	What Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Sites Exist in the Project Study Area?	203
4.17.5	How would the No-Build Alternative Impact Hazardous Materials?	203
4.17.6	How would the Reasonable Alternatives Impact Hazardous Materials?	204
4.17.7	How would Hazardous Materials Impacts be Mitigated?	206
4.18	Construction	207
4.18.1	What Types of Construction Activities would Occur on the Proposed Project?	207

4.18.1.1	Final Design	207
4.18.1.2	Pre-Construction Activities	207
4.18.1.3	Construction Activities	207
4.18.1.4	Post-Construction Activities	208
4.18.2	What Other Activities Related to Construction will Occur?	208
4.18.2.1	Construction Easements	208
4.18.2.2	Construction Phasing	208
4.18.2.3	Public Notification During Construction	208
4.18.3	How would Construction Affect the Environment and how would it be Mitigated?	209
4.18.3.1	Transportation and Traffic	209
4.18.3.2	Land Use, Communities, Businesses, and Utilities	209
4.18.3.3	Air Quality	210
4.18.3.4	Noise	210
4.18.3.5	Water Quality	211
4.18.3.6	Water Resources	212
4.18.3.7	Natural Resources	212
4.18.3.8	Cultural Resources	213
4.18.3.9	Section 4(f) Resources	213
4.18.3.10	Section 6(f) Resources	213
4.18.3.11	Hazardous and Contaminated Materials	213
4.19	Energy	215
4.19.1	What are the Existing Energy Consumption Conditions in the Corridor?	215
4.19.2	What are the Effects of the Reasonable Alternatives on Existing Energy Consumption Conditions in the Corridor?	216
4.19.2.1	No-Build Alternative	217
4.19.2.2	Reasonable Alternatives	217
4.19.3	What Mitigation Measures would be Taken for Energy Consumption	217
4.20	Short-Term Uses Versus Long-Term Productivity	218
4.21	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	219
4.22	Permits	220
4.22.1	Section 404 of the Clean Water Act	220
4.22.2	Section 401 of the Clean Water Act	220
4.22.3	Section 402 of the Clean Water Act	221

4.22.4	Critical Area Permitting	221
4.22.5	Construction in State Navigable Waters	221
4.22.6	Section 9 of the Rivers and Harbors Act	222
4.22.7	Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act	222
4.23	Sustainability	223
4.23.1	What is a Sustainable Highway?	223
4.23.2	Key Sustainability Considerations for the Project	223
4.23.2.1	Communities and Public Outreach	223
4.23.2.2	Natural World	224
4.23.2.3	Resiliency	224
4.23.3	Documentation of Sustainability During Construction and Operation on the Project	224
4.23.3.1	Environmental Compliance	224
4.23.3.2	Public Outreach During Construction	225
4.24	404(b)1 Guidelines	226
4.24.1	Clean Water Act Section 404(b)1 Guidelines	226
4.24.1.1	Regulatory Background and Existing Conditions	226
4.24.1.2	404(b)1 Guidelines for the Reasonable Alternatives	226
Chapter 5 Navigation		228
5.1	USCG Coordination	228
5.2	Existing Bridge Clearances	228
5.3	Proposed Bridge Clearances	231
5.4	Navigation Study Summary	232
5.5	Federal and State Navigation Permits Required	233
5.6	Navigation During Construction	233
Chapter 6 Public and Agency Involvement		234
6.1	Overview	234
6.1.1	Who are the Lead Agencies and What are Their Responsibilities?	234
6.1.2	What are the Cooperating and Participating Agencies?	235
6.1.3	How are the Agencies Involved in the Proposed Project?	237
6.1.4	What is the One Federal Decision Process?	239
6.2	What are the Goals and Objectives of Public Involvement?	241
6.3	How is the Public Engaged in the Proposed Project?	241

6.3.1	What Strategies and Tools are used to Involve the Public and Communicate Information?	242
6.3.1.1	Public Meetings	243
6.3.1.2	Initial Community Meetings and Companion Virtual Public Meeting (Summer/Fall 2016) - Scoping Meetings	244
6.3.1.3	Public and Virtual Engagement (Fall 2019) - Draft Reasonable Alternatives	244
6.3.1.4	Public Hearing (Late 2020)	245
6.3.1.5	Meeting Notifications	245
6.3.2	Meeting Materials Used	247
6.3.3	What Other Sources of Information are Available to the Public?	247
6.3.3.1	Website	247
6.3.3.2	Hotline	248
6.3.3.3	Social Media	248
6.3.3.4	Newsletters	248
6.3.3.5	Speakers Bureau	248
6.3.3.6	Community Office	249
6.3.4	How does FHWA and SCDOT Reach out to Traditionally Under-Represented Communities?	249
6.3.4.1	Limited English Proficiency Communities	249
6.3.4.2	Community Office	250
6.3.4.3	Community Advisory Council	250
6.3.4.4	Pop-Up Meetings	251
6.3.4.5	Additional Outreach Tools	251
6.4	Who are the Project Stakeholders?	251
6.4.1	Who was Invited to Become a Project Stakeholder?	251
6.4.1.1	How are Stakeholder Meetings Held?	252
6.4.2	How are Governments and Leadership Involved?	252
6.5	How are Public and Agency Comments Incorporated into the Project?	253
6.5.1	Comments Summary	254
Chapter 7 List of Preparers		256
Chapter 8 Distribution List		262
Index		

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Regional Overview	4
Figure 1.2	I-526 LCC WEST Project Study Area	5
Figure 2.1	Level of Service (LOS)	7
Figure 2.2	Projected Traffic	9
Figure 2.3	I-526 LCC WEST Segments	10
Figure 2.4	I-526 at Paul Cantrell Boulevard	12
Figure 2.5	I-26/I-526 System	13
Figure 2.6	I-526 at Rivers Avenue	14
Figure 2.7	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue	15
Figure 3.1	Alternatives Development Flowchart	21
Figure 3.2	Improvements to Existing Local Facilities and New Location Alternatives	26
Figure 3.3	Level of Service (LOS)	34
Figure 3.4	I-526 at Paul Cantrell Boulevard Alternative 5	36
Figure 3.5	I-526 & Paul Cantrell Boulevard Interchange Improvement Alternative (Carried Forward)	37
Figure 3.6	Paul Cantrell Boulevard at Magwood Drive Alternative 5	38
Figure 3.7	Paul Cantrell Boulevard & Magwood Drive Interchange Improvement Alternative (Carried Forward)	39
Figure 3.8	I-26/I-526 Alternative 1	40
Figure 3.9	I-26/I-526 Alternative 2	41
Figure 3.10	I-526 at Rivers Avenue Relocated Partial Cloverleaf	42
Figure 3.11	I-526 at Rivers Avenue Basic Build	43
Figure 3.12	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue Alternative 1	44
Figure 3.13	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue Alternative 2	45
Figure 3.14	I-526 LCC WEST Proposed Reasonable Interchange Alternatives	47
Figure 3.15	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue Alternatives 2A, 5, and 6	48
Figure 3.16	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue Alternative 2A	49
Figure 3.17	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue Alternative 5	50
Figure 3.18	I-526 at N Rhett/Virginia Avenue Alternative 6	51
Figure 3.19	Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Sections of I-526 LCC WEST	53
Figure 3.20	Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Mainline Typical Section	54
Figure 3.21	I-526 LCC WEST Section from Paul Cantrell Boulevard to International Boulevard	56
Figure 3.22	I-526 LCC WEST Section from International Boulevard to Rivers Avenue	58

Figure 3.23	I-526 LCC WEST Section from Rivers Avenue to Virginia Avenue	60
Figure 4.1	CIA Study Area	69
Figure 4.2	North Charleston Future Land Use	73
Figure 4.3	West Ashley Neighborhoods	79
Figure 4.4	North Charleston Neighborhoods	79
Figure 4.5	CIA Study Area, Block Groups, and EJ Neighborhoods	81
Figure 4.6	West Ashley Home Values	84
Figure 4.7	West Ashley Community Features	86
Figure 4.8	North Charleston Home Values	88
Figure 4.9	North Charleston Community Features	90
Figure 4.10	EJ Neighborhoods	92
Figure 4.11	North Charleston Noise Study Areas	139
Figure 4.12	West Ashley Noise Study Areas	140
Figure 4.13	Watersheds	144
Figure 4.14	Water Quality Monitoring Stations	146
Figure 4.15	NPDES Permits	148
Figure 4.16	Generalized Hydrographic Framework of South Carolina	153
Figure 4.17	WSWQ-ICE Study Area	160
Figure 4.18	Historic Properties near the Project Study Area	185
Figure 4.19	Recreational Facilities Protected under Section 4(f)	189
Figure 4.20	Proposed Right-of-Way at Highland Terrace-Liberty Park Community Center	196
Figure 4.21	Proposed Right-of-Way at Russelldale Community Center	198
Figure 4.22	Monthly Energy Review, April 2019	215
Figure 4.23	Correlation Between Fuel Economy and Speed	215
Figure 5.1	Major River Crossings	229
Figure 5.2	NOAA Navigation Chart - Charleston Harbor, 54th Edition, June 2015	231
Figure 6.1	Public Involvement Goals	241
Figure 6.2	Public Involvement Strategies	242
Figure 6.3	Project Website - Home Page (May 20, 2019)	247
Figure 6.4	Public Comment Methods	253
Figure 6.5	Public Comment Summary (11/7/2019 - 1/31/2020)	254
Figure 6.6	Public Comments by Geography (11/7/2019 - 1/31/2020)	255

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Cooperating and Participating Agencies for the I-526 LCC WEST DEIS	3
Table 2.1	I-526 LCC WEST Base Year Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service by Segment	8
Table 2.2	I-526 LCC WEST 2050 No-Build Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service by Segment	11
Table 2.3	BCDCOG 2040 LRTP Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements within the I-526 LCC WEST Corridor	16
Table 2.4	USACE Public Interest Review Factors	18
Table 3.1	Preliminary Screening of the Range of Alternatives	24
Table 3.2	Transportation Demand Management Strategies	30
Table 3.3	Modal Strategies	31
Table 3.4	Travel Demand Alternatives Evaluated & Implemented from the 2013 Corridor Study	31
Table 3.5	Screening of Preliminary Alternatives	33
Table 3.6	Traffic Analysis of I-526 LCC WEST	34
Table 3.7	Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Screening Matrix: Paul Cantrell Blvd to International Blvd	57
Table 3.8	Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Screening Matrix: International Blvd to Rivers Ave	59
Table 3.9	Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Screening Matrix: Rivers Ave to Virginia Ave	61
Table 3.10	Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Screening Matrix: Recommended Preferred Alternative Sections	62
Table 3.11	Proposed Reasonable Alternatives Screening Matrix: Recommended Preferred Alternative Combined	63
Table 4.1	Direct Land Use Impacts of the Recommended Preferred Alternative	74
Table 4.2	Demographic Characteristics	82
Table 4.3	Population of Disabled Persons	93
Table 4.4	Relocation Impacts within EJ Neighborhoods for the Proposed Reasonable Alternatives between International Blvd and Rivers Ave	99
Table 4.5	Environmental Justice Communities within the I-526 LCC WEST Project Study Area	111
Table 4.6	Relocation Impacts within EJ Neighborhoods for the Proposed Reasonable Alternatives between International Blvd and Rivers Ave	115
Table 4.7	Mitigation Matrix	120
Table 4.8	Relocation Impacts of the Recommended Preferred Alternative	126
Table 4.9	Noise Abatement Criteria	133
Table 4.10	Predicted Traffic Noise Impact Summary	135
Table 4.11	Noise Wall Analysis Summary	141
Table 4.12	Increase of Impervious Surface by the Reasonable Alternative	149

Table 4.13	Wetland Types within the Project Study Area	154
Table 4.14	Rivers and Streams within the Project Study Area	154
Table 4.15	Open Water Ponds within the Project Study Area	154
Table 4.16	Impacts to Water Resources	157
Table 4.17	Waters of the US Conditions and Impacts	158
Table 4.18	Potential Impacts to Floodplains from the Reasonable Alternatives	164
Table 4.19	Federal and State Protected Species in Charleston County	171
Table 4.20	EFH Types within the Project Study Area	174
Table 4.21	EFH Acreage within the Project Study Area	174
Table 4.22	EFH Impacts within the Project Study Area	178
Table 4.23	Architectural Resources in the Project Study Area	184
Table 4.24	Types of High-Risk Sites in the Hazardous Materials Project Study Area	204
Table 4.25	Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) Sites within the Recommended Preferred Alternative	205
Table 4.26	VISSIM Output Metrics - AM & PM Peak Hours	216
Table 4.27	Fuel Consumption Comparison - AM & PM Peak Hours	216
Table 5.1	Major Ashley River Crossings	230
Table 6.1	Cooperating Agencies	235
Table 6.2	Participating Agencies	236
Table 6.3	Agency Meetings	238
Table 6.4	Agency Concurrence Tracking	239
Table 6.5	Public Meetings	243
Table 6.6	Community Meetings 2016	244
Table 6.7	Community and Public Information Meetings 2019	245
Table 6.8	Speakers Bureau Presentations	248

Appendices

- A *Agency Coordination Plan, Agency Concurrence Letters*
 - B *Alternatives Development Traffic Analysis Report*
 - C *Alternatives Development Technical Memorandum*
 - D *Community Impact Assessment*
 - E *Visual Impacts Analysis*
 - F *Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment*
 - G *Environmental Justice Analysis*
 - H *Environmental Justice Community Mitigation Plan*
 - I *Relocation Impact Study*
 - J *Air Quality Impact Analysis*
 - K *Detailed Noise Analysis*
 - L *Natural Resources Technical Memorandum, Biological Assessment, USFWS Consultation*
 - M *Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination, Critical Area Plat*
 - N *Bridge Replacement Scoping Trip Risk Assessment Form, SCDOT Floodplain Checklist and Maps*
 - O *Essential Fish Habitat Assessment, NOAA Consultation*
 - P *Cultural Resources Survey, SHPO/THPO Consultation*
 - Q *Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation*
 - R *Draft Section 6(f) Evaluation*
 - S *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*
 - T *USCG Permit Application, Navigation Report*
 - U *Public Involvement Plans, Meeting Summaries*
 - V *Advertising Summary*
 - W *Informational Pop-up Meeting Outreach Summary*
 - X *Environmental Justice Outreach Strategy and Tools*
 - Y *Stakeholder Meeting Plans and Summaries, Stakeholder List*
 - Z *Comment Tracking and Responses*
-