



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	S-1
Chapter One: Purpose and Need For Action	1-1
1.1 What is the I-73 project?	1-1
1.1.1 Where is the project located?	1-2
1.1.2 What would the I-73 facility be like?	1-2
1.1.3 Why was the project initiated?	1-2
1.1.4 Who is responsible for this project?	1-6
1.2 Why study impacts to the environment?	1-7
1.2.1 What type of impacts will be evaluated?	1-8
1.2.2 How does the FHWA evaluate impacts?	1-9
1.3 What is the purpose of the project?	1-9
1.4 Why do we need the project?	1-9
1.4.1 Primary Needs	1-9
1.4.2 Secondary Needs	1-10
1.5 What is system linkage?	1-10
1.6 How could this project affect economic development?	1-11
1.6.1 Who lives in Dillon, Horry, and Marion Counties, and what population characteristics shape these counties?	1-11
1.6.2 What are some of the social and housing characteristics of Dillon, Horry, and Marion Counties?	1-12
1.6.3 What are the employment characteristics in Dillon, Horry, and Marion Counties?	1-15
1.6.4 What are the unemployment rates and poverty levels in Dillon, Horry and Marion Counties?	1-18
1.6.5 How would this project benefit the recruitment of new business to the three-county area?	1-19
1.6.6 Would this project benefit travel and tourism in the three-county area?	1-20
1.7 How would this project affect hurricane evacuation?	1-21
1.8 Would the project relieve local traffic congestion?	1-24
1.9 How would the project incorporate multimodal planning?	1-25
1.10 Will I-73 be a toll road?	1-26
1.11 How would the road be constructed?	1-29
1.12 Summary	1-30
 Chapter Two: Development of Alternatives	 2-1
2.1 How were the Potential Alternatives Developed?	2-1



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.1.1 What is the Agency Coordination Team and what was their role in developing alternatives?	2-5
2.1.2 How was the public involved in developing the preliminary Build Alternatives?	2-6
2.2 How were the 141 preliminary Build Alternatives evaluated?	2-8
2.3 How were the Reasonable Alternatives developed?	2-9
2.3.1 How was the public involved in developing the Reasonable Alternatives?	2-9
2.3.2 What modifications were made to the Reasonable Alternatives based on input?	2-9
2.3.3 Were any new segments developed based on public comments?	2-11
2.3.4 How were preliminary interchange locations designated?	2-12
2.3.5 How were the modifications of the Reasonable Alternatives evaluated?	2-12
2.4 How were the six Reasonable Alternatives evaluated further?	2-12
2.5 How were the eight Reasonable Alternatives evaluated to designate the Preferred Alternative?	2-19
2.5.1 How would the alternatives meet the primary needs of the project?	2-19
2.5.2 How would the alternatives meet the secondary needs of the project?	2-42
2.5.3 How did the alternatives compare in terms of human and environmental impacts?	2-54
2.5.4 Which alternative was designated as the Preferred Alternative?	2-66
Chapter Three: Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences	3-1
3.1 What is the existing land use in the project study area?	3-1
3.1.1 What is the agricultural land use in the project study area?	3-2
3.1.2 How many natural land areas are in the project study area?	3-2
3.1.3 What is the residential land use like in the project study area?	3-2
3.1.4 What is the commercial land use like in the project study area?	3-4
3.1.5 Do the affected counties have plans for development and future growth?	3-6
3.1.6 How is land use expected to change in the project study area?	3-9



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.1.7 How would the No-build Alternative affect land development?	3-9
3.1.8 How would the project impact development in the three-county area?	3-13
3.1.9 How were land use impacts resulting from the project determined?	3-13
3.1.10 What other factors influence growth and development?	3-28
3.1.11 Conclusion	3-29
3.2 What are the socio-economic conditions of the project study area?	3-30
3.3 How is a community defined and what communities are located in the project study area?	3-30
3.3.1 How were communities identified within the project study area?	3-30
3.3.2 What is the community impact assessment?	3-31
3.3.3 How would the No-build Alternative affect communities in the project study area?	3-31
3.3.4 What are the characteristics of Dillon county and how would it be impacted?	3-34
3.3.5 What are the characteristics of Cities and Towns located within Dillon County and how would they be impacted?	3-35
3.3.6 What neighborhoods and rural communities are located within Dillon County and how would they be impacted?	3-43
3.3.7 What are the characteristics of Marion County and how would it be impacted?	3-45
3.3.8 What are the characteristics of cities and towns located within Marion County and how would they be impacted?	3-46
3.3.9 What neighborhoods and rural communities are located within Marion County and how would they be impacted?	3-50
3.3.10 What are the characteristics of Horry County and how would it be impacted?	3-60
3.3.11 What are the characteristics of cities and towns located within Horry County and how would they be impacted?	3-61
3.3.12 What neighborhoods and rural communities are located within Horry County and how would they be impacted?	3-64
3.4 Are there any environmental justice concerns in the project area?	3-77
3.4.1 What is environmental justice?	3-77
3.4.2 How were minority and low-income populations identified within the project study area?	3-78



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.4.3 Are there any minority populations in the project study area?	3-79
3.4.4 Are there any low-income populations in the project study area?	3-80
3.4.5 How were potential environmental justice impacts evaluated?	3-82
3.4.6 Are there any minority and low-income populations impacted?	3-82
3.4.7 What other methods were used to consider environmental justice populations in the project study area?	3-84
3.4.8 What effort has been made to ensure full and fair participation of environmental justice populations in the transportation decision-making process?	3-87
3.4.9 Summary	3-88
3.5 What 4(f) resources are in the project study area?	3-88
3.5.1 What are Section 4(f) properties?	3-88
3.5.2 What parks, recreational facilities, and wildlife/waterfowl refuges are found in the project study area?	3-89
3.5.3 Would the alternatives impact parks and recreational facilities under Section 4(f)?	3-91
3.5.4 What are the potential impacts to historic resources under Section 4(f)?	3-91
3.6 What are Section 6(f) Resources and would any be impacted by the project?	3-92
3.7 What are the historic resources and how would they be affected by this project?	3-93
3.7.1 What are historic resources?	3-93
3.7.2 How was the historic resources survey conducted?	3-93
3.7.3 What above-ground historic resources were found during the survey?	3-95
3.7.4 What archaeological resources are anticipated within the historic resources study area?	3-96
3.7.5 What are the differences between Section 106 and Section 4(f), in terms of analyzing historic resources?	3-96
3.7.6 What would the potential impacts to historic resources be under Section 106?	3-96
3.8 What Hazardous Material and Waste Sites are in the project study area?	3-99
3.8.1 What are hazardous materials and wastes?	3-99



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.8.2 Are there any hazardous waste site located within the project area?	3-99
3.8.3 Would the proposed alternative impact any known potentially contaminated sites?	3-100
3.9 Noise	3-100
3.9.1 What is noise?	3-100
3.9.2 How are noise impacts estimated?	3-100
3.9.3 How was background noise determined in the project study area?	3-102
3.9.4 How was TNM tested to ensure accuracy?	3-103
3.9.5 What happens when impacts occur?	3-105
3.9.6 What are the anticipated noise impacts for the proposed alternative?	3-105
3.9.7 How could impacts be mitigated?	3-107
3.10 How is air quality measured?	3-111
3.10.1 How is air quality regulated?	3-113
3.10.2 Would air quality be impacted by the proposed project?	3-113
3.11 What impacts could construction of the Build Alternative have?	3-114
3.11.1 Air quality	3-114
3.11.2 Noise	3-114
3.11.3 Water quality	3-115
3.11.4 Wildlife	3-115
3.11.5 Maintenance of traffic	3-115
3.11.6 Estimated Costs	3-118
3.12 What considerations have been made concerning pedestrians and bicyclists?	3-118
3.13 What is the relationship of local short-term uses versus long-term productivity for the proposed project?	3-119
3.14 Why is farmland an important consideration?	3-119
3.14.1 How is farmland protected?	3-119
3.14.2 What are the different types of protected farmland?	3-120
3.14.3 What are the types and amounts of farmland in the project study area?	3-121
3.14.4 What are the typical farm sizes in Dillon, Horry, and Marion counties?	3-122
3.14.5 What methodology was used to determine farmland impacts?	3-122



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.14.6 What were the results of the Farmland Impact Conversion Evaluation?	3-123
3.14.7 How would the proposed project impact farmlands?	3-124
3.14.8 What would be the potential indirect and cumulative impacts on farmland?	3-125
3.14.9 What Federal/USDA farmland programs are active or found in the project study area and how would they be impacted by the proposed alternatives?	3-127
3.15 What types of Uplands are found in the project study area?	3-130
3.15.1 What are upland communities?	3-130
3.15.2 Why are uplands important?	3-131
3.15.3 How were upland communities identified for this project?	3-132
3.15.4 What upland natural community types were identified within the study area?	3-132
3.15.5 What impacts to upland natural community would occur?	3-135
3.16 What types of wetlands are found in the project study area?	3-137
3.16.1 What are wetlands?	3-137
3.16.2 Why are wetlands important?	3-137
3.16.3 How are wetland identified for this project?	3-137
3.16.4 What wetland types were identified along the alternatives?	3-140
3.16.5 What kind of impacts would occur to wetlands as a result of this project?	3-143
3.16.6 How were the potential wetland impacts calculated?	3-144
3.16.7 How many acres of wetland would be impacted by the project?	3-144
3.16.8 What kind of impacts would occur in streams as a result of this project?	3-148
3.16.9 How much stream impact would result from the project?	3-148
3.16.10 What indirect impacts to wetlands and streams would occur as the result of the project?	3-150
3.16.11 What would cumulative impacts be to wetlands and streams in the project study area?	3-152
3.16.12 What is mitigation?	3-154
3.16.13 What was done to avoid and minimize wetland and stream impacts?	3-155
3.16.14 How will the wetland and streams be compensated?	3-157
3.17 What are the groundwater resources in the project study area?	3-159



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.18	What are the surface waters in the project study area? 3-161
	3.18.1 What are the designations of the surface waters? 3-161
	3.18.2 Does drinking water come from these surface waters? 3-164
	3.18.3 What are some common terms associated with water quality? 3-164
	3.18.4 How is surface water quality evaluated? 3-166
	3.18.5 What is the surface water quality like in the Pee Dee River Basin and Waccamaw/AAIW Basin? 3-168
	3.18.7 How would these watersheds be impacted by the proposed project? 3-175
	3.18.8 How much pollutant would runoff into streams in the project study area as a result of the alternatives? 3-175
	3.18.9 What best management practices and measures would be used to minimize the amount of runoff pollution into streams? 3-186
3.19	What are floodplains? 3-187
	3.19.1 What agencies regulate floodplains? 3-187
	3.19.2 How were the floodplain boundaries determined for this study? 3-187
	3.19.3 What floodplains might be affected by the project? 3-188
	3.19.4 How do the alternatives affect floodplains? 3-189
	3.19.5 What direct impacts would there be to floodplains? 3-189
3.20	Are there any federally-protected species or state species of concern in the project study area? 3-191
	3.20.1 What are threatened and endangered species? 3-191
	3.20.2 What federally-listed species are potentially found in the project study area? 3-191
	3.20.3 What has been done to avoid impacts to federally-listed species on this project? 3-192
	3.20.4 What do the federally-listed species look like and where are they found? 3-193
	3.20.5 How could federally-protected species be affected by the proposed project? 3-198
	3.20.6 What state species of concern may be in the project study area? 3-201
3.21	How would wildlife and their habitat be impacted by this project? 3-201
	3.22.1 What indirect and cumulative impacts would occur to wildlife? 3-204
3.22	Would wild and scenic rivers be impacted by the alternatives? 3-206



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter and Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.23	What resources are expected to be affected uniformly? 3-207
3.23.1	Coastal zone resources 3-207
3.23.2	Coastal barriers 3-210
3.23.3	Energy 3-210
3.24	What permits could be necessary in order to construct the alternatives? 3-211
3.24.1	Section 404 of the Clean Water Act 3-211
3.24.2	Section 401 Water Quality 3-211
3.24.3	Coastal Zone Consistency Certification 3-211
3.24.4	Stormwater Management and Sediment Reduction Act of 1991 3-212
3.24.5	Section 9 and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 3-212
Chapter Four: Agency Coordination and Public Involvement	4-1
4.1	Public Involvement 4-1
4.1.1	How was the public engaged in the project? 4-1
4.1.2	What happened at the Public Scoping Meetings? 4-1
4.1.3	What took place at the Public Information Meetings? 4-2
4.1.4	How were local governments involved? 4-4
4.1.5	How did the FHWA and SCDOT reach out to communities? 4-5
4.1.6	What other forms of information were available to the public? 4-7
4.2	Agency Involvement and Coordination 4-8
4.2.1	What is the Agency Coordination Team? 4-9
4.2.2	How did the ACT contribute to the project? 4-10
4.2.3	Were there any meetings with agencies prior to the formation of the ACT? 4-10
4.2.4	Who participated in the ACT meetings and contributed to the project? 4-10
4.2.5	When did the ACT meetings occur and what happened at the meetings? 4-11
4.3	Stakeholder Working Group Involvement 4-23
4.3.1	What was the Stakeholder Working Group? 4-23
4.3.2	What Happened at the Stakeholder Working Group Meetings? 4-23
4.4	Tribal Involvement 4-24
4.4.1	How was Tribal Consultation handled for this project? 4-24



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter and Section

	<u>Page</u>
4.5 What other Public Involvement Meetings were held?	4-26
Chapter Five: List of Preparers	5-1
List of Acronyms	A-1
Index	i-1

Appendices

A	Agency Letters
B	Corridor Analysis Tool
C	Resolutions and Local Government Letters
D	Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation
E	Notice of Intent
F	Correspondence with Native Americans



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

Page

Chapter One

1.1	County Population Growth	1-12
1.2	Demographic Composition of County Seats and Population Centers with Greater than 2000 People	1-13
1.3	County Demographic Characteristics	1-14
1.4	Housing Characteristics of Counties in the Project Study Area	1-14
1.5	County Job Training/Adult Education Options	1-15
1.6	Total Employment, by County	1-16
1.7	Top Employers by County	1-18
1.8	Unemployment Rates, 2005	1-19
1.9	Evacuation Clearance Times on U.S. Route 501, S.C. Route 9 and I-73 by Hurricane Category (in hours)	1-23

Chapter Two

2.1	Agencies Contacted Regarding GIS Data	2-3
2.2	Possible GIS Layers for CAT Program	2-4
2.3	Alternatives Considered by the ACT	2-17
2.4	Alternatives	2-19
2.5	Reasonable Alternatives Matrix	2-29
2.6	Minimum Trip Time Between U.S. Route 17 and I-95 in Year 2030	2-20
2.7	I-73 Economic Impact Summary in 2030 – Value Change (Alternatives compared to No-Build)	2-39
2.8	I-73 Economic Impact Summary Percentage Increase in 2030 (Alternatives compared to No-Build)	2-40
2.9	I-73 Cumulative Economic Output Impact from 2015 to 2030 (Alternatives compared to No-Build)	2-40
2.10	Strategic Development Impacts of I-73, Employment Increases by Alternative and County (Number of Jobs)	2-41
2.11	Annual Income Impacts based on Strategic Development Impacts of I-73, by Alternative and County (in Millions of Dollars)	2-41
2.12	Summary of Economic Impacts of I-73 in 2030, by Alternative	2-42
2.13	Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) in Network for Alternatives Using Average Annual Daily Traffic Volumes (Year 2030)	2-43
2.14	Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) in Network for Alternatives using Peak Season Daily Traffic Volumes (Year 2030)	2-44
2.15	Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) in Network for Alternatives using Average Annual Daily Traffic Volumes with I-73 Traffic Removed (Year 2030)	2-44



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

Chapter Three

	<u>Page</u>	
3.1	Projected Population Growth by County, 2000 to 2030	3-10
3.2	No-build Alternative, Summary of Land Use Requirements, by Acres	3-10
3.3	No-build Alternative, Detailed Land Use Requirements, in Acres	3-12
3.4	Proposed I-73 Interchanges Along Each Alternative by TAZ	3-14
3.5	Total Shift in Anticipated Development Resulting from I-73 Alternatives by TAZ	3-16
3.6	Impact of I-73 Alternatives by TAZ	3-17
3.7	Total Growth by 2030 including Impact of I-73 Alternatives by TAZ	3-18
3.8	Demographic Characteristics of Communities in CIA Study Area	3-35
3.9	Economic Characteristics of Communities in CIA Study Area	3-36
3.10	Dillon County and Communities Projected 2030 Development by Acreage	3-37
3.11	Marion County and Communities Projected 2030 Development by Acreage	3-46
3.12	Horry County and Communities Projected 2030 Development by Acreage	3-62
3.13	2000 Department of Health and Human Services Poverty Thresholds	3-78
3.14	2000 Minority Population	3-79
3.15	2000 Low-income Population	3-80
3.16	Total Number of Block Groups with Environmental Justice Populations	3-80
3.17	Block Groups Impacted by Alternative	3-83
3.18	Community Block Group Relocations	3-85
3.19	Section 4(f) Impacts to Parks and Recreational Facilities	3-91
3.20	Potential Impacts to Historic Properties under Section 4(f)	3-92
3.21	Archaeological Predictive Model: High Probability Acreage	3-94
3.22	NRHP Sites in the Historic Resources Study Area	3-95
3.23	Potential Impacts to Historic Resources under Section 106	3-97
3.24	Summary of Hazardous Material and Waste Sites Identified	3-99
3.25	Hazardous Materials and Waste Sites Potentially Impacted, by Alternative	3-101
3.26	Common Noises and dB Levels	3-102
3.27	FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria	3-103
3.28	Ambient Noise Levels	3-104
3.29	Approximate Distance to Activity Category Impact	3-106
3.30	Approximate Distance to Activity Category Impact (feet)	3-107
3.31	Noise Impacts Based on GIS Analysis	3-108
3.32	Noise Barrier Analysis	3-110
3.33	Criteria Pollutants Measured Under the NAAQS	3-112



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables		Page
3.34	Potential Cost Per Alternative	3-118
3.35	Top Five Crops in Dillon, Horry and Marion Counties in 2002	3-120
3.36	Summary of Prime and Farmland of Statewide Importance Soils	3-121
3.37	Total Land Area in Farms, 2002	3-122
3.38	NRCS Farmland Conversion Evaluation	3-123
3.39	Prime and Farmland of Statewide Importance Soils	3-124
3.40	Divided Farmland Parcels in the Project Study Area	3-125
3.41	Impacts from Induced Development on Prime and Farmland of Statewide Importance Soils in the Project Study Area by Alternative	3-126
3.42	Cumulative Impacts on Prime and Farmland of Statewide Importance Soils in the Project Study Area by Alternative	3-127
3.43	Land Enrolled in Federal Conservation Programs	3-129
3.44	Impacts to Land in the Conservation Reserve Program	3-130
3.45	Potential Upland Community Impacts in Acres	3-136
3.46	Potential Wetland Impacts in Acres and Wetland Values	3-145
3.47	Potential Stream Impacts	3-149
3.48	Potential Indirect Wetland Acres and Stream Impacts	3-151
3.49	Sub-basins, Watershed Units, and Major Streams in Project Study Area	3-163
3.50	Water Service Providers in the Project Study Area	3-164
3.51	2004 303(d) List of Impaired Streams within the Project Study Area	3-167
3.52	Pollutant discharge by Pounds in Year 2030	3-176
3.53	Stream Crossings by Alternative	3-179
3.54	Impaired Stream Crossings by Alternative	3-180
3.55	Streams Impacted by Predicted Development in the Project Study Area	3-181
3.56	National Flood Insurance Program Regulated Floodplains	3-188
3.57	Floodplain Crossings by Locations and Impact Areas	3-190
3.58	Summary of Floodplain Impacts	3-191
3.59	Federally-protected Species in Dillon County, Marion County, and Horry County, South Carolina	3-192
3.60	State Listed Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species Known to Occur in Dillon, Horry, and Marion Counties, S.C.	3-202-3-303
3.61	Potential Wildlife Habitat Impacts in Acres	3-204
3.62	Potential Indirect Wildlife Habitat Impacts in Acres	3-205
Chapter Four		
4.1	Community Information Meetings	4-8
4.2	Agency Coordination Team Members	4-11
4.3	ACT Meetings and Attendance	4-12
4.4	Tribal Consultation Process	4-25



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figures

Chapter One

		<u>Page</u>
1-1	Interstate 73 corridor	1-1
1-2	I-73 study area map	1-3
1-3	Interim typical section	1-4
1-4	Ultimate typical section	1-5
1-5	Northern Coastal Conglomerate	1-21

Chapter Two

2-1	Preliminary Build Alternatives	2-7
2-2	Twenty-Five Preliminary Build Alternatives	2-10
2-3	Suitability Grid for Seven Reasonable Alternatives	2-13
2-4	108 Segments Modified by the Public Input	2-14
2-5	Additional Segments Suggested by the Public	2-15
2-6	10 Alternatives	2-16
2-7	Alternative 1	2-21
2-8	Alternative 2	2-22
2-9	Alternative 3	2-23
2-10	Alternative 4	2-24
2-11	Alternative 5	2-25
2-12	Alternative 6	2-26
2-13	Alternative 7	2-27
2-14	Alternative 8	2-28
2-15	2030 AADT Travel Time No Build	2-30
2-16	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 1	2-31
2-17	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 2	2-32
2-18	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 3	2-33
2-19	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 4	2-34
2-20	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 5	2-35
2-21	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 6	2-36
2-22	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 7	2-37
2-23	2030 AADT Travel Time Alternative 8	2-38
2-24	2030 AADT Level of Service No Build	2-45
2-25	2030 AADT Level of Service Alternative 1	2-46
2-26	2030 AADT Level of Service Alternative 2	2-47
2-27	2030 AADT Level of Service Alternative 3	2-48
2-28	2030 AADT Level of Service Alternative 4	2-49
2-29	2030 AADT Level of Service Alternative 5	2-50
2-30	2030 AADT Level of Service Alternative 6	2-51
2-31	2030 AADT Level of Service Alternative 7	2-52



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figures

Chapter Three

		<u>Page</u>
3-1	Study Area for Land Use and Uplands	3-2
3-2	Alternative 1 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-20
3-3	Alternative 2 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-21
3-4	Alternative 3 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-22
3-5	Alternative 4 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-23
3-6	Alternative 5 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-24
3-7	Alternative 6 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-25
3-8	Alternative 7 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-26
3-9	Alternative 8 2030 Year Potential Land Use Change Areas	3-27
3-10	Communities Evaluated by Community Impact Assessment	3-32
3-11	Community Boundaries	3-33
3-12	Dillon Urban Cluster	3-40
3-13	Latta	3-43
3-14	Floydale	3-44
3-15	Marion	3-47
3-16	Mullins	3-49
3-17	Gapway	3-51
3-18	Pecan Pointe	3-52
3-19	Rains	3-54
3-20	Temperance Hill	3-56
3-21	Spring Branch	3-58
3-22	Zion	3-59
3-23	Aynor	3-63
3-24	Cool Spring	3-65
3-25	Galivants Ferry	3-67
3-26	Ketchuptown	3-68
3-27	Poplar Hill	3-70
3-28	Joyner	3-71
3-29	Bakers Chapel	3-73
3-30	Dog Bluff	3-74
3-31	Methodist Rehobeth	3-76
3-32	Environmental Justice Block Groups Impacted by Alternative	3-81
3-33	Section 4(f) Properties	3-90
3-35	Land Enrolled in Federal Conservation Programs	3-128
3-36	Wetlands, Streams and Floodplains	3-139
3-37	Potentially Impacted Watershed Units	3-162



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Charts

1.1	County Population Growth Forecasts, 2005 to 2030	1-12
1.2	2000 Median Household Income	1-13
1.3	Education Levels of Dillon, Horry, and Marion Counties	1-14
1.4	Dillon County Employment, by Industry	1-17
1.5	Horry County Employment , by Industry	1-17
1.6	Marion County Employment, by Industry	1-17