

# **2026 TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX DRAFT PROGRAM PUBLIC INPUT OVERVIEW**

*APRIL 14, 2026*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW .....	1
PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY.....	2
PUBLIC OPINION POLLING.....	15
APPENDIX: POLL RESULTS.....	16

# OVERVIEW

Following an extensive public and municipal engagement process initiated in September 2025 at the direction of Charleston County Council's Special Transportation Sales Tax Committee, Council developed and adopted a set of guiding principles, a project evaluation scoring framework, and a draft 2026 Transportation Sales Tax (TST) program, including proposed funding allocations and a slate of potential projects.

From the outset, this process emphasized broad public participation. County staff conducted outreach across Charleston County, engaging residents, municipalities, and stakeholder groups through presentations, public meetings, and direct conversations. This effort generated substantial input reflecting a wide range of community perspectives and priorities.

In February 2026, County Council directed staff to present the draft program for public review and comment, to ensure residents had the opportunity to provide additional feedback that could be incorporated before final decisions were made.

To support this phase, County staff implemented a comprehensive outreach strategy consistent with earlier efforts. This included an online public survey, additional public meetings held throughout the County, and continued engagement with community and stakeholder groups.

In addition, a statistically representative public opinion poll of more than 1,200 Charleston County residents was conducted to supplement the open survey and provide a balanced, data-driven perspective on community sentiment.

Taken together, these inputs represent a robust, multi-source feedback process, providing County Council with objective and actionable insights to guide decision-making on the draft 2026 Transportation Sales Tax program.

# PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

## ONLINE SURVEY RESULTS

### Overall Participation

- Participants: 3,548
- Responses: 27,760
- Comments: 1,543

### Respondent Profile

- 90% of respondents are Charleston County residents

*The following analysis is derived solely from Charleston County resident responses.*

### Process

- **Question:** “Do you believe the process thus far has been transparent and community driven?”
- **Respondents:** 2,995
  - Yes, definitely: 19%
  - Yes, somewhat: 39%
  - No, not really: 19%
  - No, not at all: 9%
  - Unsure: 13%
- **Summary:**
  - Total Yes: 58%
  - Total No: 28%
  - Net Positive: +30%

## **Guiding Principles**

- **Question:** “Do you believe these guiding principles are fair and reflect the mindset of Charleston County residents?”
- **Respondents:** 2,892
  - Yes, definitely: 39%
  - Yes, somewhat: 38%
  - No, not really: 13%
  - No, not at all: 7%
  - Unsure: 3%
- **Summary:**
  - Total Yes: 77%
  - Total No: 20%
  - Net Positive: +57%

## **Project Evaluation**

- **Question:** “Do you believe this is a fair selection process?”
- **Respondents:** 2,837
  - Yes, definitely: 25%
  - Yes, somewhat: 39%
  - No, not really: 17%
  - No, not at all: 8%
  - Unsure: 10%
- **Summary:**
  - Total Yes: 64%
  - Total No: 25%
  - Net Positive: +39%



## **Overall Funding Balance**

- **Question:** “ Do you believe the overall funding balance between Infrastructure (roads/safety), Public Transit, and Greenbelt is:”
- **Respondents:** 2,684
  - About right: 36%
  - Too much toward transit: 22%
  - Too much toward infrastructure: 15%
  - Too much toward greenbelt: 13%
  - Unsure: 14%

## **Roads and Infrastructure**

- **Question:** “The draft allocates \$2.7B (63.52%) to roads and infrastructure. Do you believe this amount is:”
- **Respondents:** 2,653
  - Too low: 34%
  - About right: 32%
  - Too high: 16%
  - Unsure: 18%

## **Public Transit**

- **Question:** “The draft allocates \$860M (20.24%) to public transit. Do you believe this amount is:”
- **Respondents:** 2,648
  - Too high: 35%
  - About right: 31%
  - Unsure: 18%
  - Too low: 16%

## **Greenbelt Funding**

- **Question:** “The draft allocates \$690M (16.24%) to the Greenbelt program. Do you believe this amount is:”
- **Respondents:** 2,655
  - About right: 35%
  - Too low: 29%
  - Too high: 22%
  - Unsure: 14%

## **Project List**

- **Question:** “Do you believe this proposed list of projects is a good use of available funding to address congestion and safety concerns?”
- **Respondents:** 2,572
  - Yes, definitely: 15%
  - Yes, somewhat: 42%
  - No, not really: 23%
  - No, not at all: 12%
  - Unsure: 9%
- **Summary:**
  - Total Yes: 57%
  - Total No: 35%
  - Net Positive: +22%

# OPEN-ENDED COMMENT OVERVIEW

## SUMMARY

Open-ended public comment on the draft 2026 Transportation Sales Tax program reflects a combination of highly concentrated, issue-specific advocacy and broader countywide concerns.

A substantial share of total comment volume is driven by a small number of organized efforts focused on specific projects, most notably Seabrook Island Road, the Highway 41 / Laurel Hill Parkway plan from the 2016 Transportation Sales Tax, and funding priorities on Johns Island. These topics account for a significant portion of responses, often through coordinated, near-identical submissions.

Beyond these concentrated inputs, broader sentiment centers on worsening congestion, the need for roadway improvements, and concern that growth is outpacing infrastructure. Residents also emphasize the importance of timely project delivery, fair geographic distribution of funding, and clear accountability in how decisions are made.

Feedback is most heavily concentrated in high-growth and project-impacted areas, including Johns Island, Mount Pleasant, West Ashley, and southern coastal communities, where residents express concern about infrastructure keeping pace with demand.

Taken together, the comments indicate strong engagement on specific projects, alongside broader expectations that the program address congestion, manage growth, and deliver visible results in a fair and accountable manner.

## Question 1

- **Question:** “What specific project(s) do you believe needs to be removed? What project(s) should take its place?”
- **Respondents:** 332

Theme 1: Add Seabrook Island Road to the Project List

~32% of Q1 comments

This was by far the most frequently raised topic in Q1 — approximately 32% of remove/replace comments mentioned Seabrook Island Road. The comments reflect a highly organized advocacy effort, with many residents submitting near-identical language. Core arguments centered on: the road being the sole vehicular access to Seabrook Island; tidal flooding that renders the road impassable multiple times per year; proximity to the new MUSC emergency medical facility; and the perception that Seabrook residents contribute significant tax revenue while receiving no project allocation.

## Representative comments:

*“Seabrook Island Road is the only means of vehicular access to and from our community and low-lying segments regularly experience tidal flooding during high tides and storm events. Each day, approximately 7,700 vehicle trips*

**CHARLESTON COUNTY – TST PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY  
AS OF APRIL 10, 2026**

*travel along Seabrook Island Road. The corridor serves more than 2,100 full-time residents, 2,600 dwelling units, and thousands of visitors.” — Seabrook Island resident*

*“The road from Seabrook Island to Betsy Kerrison Pkwy is prone to flooding. It is a busy road, made even busier by the recent MUSC office and the large Seafields retirement community. The problems on this road have existed for years and nothing has been done.” — Seabrook Island resident*

*Seabrook Island residents and visitors have contributed millions to the county transportation sales tax for decades but have not received comparable investment. This is the only way into and out of the town, and it needs attention.”*

*— Seabrook Island resident*

Theme 2: Remove / Redesign Highway 41 Plan — Oppose Laurel Hill Parkway

~18% of Q1 comments

Approximately 18% of Q1 comments addressed Highway 41 project that is funded through the 2016 Transportation Sales Tax, with the overwhelming majority opposing the proposed Laurel Hill Parkway routing. Residents argued that routing a new road through Laurel Hill County Park destroys protected green space and wetlands, costs significantly more than widening the existing roadway, and will not meaningfully reduce congestion. Many stated they would vote against the TST unless this plan is withdrawn.

**Representative comments:**

*“Remove the terrible Highway 41 ‘Road to Compromise’ plan. It wastes upwards of \$30 million of taxpayer dollars versus just widening 41, and it destroys our county park and wetlands. Widen 41 as it is or come up with something else.” — Mt. Pleasant resident*

*“The Laurel Hill Parkway needs to be removed. This makes absolutely zero sense. Either leave highway 41 as is or widen it. Do not make a cut through that is useless. I have gone over the plans and drive this area every day and cannot fathom the use of it.” — Dunes West resident*

*“Remove Laurel Hill Bypass. Seriously, how many times do you have to hear it. You’d think after many public hearings where affected stakeholders were overwhelmingly against it and over 5,000 recorded comments you’d get the message.” — Mt. Pleasant resident*



Theme 3: Redirect Main–Mary Ann Point Funds to Maybank-Main-Bohicket Intersection

~15% of Q1 comments

Approximately 15% of Q1 comments — many in coordinated identical language — requested that funds earmarked for the Main–Mary Ann Point roundabout be redirected to the Maybank-Main-Bohicket intersection on Johns Island, which commenters described as a far more critical congestion point. Several respondents also requested that all 33 named programs with estimated completion timeframes be listed on the ballot.

Representative comments:

*“The Main-Mary Ann Point intersection funding should be transferred to fund improvements to the Maybank-Main-Bohicket intersection. That intersection is a major choke point!” — Johns Island resident*

*“Rather than funding a roundabout at the Main-Mary Ann Point intersection, the funds should be spent on part of the Maybank-Main-Bohicket intersection. Anyone who travels this road on a daily basis can see that the problem at Maybank needs to be addressed.” — Wadmalaw Island resident*

Theme 4: Remove or Reduce Transit / CARTA Funding

~10% of Q1 comments

Approximately 10% of Q1 comments called for reducing or eliminating transit funding, with many specifically citing CARTA’s low ridership and operational inefficiency. Several recommended redirecting those dollars entirely to roads and infrastructure.

Representative comments:

*“Public transit is an absolute waste. If it cannot support itself, it should be fully eliminated. Use the funds wasted on CARTA to fund the Greenbelt program and infrastructure. Charleston would be much better off without CARTA.” — Respondent*

*“Public transportation is an inner city matter and should come from city funding. Most out in rural areas don’t need transportation and shouldn’t be provided by the taxpayer.” — Respondent*

Theme 5: Remove Battery Extension / Greenbelt as Non-Transportation Projects

~8% of Q1 comments

Approximately 8% of Q1 comments argued that the Battery Extension and, to a lesser extent, Greenbelt projects do not belong in a Transportation Sales Tax and should be funded through separate mechanisms such as federal resilience grants or the general fund.

**Representative comments:**

*“Battery Extension project needs to be nixed. Where is a project to relieve congestion and accidents on Savannah Highway? If the Battery Extension project is in the final draft, I will not vote for this tax.” — West Ashley resident*

*“As this is a ‘transportation’ tax, priority should be placed on ‘transportation’ projects. Projects for other types of infrastructure, while beneficial and valid, should not be funded using transportation tax dollars.” — Respondent*

**Theme 6: Remove Specific Roundabouts / Low-Priority Intersection Projects**

~7% of Q1 comments

Approximately 7% of Q1 comments targeted specific projects for removal, including the SC-162 at Salters Hill roundabout, the SC-174 at SC-164 roundabout, the Doar/Sewee roundabout, and the Rivers Avenue/Durant overpass. Respondents questioned the traffic volumes at these locations and whether the costs were justified.

**Representative comments:**

*“How many cars go through Doar Rd at Sewee Rd to make that project a worthwhile investment? The money should be spent to raise Seabrook Island Road instead.” — Respondent*

*“The Rivers/Durant overpass at \$175.9M is not worth it. The rail companies are a separate issue that needs to be addressed with fines, not overpasses.” — Park Circle resident*

**Theme 7: Add More Johns Island / Southern Corridor Projects**

~7% of Q1 comments

Approximately 7% of respondents felt the project list underinvested in Johns Island and the southern corridor — particularly Maybank Highway widening, River Road improvements, and Bohicket/Betsy Kerrison. Many cited explosive residential growth with inadequate infrastructure.

**Representative comments:**

*“The Main Road widening and Wappoo Road/Savannah Hwy intersection are needed. Johns Island needs more congestion relief — too little has been done or planned, especially since 526 is off the table.”  
— Johns Island resident*

*“Main Road on Johns Island needs help for congestion. We are one of the fastest growing areas in the state and absolutely no infrastructure has been updated for the increased population.”  
— Johns Island resident*

## Question 2

- **Question:** “Please provide any additional input you would like to provide to Council for its consideration.”
- **Respondents:** 832

### Theme 1: Seabrook Island Road — Include in Funding

~30% of Q2 comments

Mirroring Q1, the single largest theme in Q2 was the call to fund Seabrook Island Road improvements. Approximately 30% of Q2 comments addressed this topic. Beyond flooding, respondents in Q2 emphasized emergency response delays, the impact on the new MUSC ER, the senior population at Seafields, and the argument that Seabrook residents will have contributed an estimated \$35–40 million to the TST over both cycles with no project return.

#### Representative comments:

*“Low-lying segments of Seabrook Island Road regularly experience tidal flooding during high tides and storm events. When flooding occurs, access to the island can be significantly restricted or completely cut off. During a nor’easter in December 2023, first responders were forced to rescue occupants from vehicles stranded in floodwaters.” — Seabrook Island resident*

*“It is my understanding that if we include the income from this proposed tax, Seabrook residents will have donated almost \$40 million toward the previous tax and this one, with no projects funded. This all-important road, the only access to the island, needs to be funded.” — Seabrook Island resident*

*“Seabrook Island deserves transportation funding that is Faster, Fairer, and Safer. Reliable access to Seabrook Island is not optional — it is essential for public safety, emergency response, evacuation, and the continued vitality of our community.” — Seabrook Island resident*

### Theme 2: Highway 41 / Laurel Hill Parkway — Withhold TST Support

~18% of Q2 comments

Approximately 18% of Q2 comments addressed Highway 41, with a significant coordinated block of near-identical comments explicitly stating the respondent will not vote for the TST until the Laurel Hill Parkway design is scrapped.

#### Representative comments:

*“I cannot support any extension of the Transportation Sales Tax until Charleston County puts forward a better plan for Highway 41. The current Laurel Hill Parkway design would destroy several acres of green space, cut through public parkland, and fails to reflect updated traffic modeling or community concerns.” — Mt. Pleasant resident*

*“The disregard for the majority of the public’s opinion regarding the Highway 41 project through Laurel Hill Park is insulting to anyone that travels that road on a daily basis. There is clearly something else in mind that requires the destruction of a park that was gifted to the town.” — North Mt. Pleasant resident*

*“Constituents have previously voted this tax and referendum down. This will happen again unless you remove the present plan for 41 and the Laurel Hill Parkway. Your seats on the council are at risk at the next election should the council continue to ignore your constituents.” — Respondent*

**Theme 3: Restore Greenbelt to 20% / List All 33 Projects on Ballot**

**~14% of Q2 comments**

Approximately 14% of Q2 comments — many using near-identical language — called for three changes: restoring greenbelt funding to the staff-recommended 20% (from the current 16.24%), redirecting the Main-Mary Ann Point funds to the Maybank-Main-Bohicket intersection, and requiring all 33 named programs with estimated completion timeframes to appear on the ballot.

**Representative comments:**

*“The Greenbelt funding for land conservation and parks should revert to the staff recommended 20% allocation. County Council reversed the allocations proposed by County staff that were a direct result of public input. This change is disrespectful to citizens.” — Respondent*

*“Greenbelt conservation funding should be at the previous 20% recommendation. We all know that conservation is a cost-effective way to reduce transportation needs, and we could use more green spaces for the exploding population.” — Respondent*

*“Funding the Greenbelt program by 25% and no less than 20% of the funds generated by the TST is critical. The Greenbelt project is the only tool the TST provides that can address unchecked overdevelopment, which is the root cause of our clogged roadways.” — Respondent*

**Theme 4: Trust, Accountability, and Past TST Spending Concerns**

**~12% of Q2 comments**

Approximately 12% of Q2 comments expressed distrust in County government’s stewardship of TST funds, citing the 526 extension cancellation, Hwy 41 delays, and unfinished projects from the prior tax cycle. Many demanded an itemized accounting of prior TST spending before supporting a new tax.



Representative comments:

*“What happened to the funds that were already allocated to road projects that were never done? I know I voted for a tax recently that was promising 526 extension which was cancelled without a public vote. This should not be allowed.” — Respondent*

*“Charleston County staff used public input to allocate 20% to Greenbelt funding, yet the allocation has been reduced. It’s not right. Council needs to demonstrate it can make decisions based on quantitative measures, not qualitative opinions.” — Respondent*

Theme 5: Calhoun Street Corridor — Strong Organized Support

~10% of Q2 comments

Approximately 10% of Q2 comments expressed coordinated support for the Calhoun Street Corridor project, citing flood mitigation and safe neighborhood access as the primary benefits.

Representative comments:

*“I support the Calhoun Street Corridor Project to ensure safe, reliable access to our neighborhood and to mitigate flooding. It must be done.” — Peninsula resident*

*“The Calhoun corridor drainage improvements need dedicated funding to address increased flooding and traffic congestion impacted by planned growth and increasing storm-generated flooding.” — Peninsula resident*

Theme 6: Overdevelopment — Halt Growth and Charge Developers

~10% of Q2 comments

Approximately 10% of Q2 comments expressed frustration that development is being approved faster than infrastructure can be built, and called for a moratorium on new approvals or for developers to bear infrastructure costs rather than existing taxpayers.

Representative comments:

*“I would like to see more thought and consideration of the traffic impact of proposed developments prior to approval. Johns Island in particular is experiencing tremendous growth and large developments are being approved with little or no consideration of the impact on roads already constricted.” — Johns Island resident*

*“Developers should bear the costs for infrastructure, not the existing tax base. Existing taxpayers are already bearing the brunt of too many costs associated with operating our government.” — Respondent*

*“We need to stop allowing uncontrolled building. Infrastructure cannot support current demand. Stop allowing wetlands to be destroyed.” — Respondent*

Theme 7: Invest More in Public Transit and Bike/Pedestrian Infrastructure

~9% of Q2 comments

Approximately 9% of Q2 comments argued for more transit and bike/pedestrian investment, citing induced demand from road widening, the need to reduce car dependency, and the disproportionate benefit of multimodal options for lower-income residents. Many noted that only one bike/pedestrian project appeared on the draft list.

Representative comments:

*“There is only one bike/pedestrian project proposed. This does not reflect the need for more bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure for ease of mobility without reliance on automobile transport.” — Respondent*

*“The best way to reduce congestion is to support folks getting out of their cars. A more robust transit system would actually address congestion by providing folks with an alternative to being one more car on the road.” — Peninsula commuter*

Theme 8: Geographic Inequity — West Ashley, James Island, Southern County

~9% of Q2 comments

Approximately 9% of Q2 comments expressed that West Ashley, James Island, southern communities, and beach towns are underrepresented in the project list relative to their tax contributions and growth. Mt. Pleasant residents, conversely, felt overtaxed with insufficient project return in this cycle.

Representative comments:

*“We are only getting 1 project in West Ashley. Too much money for the rest of the county and leaving West Ashley out as usual.” — West Ashley resident*

*“This proposed list shows a large disparity in the geographic location of proposed projects. There are no projects within 29412 and other areas — Folly Beach, James Island, Johns Island for the most part, Sullivan’s Island, Isle of Palms.” — Respondent*

*“Mt. Pleasant pays an overwhelming amount of the taxes in our area and is seeing the least amount of improvements.” — Mt. Pleasant resident*



Theme 9: Opposition to Tax Increase / Vote No

~7% of Q2 comments

Approximately 7% of Q2 comments expressed outright opposition to the sales tax, arguing that existing revenue should be managed better, that taxes are already too high, or that government cannot be trusted to execute on promises.

Representative comments:

*“I will not support any sales tax extension. Charleston County already has the highest taxes in the state. We need tax cuts, not more taxes.” — Respondent*

*“The fact that my car and property taxes keep rising is preposterous. No amount of taxpayer money seems to ever be enough. I’d actually be fine with maintaining what we have instead of spending another \$25 billion.” — Respondent*

Theme 10: Prioritize Road Maintenance Over New Projects

~5% of Q2 comments

Approximately 5% of Q2 comments argued that existing roads should be repaired and repaved before new capital projects are launched. Potholes, crumbling surfaces, and poor road conditions were mentioned frequently.

Representative comments:

*“Fix the potholes, sinkholes and let’s resurface some streets — starting with Huger! There is very little happening on the peninsula.” — Peninsula resident*

*“Road maintenance and repairs should be focused on as the quality of the downtown roads are generally poor. The greatest percentage of funding needs to be used for roads.” — Respondent*

# PUBLIC INPUT POLLING RESULTS

A statistically representative survey of Charleston County residents was conducted April 6–11, 2026 via live-operator phone and SMS/web. Results were weighted to reflect the county population across gender, age, ethnicity, education, geography, and party affiliation.

Consistent with the online survey, results indicate general alignment with the framework and priorities of the draft 2026 Transportation Sales Tax (TST) program, alongside more mixed views on the process and specific funding allocations.

## KEY FINDINGS

### Process Transparency

Resident opinion on whether the process has been transparent and community driven is effectively split, with a narrow +1.1% net margin separating “Yes” from “No.” Notably, 27% of respondents selected “unsure,” indicating a substantial share of residents without a definitive view of the process.

### Guiding Principles

The guiding principles are the strongest-performing component (+48% net), with majority support across party, geography, and age groups. This reflects broad alignment with the program’s stated goals and priorities.

### Project Selection

A majority of respondents view the project scoring and selection process as fair (+37% net), outperforming overall perceptions of transparency and indicating stronger confidence in the evaluation framework.

### Funding Allocations

- **Roads & Infrastructure:** +9% net “too low,” indicating greater concern about underinvestment than overinvestment
- **Greenbelt:** +9% net “too low,” reflecting moderate support for increased funding
- **Public Transit:** –8% net, indicating more respondents view funding as too high than too low

Across all categories, large shares of respondents selected “about right” or “unsure,” indicating limited consensus on specific allocation levels.

# APPENDIX: POLL RESULTS



## SURVEY OF CHARLESTON COUNTY RESIDENTS

*n=1,276 RESIDENTS MoE=±2.7% FIELDDED: APR 6-11, 2026*

*The survey was fielded April 6-11, 2026. Potential respondents were randomly selected from a database of Charleston residents and contacted via either a live-operator phone call or an SMS message that led to a web-based survey. Respondents were screened to ensure they were residents of Charleston County. Results were weighted using an iterative proportional fitting process to match the known attributes of the Charleston population on the variables of gender, age, ethnicity, educational attainment, geographic area, and political party affiliation. This weighting model was created using data sourced from the United States Census Bureau American Community Survey Public Use Microdata, as well as the South Carolina Election Commission. The final sample of qualified respondents is n=1,276 residents, and the survey has a margin of error of ±2.7% with 95% confidence.*

DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES OF CHARLESTON COUNTY RESIDENTS		
GENDER	Female	51.4%
	Male	47.6%
	Non-binary or Other	1.0%
AGE	18-34 years old	28.9%
	35-44	18.4%
	45-54	14.1%
	55-64	15.8%
	65+	22.8%
ETH	White or Caucasian	67.4%
	Black or African American	21.3%
	Other	11.4%
EDUCATION	Attended high school but have not graduated, or a high school degree or equivalent	23.7%
	Attended some college, but have not earned a degree yet, or Earned an Associate's degree	26.8%
	Earned a Bachelor's degree	30.1%
	Earned a Master's degree, Doctoral degree, or professional degree beyond a Bachelor's degree	19.5%
POLITICAL	Democrat	18.6%
	Republican	22.3%
	Unaffiliated, Third Party, Unsure, or Not Registered	59.1%
GEO*	City of Charleston	32.7%
	City of North Charleston	25.0%
	North and East	21.6%
	South and West	20.7%

\* "North and East" includes Mount Pleasant, Isle of Palms, Sullivan's Island, Awendaw, and McClellanville. "South and West" includes Summerville, James Island, Hollywood, Ravenel, Folly Beach, Seabrook Island, Kiawah Island, Meggett, Lincolnville, Rockville, and all unincorporated areas of the county.\*

**TOPLINE SURVEY RESPONSES**

<b>Q3 - RESIDENCY</b>	<b>About how long have you lived in Charleston County?</b>	
	Entire life	25.8%
	Moved here less than 1 year ago	2.7%
	Moved here 1-4 years ago	12.0%
	Moved here 5-9 years ago	16.2%
	Moved here 10-19 years ago	17.9%
	Moved here 20 years ago or more	25.5%

<b>Q4 - TRANSPARENT &amp; COMM DRIVEN</b>	<p>The 2004 half cent Transportation Sales Tax is set to expire in 2027. Last Fall, Charleston County Council began a broad-based public, municipal, and stakeholder listening effort to gather input on the current and future transportation needs for a potential extension of the Transportation Sales Tax.</p> <p>As part of that effort, County staff attended and presented at 67 public and stakeholder meetings across Charleston County. This outreach resulted in nearly 29,000 public comments, more than 600 individual project requests, and approximately \$68 billion in identified transportation needs.</p> <p>Do you believe the process thus far has been transparent and community driven?</p>	
	Yes, definitely	12.7%
	Yes, somewhat	24.3%
	No, not really	20.9%
	No, not at all	15.0%
	Unsure	27.2%
	<b>Total "Yes" vs. Total "No" Margin</b>	<b>1.1%</b>

**Q5 - GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

Using public input, County Council adopted a set of guiding principles to inform future Transportation Sales Tax (TST) decisions. I'd like to quickly read them to you, they are:

**Finish What Was Promised**

Complete key projects carried forward from the existing Transportation Sales Tax program.

**Focus on Congestion Relief and Safety**

Invest fairly across the county to reduce congestion and improve roadway safety brought on by growth.

**Support Multimodal Mobility**

Enhance communities with sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and transit services that address identified needs and improve mobility.

**Use Greenbelt Investments to Manage Growth and Protect Quality of Life**

Protect natural areas through continued Greenbelt investments that help limit overdevelopment and support long-term quality of life.

**Build Resilient Infrastructure**

Integrate flood mitigation and resiliency measures into transportation projects to strengthen infrastructure.

**Ensure Transparency and Accountability**

Maintain strong oversight and clear communication to demonstrate progress and responsible stewardship of public funds.

**Do you believe these guiding principles are fair and reflect the mindset of Charleston County residents?**

<b>Yes, definitely</b>	40.1%
<b>Yes, somewhat</b>	28.4%
<b>No, not really</b>	10.6%
<b>No, not at all</b>	9.8%
<b>Unsure</b>	11.1%
<b>Total "Yes" vs. Total "No" Margin</b>	<b>48.1%</b>

**Q6 - SELECTION PROCESS**

All projects being considered as part of a potential Transportation Sales Tax extension were evaluated using a 100-point scoring system based on public and municipal support, congestion relief, and safety improvements, as well as consistency with the guiding principles.

**Do you believe this is a fair selection process?**

*(asked to n=692 respondents)*

<b>Yes, definitely</b>	22.6%
<b>Yes, somewhat</b>	38.3%
<b>No, not really</b>	12.2%
<b>No, not at all</b>	11.9%
<b>Unsure</b>	15.1%
<b>Total "Yes" vs. Total "No" Margin</b>	<b>36.8%</b>

**Q7 - ROADS AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

Earlier this year, County Council voted to advance a working draft of a potential 2026 Transportation Sales Tax program, which is estimated to generate \$4.25 billion over 25 years.

**Funding is structured as follows:**

- 64% or \$2.7 billion towards infrastructure projects like roads and intersections.
- 20% or \$860 million for public transportation like CARTA buses and Lowcountry Rapid Transit
- 16% or \$690 million for the greenbelt program which funds parks and land conservation

**Do you believe the 64% or \$2.7 billion towards roads and infrastructure is:**

Too low	24.2%
About right	30.1%
Too high	15.2%
Unsure	30.5%

**Q8 - PUBLIC TRANSP**

**Do you believe the 20% or \$860 million for public transportation like CARTA buses is:**

Too low	19.8%
About right	28.8%
Too high	28.1%
Unsure	23.3%

**Q9 - GREENBELT**

**Do you believe the 16% or \$690 million for the greenbelt program for parks and land conservation is:**

Too low	28.6%
About right	32.6%
Too high	19.2%
Unsure	19.6%



<b>Q15 - HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>	<b>What is your total annual household income before taxes?</b>	
	Under \$25,000	7.3%
	\$25,000 – \$49,999	12.2%
	\$50,000 – \$74,999	13.7%
	\$75,000 – \$99,999	10.7%
	\$100,000 – \$149,999	14.4%
	\$150,000 – \$199,999	11.6%
	\$200,000 or more	13.6%
	Prefer not to say	16.6%

