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Introduction

Through careful planning and a publicly supported funding initiative, the Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission (CCPRC) was able to nearly double its park land between 2006 and 2012. The 15 newly purchased properties created 10 new park sites and expanded three existing park properties. CCPRC now has 10,078 acres in its park system.

Poised for facility expansion, a road map for growth was needed. CCPRC began the process of developing this 10-year vision in March 2012, with the help of GreenPlay, LLC and its consulting team. Through public workshops, surveys, and research, the current and future recreational needs of Charleston County were assessed to help CCPRC plan, fund, manage, and develop parks, facilities, trails, and programs.

The outcome of this extensive process is the Comprehensive Park, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan, the Parks for Tomorrow Plan, which will guide CCPRC as improvements to the park system are planned over the next ten years. The priorities established in this plan will assist CCPRC in its goal to provide an accessible and diverse offering of parks and recreation facilities and programs to all residents of Charleston County.
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A. Purpose and Goals

The Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan will help to further the mission of Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission (CCPRC) while determining additional service needs that can be provided in harmony with other recreation providers. This 10-year growth plan focuses on immediate, short-term, and longer-term capital development and improvement strategies that correspond to the community’s unmet needs and priority investments for critical parks and recreation services. This plan articulates a clear vision (a “road map”) for CCPRC’s future that:

- Identifies and serves current and future parks and recreational needs through an integrated park system that provides adequate open space, recreational services and facilities, trails, and stewardship of natural and cultural resources.
- Provides an accessible and diverse offering of parks and recreation facilities and programs to all residents of Charleston County.
- Establishes the updated greenways and trails master plan, including trails for recreational use within park facilities, as well as County-wide greenway corridors and linkages.
- Develops an action plan – a strategy for prioritizing, phasing, funding, and accomplishing the identified needs.

B. History and Planning Context

“The Charleston County Park, Recreation and Tourist Commission was created in 1968 as a county special purpose district by an act of the South Carolina legislature. The original act was amended in 1972, authorizing the Commission to promote Charleston’s historical and tourist attractions, to create and operate countywide parks and recreation facilities, and to provide technical assistance to existing park and recreation agencies and community groups.

“In July 1985, the Commission’s tourism function was transferred to the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce and the commission was renamed Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission. CCPRC represents one of the most unique park and recreation agencies in the State of South Carolina.

“The agency has specific areas of responsibility that are defined through our legislative act. The Commission is charged with the responsibility to provide park and recreation services, but not to duplicate services provided by the other municipalities and special recreation districts existing in the area.

“One of the prime responsibilities of the Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission is the development of a countywide park system. These parks are generally of a size and scope that would not be developed by other municipalities and public service districts. The park system emphasizes passive activities, outdoor recreation, environmental education, and public beach access. Each park facility offers a variety of programming generally directed toward the natural features and characteristics of the site. The staff and commission[ers] of the Charleston County Park and Recreation [Commission] are committed to maintaining high standards in the delivery of leisure services and facilities to the citizens of Charleston County.”

C. Planning Process

In February 2012, CCPRC engaged the services of a team of consultants with national and local recreation planning experience to assist in developing this master plan guided by a staff Project Team. The consultant team, led by Colorado-based GreenPlay LLC, assessed existing parks, trails, recently acquired undeveloped lands, recreation facilities and services, and new opportunities through research, site visits, and a comprehensive public engagement process. The consultant team reviewed administrative, land, facility, programmatic, and industry trends, as well as demographic trends, and considered best practices. A comprehensive needs assessment, gap analysis, and level of service analysis were also performed as part of their process.

D. Guiding Principles

Based on the public and stakeholder input received throughout the planning process, the following guiding principles were identified to provide a framework for parks and recreation within CCPRC.

- Parks and recreation opportunities are provided to promote healthy active lifestyles and connect people to nature.
- Core services include management and protection of historically or culturally significant resources, land acquisition, and environmental stewardship.
- The community is engaged in planning decisions.
- Environmental, social, and financial sustainability guides planning and operations.
- Provide park facilities within a 15-minute drive time or less to every resident.
- Priorities include providing recreation programs and services for all age groups, connectivity and development of hiking/biking trails and greenways, more water and beach access, improve or expand existing park facilities, and develop new parks on recently acquired lands.
E. Mission, Vision, and Core Values

CCPRC Mission
“The Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission will improve the quality of life in Charleston County by offering a diverse system of park facilities, programs, and services.”

CCPRC Vision
“CCPRC continues their legacy of preservation for the public good through responsible stewardship, management, and improvement of the current public entrusted infrastructure; and through the balance of passive, active, and entrepreneurial planning and development for the undeveloped properties acquired through the 1992 bond program.”

Core Values
“Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission is making a commitment to a new set of Core Values. This effort will ensure that we leave some blue up above and some green on the ground. Adopting these important values ensures a thriving park system for our children and grandchildren.”

Community Enrichment – Enriching lives through education and programs
Leadership – Providing professional staff development
Fun – Delivering fun to customers
Exceptional Customer Service – Always focusing on you
Health and Wellness – Providing and promoting healthy lifestyle opportunities
Quality – Striving for quality throughout the park system
Diversity – Fostering diverse populations of vendors, employees, and customers
Safety – Ensuring safe and secure environments
Accessibility – Providing accessibility through affordable options and a variety of offerings
Stewardship – Preserving and conserving cultural, natural, and historical resources
Building a Legacy – Maintaining a vision for the future while sustaining a healthy park system
“Over the past 5 years, CCPRC has doubled the acreage in its park system, now totaling nearly 10,000 acres. As we dream about future improvements (keeping in mind that quality recreation facilities and programs cost money to provide and maintain), how much additional property tax would you be willing to pay annually to increase recreational opportunities in Charleston County?”

Based on this information, most survey respondents (36%) stated that they would be willing to increase property taxes by $1 to $10 annually, 28 percent were willing to pay an annual increase of $11 to $20, and 17 percent indicated that they were willing to pay more than $20 in increased property taxes. Less than 20 percent of respondents indicated that they would not be willing to increase property taxes.

If a bond referendum was identified as a viable funding source for parkland expansion, 73 percent of respondents said that they would support passing a vote for this option (31 percent “definitely support”; 42 percent “probably support”). Whereas nine percent said that they would not support passing a vote. Eighteen percent were neutral.

G. Key Findings

Public Engagement

A series of six public meetings and several small focus group meetings with staff, potential partners, and key stakeholders were conducted in June and July 2012, resulting in these key findings.

- Provide a variety of affordable services
- Maintain quality infrastructure
- Pursue partnerships for sustainable services
- Get the word out and expand marketing efforts
- Grow what we have – trails, water access, camping, environmental opportunities, etc.
- Increase rural recreation areas that are underserved
- Develop parks on newly acquired lands

Survey

A random, statistically-valid survey, as well as an open on-line survey, yielded input from over 3,000 residents. The following survey conclusions provide understanding of usage patterns and recreation preferences, and help to establish priorities.

- CCPRC parks, programs, and services are well loved and used.
- Water access, maintaining what the community already has, development of recently acquired properties, and trails are priorities for the Charleston community.
- There appears to be support for a future taxation measure to develop the newly acquired properties, improve the system, and address prioritized unmet needs.

“Thank you for allowing us to give feedback regarding our special view of the world!! Keep up the great job!”

Survey write-in comment
Analysis of Inventory & Services

Key Issues for Existing Developed Lands
Through public and stakeholder input, consultant team observation and expertise, GRASP® level of service analysis, and the needs assessment, the following key issues were identified for consideration.

For Regional Parks and Special Use Facilities
- Wayfinding signage is needed for waterparks on adjacent highways.
- Complete the Folly Beach County Park re-nourishment project.
- Additional parking is needed at all three CCPRC beach properties.
- Wannamaker County Park may be at capacity, and phase 2 is warranted.
- Maintain and sustain amenities at James Island County Park with a focus on upgrades and repurposing of existing amenities to enhance visitor experience.
- Enhance amenities at Palmetto Islands Park to increase annual visitors.

For Rural Recreation Areas
- Rural areas have gaps in level of service.
- There are opportunities to partner with the School District to utilize school sites for recreation facilities.
- Level of quality in amenities is not consistent across rural recreation sites.
- Rural recreation sites at school facilities should feel welcoming to users.
- Opportunities exist to strengthen educational experience and public involvement at school sites.

For Water Access
As the population continues to grow, access to the water both for boating opportunities and other water-based recreational activities becomes more limited. Parking at popular boat launches is already a major issue, along with conflicts between boaters, fishing and crabbing, and non-motorized users. More boat landings are needed.

Key Issues For Planning of Undeveloped Lands
There are a number of significant criteria that will drive the planning and development of undeveloped lands in the coming years. Each of the following items should be considered not only within the context of the individual property, but also within the framework of the overall park system. The criteria are shown in no particular order of importance, as they should all be evaluated equally in the determination of parkland development, prioritization, and planning.
- GRASP® level of service (LOS)/accessibility to user population
- Programming based on community identified needs/survey results/public input meetings
- Connectivity/trails
- Management and protection of natural and cultural resources
- Access to water
- Impacts/development considerations:
  - Environmental sensitivity
  - Physical conditions of site
  - Deed restrictions/conservation easements
  - Adjacent existing development/surrounding context
  - Population context
  - Political considerations
• Revenue potential/funding – Significant financial resources will be required to implement the planning and construction necessary to realize the recommendations of this plan. CCPRC will need to consider a number of possible revenue streams as well as establishing priorities for respective projects that are based on balancing expenses with known revenue streams. Possible funding mechanisms could include:
  ▪ Revenue bonds
  ▪ Increasing user fees
  ▪ Create sponsorship opportunities for capital improvements
  ▪ Grants
  ▪ Expand existing or create new revenue generating features/activities
  ▪ Improve attendance by marketing to new and different user groups
  ▪ Financial partnerships/joint ventures

Key Issues For Trails
As a whole, Charleston County has qualities naturally suited for bicycling, walking, and trail activity and for trail and greenway development. The County benefits from:
• Scenic, protected natural areas and undevelopable wetlands
• Flat terrain
• Climate for year-round bicycling and walking
• Relatively dense, mixed-use areas (such as North Charleston)
• Master-planned bike and walk friendly developments (such as I'on Village)
• Bike and walk friendly beach communities (such as Isle of Palms)
• Popular recreation amenities and outdoor attractions
• Segments of two long-distance trails, (the Palmetto Trail and the East Coast Greenway)

The following key needs were identified with regard to trails.
• Improved access to trails in urban areas
• Provide trails in undeveloped parks for multiple users: hiking, mountain biking, equestrian, and ATV
• Improve and increase ADA accessible trails within parks
• Connect trails to municipal and county parks
• Improve and repair existing trails
• Expand trail network
  ▪ Trails in new properties
  ▪ Connector trails between parks and mountain bike trails

The trail recommendations of this Plan address the community-identified goals of expanding Charleston County’s existing trail system and creating bicycle and pedestrian access to park and recreation facilities. Recommendations build on the strengths of the existing CCPRC parks and recreation system and previous bicycle, pedestrian, and trail planning efforts. Proposed improvements are organized as follows:
• Recommended Trail Facility Types
• Regional Trails
• Interior Park Trails
• Water-based Trials
• Trail Network Recommendations by Sub-Area
• Implementation Strategies
Key Issues for Programs
Through public and stakeholder input, survey results, consultant team observation and expertise, and the needs assessment, the following key issues were identified for consideration:

- Because of weather and environmental issues related to Lowcountry living and the proximity to many bodies of open water, all Charleston County youth should know how to swim and feel comfortable in the water.
- Wedding venues and event destinations are an opportunity for service expansion in Charleston County.
- Ecotourism is a program area ripe for expansion.
- Nature programs and environmental education are highly valued.
- Festivals are well attended and desired services.
- Providing recreation opportunities to rural recreation sites will require partnerships and creative, leveraged uses of existing resources. Both CCPRC owned and managed sites and school sites should be invested in as growth and demand necessitate.

Key Issues for Operations and Management
CCPRC is one of the premiere park and recreation agencies in the nation and provides a sustainable operation with their many entrepreneurial endeavors. Identifying and anticipating industry trends have helped them refine their service portfolio and be responsive to opportunistic endeavors as they present themselves. Continual self-analysis and feedback identified these areas for attention:

- CCPRC should continue to seek the sustainable balance between available resources and needs, revenues and expenses, passive and active recreation opportunities, development and preservation, etc. as they provide services into the future.
- There was a consistent message throughout the internal and external input process that CCPRC needed to upgrade their registration and rental software, along with the possibility of linking it to an upgraded point-of-sale software. Both could be linked to the financial tracking software system.
- There was a consistent message throughout the public input process that improved marketing efforts to inform the public of facilities, activities, services, and update was desirable.
- Internal staff focus groups pointed out the need to streamline the process to get marketing materials approved and created.
- CCPRC should continue to let the public know how they leveraged the half-cent sales tax bond money to get approximately twice the amount of public land for parks.
- CCPRC should package the costs of the priority items identified in the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan and develop a strategy to educate the public to vote for another bond referendum that will finance the development of the recommended improvements.

H. Summary of Plan Recommendations
The recommendations are provided for 1-3, 4-7, and 8-10 years out and are not in priority order. In addition, flexibility with this plan is warranted, because unique, opportunistic enterprises for entrepreneurial ventures or other partnerships may arise as CCPRC moves forward. It is realistic to assume that unique circumstances will arise, providing opportunities for CCPRC to participate in recreation options that are not currently quantifiable. Whether through property acquisition or by partnering with other entities in the design, construction, and/or management of recreation facilities or programs, CCPRC should remain open to opportunities that would further its mission.
Recommendations are provided for:

- Existing Developed Lands
- Undeveloped Lands
- Trails
- Opportunity Enterprises including acquisition

Additional operational and programmatic suggestions and recommendations can be found in other chapters in this document and are not included here, because most of them do not have financial implications.

Capital recommendations for existing developed lands, undeveloped lands, and trails by Sub-Area:

- West Sub-Area: $29,635,000
- Charleston Central Sub-Area: $28,442,000
- North Sub-Area: $45,596,000
- East Sub-Area: $20,256,500
- All: $16,213,600
- Location TBD: $19,935,000

The entire capital campaign totals $160,078,100 not including acquisition and other costs to be determined.

- Years 1-3: $61,795,700
- Years 4-7: $49,167,200
- Years 8-10: $49,115,200

Funding from General Obligation Bonds will help provide short- and mid-term priority projects, feasibility studies and conceptual planning efforts identified in this Master Plan. Additional longer-term facilities are proposed and funds will need to be identified to support additional improvements. There is a potential to use revenue bonds for revenue producing facilities. Leveraging resources through partnerships and grants will be important to successful implementation of many of the plan’s recommendations. CCPRC may also need to consider operational funding increases as well.

J. Summary

Charleston County is home to over 350,000 diverse residents, some of whom are avid users of CCPRC’s parks, facilities and services, and others who are not aware of what the CCPRC system has to offer. This Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan provides a vision and strategies to enhance popular indoor and outdoor recreational activities and add new ones to engage diverse communities. An “all hands on deck” approach is needed (among staff, stakeholders, and partners) to embrace the Plan’s vision and guiding principles. This master plan helps position the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission to proactively plan for the future and ensure its legacy as a valued treasure for the next century and beyond.
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Chapter 2: CCPRC Today – Perspective and Context

A. Purpose of This Plan – Project Vision

Created in 1968, the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission (CCPRC) functions as a Special Purpose Public Service District whose areas of responsibility have been determined through a legislative act. CCPRC boasts one of the County’s premier park and recreation systems, predominantly serving Charleston County, along with a secondary service market of Berkley and Dorchester Counties. Organizationally, CCPRC emphasizes appropriate cost recovery, community engagement, and best practices in parks and recreation. As the size of the park system recently doubled with the purchase of additional land acquisitions, CCPRC must determine the appropriate level of sustainable development, open space preservation, and strategies to provide a balanced and/or improved level of service.

Project Vision

The Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan will help further the mission of CCPRC and determines additional service needs that can be provided in harmony with other recreation providers. The 10-year growth plan focuses on immediate, short-term, and longer-term capital development and improvement strategies that correspond to the community’s unmet needs and priority investments for critical parks and recreation services. This study articulates a clear vision (a “road map”) for CCPRC’s future that:

- Identifies and serves current and future parks and recreational needs through an integrated park system that provides adequate open space, recreational services and facilities, trails, and stewardship of natural and cultural resources.
- Provides an accessible and diverse offering of parks and recreation facilities and programs to all residents of Charleston County.
- Establishes an updated greenways and trails master plan, including trails for recreational use within park facilities, as well as County-wide greenway corridors and linkages.
- Develops an action plan: a strategy for prioritizing, phasing, funding, and accomplishing the identified needs.

Critical Success Factors

To kick off the project, the team identified key “Critical Success Factors” that ensured the project’s success, and determined CCPRC’s desired level of involvement and outcomes.

“The Charleston County Park, Recreation and Tourist Commission was created in 1968 as a county special purpose district by an act of the South Carolina legislature. The original act was amended in 1972, authorizing the Commission to promote Charleston’s historical and tourist attractions, to create and operate countywide parks and recreation facilities, and to provide technical assistance to existing park and recreation agencies and community groups.

“In July 1985, the Commission’s tourism function was transferred to the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce and the commission was renamed Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission. CCPRC represents one of the most unique park and recreation agencies in the State of South Carolina.

“The agency has specific areas of responsibility that are defined through our legislative act. The Commission is charged with the responsibility to provide park and recreation services, but not to duplicate services provided by the other municipalities and special recreation districts existing in the area.
“One of the prime responsibilities of the Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission is the development of a countywide park system. These parks are generally of a size and scope that would not be developed by other municipalities and public service districts. The park system emphasizes passive activities, outdoor recreation, environmental education, and public beach access. Each park facility offers a variety of programming generally directed toward the natural features and characteristics of the site. The staff and commission[ers] of the Charleston County Park and Recreation [Commission] are committed to maintaining high standards in the delivery of leisure services and facilities to the citizens of Charleston County.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Success Factors</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensure that key stakeholders and partners, including community groups, municipalities, school district representatives, special interest groups, business community, staff, and County officials have an opportunity to participate in the process.</td>
<td>1. Determine list of invited stakeholders and partners and provide multiple opportunities for participation and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prioritize capital improvement projects, determine costs, and provide potential funding sources.</td>
<td>2. Determine priorities based on the results of the needs assessment, gap analysis, fundability, and desired level of service scores using a strategic development/improvement methodology, not a cookie-cutter approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create a future vision for agency growth.</td>
<td>3. Identify and prioritize the public recreation needs and desires through surveys, interviews, and workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establish new park prototypes that will better define the agency.</td>
<td>4. Determine park prototypes that will fit the current and future structure of the park system, based on facilities, programs, and cultural and natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Define the boundaries for facilities and programs, and the customer base for those who use the park system.</td>
<td>5. Determine service areas where facilities should be located and where they should be conducted, and determine who uses and will likely use the park system into the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identify opportunities to improve management and efficiency as the park system grows.</td>
<td>6. Identify needed policies and procedures to sustain operational and financial growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology of this Planning Process

Utilizing their collective experience and knowledge, coupled with best practices in parks and recreation planning, the consultant team assisted the Commission in creating a plan that helps further the mission of CCPRC, while accomplishing the goals as stated in the project vision (see previous page).

The consultant team integrated financial, environmental, and social sustainability concepts into all aspects of the planning process to help create a management balance for the CCPRC community.

Related Planning Efforts and Integration

This section provides a summary of related planning efforts that impact CCPRC’s master plan. The trails-specific related planning efforts, as well as other related trails planning efforts, are described and included in Chapter 12 – The Trails System Today. The seven overarching, relevant planning documents that are currently active within the County were reviewed for this PROST Master Plan and are listed in Table 1 and are summarized in Appendix A.

Table 1: Related Planning Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROST Master Plan Related Planning Efforts</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year (listed alphabetically)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston County Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Charleston County</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Edisto Plan</td>
<td>East Edisto</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Recreation, Park, and Open Space Standards and Guidelines</td>
<td>NRPA</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment Report for Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission (MLL)</td>
<td>CCPRC</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment Study for Water Based Recreation Programs and Facilities (LS3P)</td>
<td>CCPRC</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Five Coastal County Boat Ramp Study (JGT)</td>
<td>Charleston County</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)</td>
<td>State of South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails-Specific Related Planning Efforts (discussed in detail in Chapter 12 – The Trails System Today)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Year (listed alphabetically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Charleston Dorchester (BCD) Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Action Plan (Toole Design Group)</td>
<td>BCD Council of Governments</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Bicycle Master Plan 2012</td>
<td>City of Charleston</td>
<td>Authored in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston County Comprehensive Greenbelt Plan</td>
<td>Charleston County</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATS and Charleston County Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan (HOH Associates)</td>
<td>CHATS and Charleston County</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATS Long Range Transportation Plan 2030</td>
<td>CHATS</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive CCPRC Trails Study and Recommendation</td>
<td>CCPRC</td>
<td>2003 (updated 2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timeline for Completing the Parks for Tomorrow Plan**

The Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan began in March 2012 and was completed in July 2013.
### Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission

**Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails Master Plan – Proposed (3.1.12) Revised (7.23.12)**

- Public Meeting
- Interest/Focus Group Meetings
- Formal Presentation

CCPRC meetings are the 3rd Monday at 5:30pm each month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Phases:**

- **Contract Negotiations**
- **Strategic Kick-off (SKO)**
- **Research and Community Engagement**
- **Analysis and Recommendations**

**Tentative Dates:**

- **Notice of Award:** 2/29/12
- **April 5, 2012 (KB/PO):**
- **Week of June 18th, 2012 (KB/PO):**
- **July 23-27, 2012 (KB/PO):**
- **November 19-20, 2012 (KB/PO):**
- **TBD (KB):**

**Summary of GreenPlay Team Trips:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Negotiations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Kick-off (SKO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Gathering**

- X

**Public Engagement**

- X

**Statistically-Valid Survey**

- X

**Level of Service – Gaps & Saturation – Demand Analysis**

- X

**Costs and Funding**

- X

**CIP & Implementation Plan**

- X

**Task/Timeline**

- **Project Phases:**
  - Contract Negotiations
  - Strategic Kick-off (SKO)
  - Research and Community Engagement
  - Analysis and Recommendations

- **Tentative Dates:**
  - Notice of Award: 2/29/12
  - April 5, 2012 (KB/PO)
  - Week of June 18th, 2012 (KB/PO)
  - July 23-27, 2012 (KB/PO)
  - November 19-20, 2012 (KB/PO)
  - TBD (KB)

**Summary of GreenPlay Team Trips:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Start-up meetings with staff, Critical Success Factor, values, community issues, vision and mission</td>
<td>June 18th</td>
<td>Stakeholders identified, Tour system, Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information gathering, Public Engagement (7 focus groups, 20 interviews)</td>
<td>June 18th</td>
<td>Inventory begins, Survey Instrument Development, Trends, CCPRC meeting – project introduction (June 18th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Survey instrument finalized and sample obtained, Inventory confirmed, More stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>July 23-27, 2012 (KB/PO)</td>
<td>LOS analysis on inventory, cultural factors, and natural features, trails, Conduct survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trip 5**

- Present Draft Master Plan
- CCPRC meeting – draft plan presentation (February 18th)

**Trip 6**

- Review and revisions to draft plan
- Final document presentation
- CCPRC meeting
B. History of the District (by CCPRC)

History

“The Charleston County Park, Recreation and Tourist Commission was created in 1968 as a county special purpose district by an act of the South Carolina legislature. The original act was amended in 1972, authorizing the Commission to promote Charleston’s historical and tourist attractions, to create and operate countywide parks and recreation facilities, and to provide technical assistance to existing park and recreation agencies and community groups.

“In July 1985, the Commission's tourism function was transferred to the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce and the commission was renamed Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission. CCPRC represents one of the most unique park and recreation agencies in the State of South Carolina.

“The agency has specific areas of responsibility that are defined through our legislative act. The Commission is charged with the responsibility to provide park and recreation services, but not to duplicate services provided by the other municipalities and special recreation districts existing in the area.

“One of the prime responsibilities of the Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission is the development of a countywide park system. These parks are generally of a size and scope that would not be developed by other municipalities and public service districts. The park system emphasizes passive activities, outdoor recreation, environmental education, and public beach access. Each park facility offers a variety of programming generally directed toward the natural features and characteristics of the site. The staff and commission[ers] of the Charleston County Park and Recreation [Commission] are committed to maintaining high standards in the delivery of leisure services and facilities to the citizens of Charleston County.”

CCPRC Mission

The Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission will improve the quality of life in Charleston County by offering a diverse system of park facilities, programs, and services.

- Provision of park and recreation facilities in an efficient and economical manner
- Acquisition of park land and open space
- Recreation services and programs to meet county wide needs
- Knowledge through the interpretation of the county’s natural, historic, and cultural resources
- Stewardship through responsible management

Chapter 2: CCPRC Today – Perspective and Context

Core Values

“Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission is making a commitment to a new set of Core Values. This effort will ensure that we leave some blue up above and some green on the ground. Adopting these important values ensures a thriving park system for our children and grandchildren.”

*Community Enrichment* – Enriching lives through education and programs

*Leadership* – Providing professional staff development

*Fun* – Delivering fun to customers

*Exceptional Customer Service* – Always focusing on you

*Health and Wellness* – Providing and promoting healthy lifestyle opportunities

*Quality* – Striving for quality throughout the park system

*Diversity* – Fostering diverse populations of vendors, employees, and customers

*Safety* – Ensuring safe and secure environments

*Accessibility* – Providing accessibility through affordable options and a variety of offerings

*Stewardship* – Preserving and conserving cultural, natural, and historical resources

*Building a Legacy* – Maintaining a vision for the future while sustaining a healthy park system

CCPRC Future Vision

CCPRC continues their legacy of “preservation for the public good” through responsible stewardship, management, and improvement of the current public entrusted infrastructure and through the balance of passive, active, and entrepreneurial planning and development for the undeveloped properties acquired through the 1992 bond program.

Identity

CCPRC Is Known For . . .

- Being voted the best park in Berkeley County – Wannamaker Park (although it is not in Berkley County)
- Outside: #6 Best Town Ever – *Outside* magazine, 2011
- Surfing: Folly Beach, “One of 25 Dream Towns for Best Surfing on East Coast” – *Outside* magazine, 2010
- Biking: Charleston, SC is a 2010 “Bike Town” – *Bicycling* magazine, 2010. It is also 29th on “America’s TOP 50 Bike-Friendly Cities” – *Bicycling* magazine, 2010
C. District Structure and Overview

CCPRC was established as a Special Purpose District in 1968, with specific areas of responsibility defined by state legislation. CCPRC’s operations are overseen by a seven-member board that is appointed by the Governor upon the recommendation of the Charleston Legislative Delegation.

With a recent acquisition of 5,000 acres of potential parks and open space property, a top spot on Condé Nast Traveler’s “Top Ten Cities,” a multitude of diverse recreational opportunities for residents, and an abundance of cultural and historical resources, Charleston County, South Carolina is a great place to live, work, play, and visit. GreenPlay is currently working with the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission (CCPRC) to develop a Parks, Recreation, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan.

Tom O’Rourke, CCPRC’s Executive Director states, “We recently completed a park purchase plan that resulted in our Park System doubling in size from 5,000 total acres to 10,000 total acres. With this expansion there now is a park within a reasonable distance from all points in Charleston County. That is an amazing feat for a County that is 100 miles long.”

All of this additional acreage will be put to use, and a goal of this plan is to determine the best way in which to achieve this. “The public will determine the individual desires, but it is essential that we expand on our Core Values of Health and Wellness and Environmental Stewardship in our future planning. We are in a perfect position to make each person in our County healthier and to also be a leader in the protection of our cultural and natural resources.”

The CCPRC manages parks, recreation, open space, and other facilities that are cherished by residents and attractive to visitors. People who love water recreation have many rivers and lakes to choose from, or they can play in the ocean on one of Charleston County’s beach parks. For those who aren’t brave enough to recreate in open water, there are also several water parks and aquatics facilities. History buffs can tour several historic sites and take in the local culture.

Charleston County also offers several elegant and picturesque wedding venues for travelers and residents alike. In fact, it is home to the largest wedding cruise ship in the harbor.

Features and amenities such as these contribute to a high quality of life enjoyed by county residents.

Additionally, the CCPRC’s responsibilities in the provision of parks and recreation services and amenities are determined by a legislative act. The CCPRC provides parks and recreation services to the County, but cannot duplicate services that are already in place through other agencies within the county. It is also important to the Commission to ensure that everyone in the community can enjoy its offerings. “...we have found a way to create an agency that exists for ALL people, whether they have the ability to pay or not. Our mission, vision, and values drive our agency, not money. We have created an Enterprise based agency that is there for all people in the County regardless of the ability to pay,” says O’Rourke.

With all of these factors, the Parks, Recreation, Trails, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan is essential in providing guidance and direction to the CCPRC as it continues to grow and move forward. According to O’Rourke, “Now that the footprint of our park system has been determined, the work of GreenPlay is an essential next step for our future. We now are in the process of finding out what everyone wants to do. GreenPlay is helping with the data collection, but also in determining the science behind the prioritization of the citizens’ needs.”

A primary goal of this project is “...to assess the current and future recreational needs of Charleston County, as they relate to the mission of the agency, in order to better plan, fund, manage and develop parks, facilities, trails and programs.” By developing this plan and involving residents and other stakeholders, GreenPlay can help the CCPRC manage and deliver these facilities and services in the most efficient and cost effective manner – ensuring that it maintains its reputation as a premier parks and recreation provider.
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Figure 1 shows the current organization chart.
Figure 1: CCPRC Organizational Chart
Socio-Demographic Context

The Community Profile for the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission (CCPRC) analyzes social-demographic data and helps decision makers to understand trending for future planning. This profile compares the County with the Tri-County Service Region in the following areas: household income, age, race, education, and employment. In addition, the CCPRC service area was broken down into four sub-areas identified by the Commission: West County, Charleston Center, North Area, and East County.

The Berkeley, Charleston, and Dorchester Counties (BCD) Council of Governments was the primary source for this document when looking at the County as a whole. Only 2010 data was available. ESRI Business Information Solutions, Inc. (ESRI) was also used to provide demographic information not available through the BCD Council of Governments, including sub-area analysis. The most recent year of data available is the estimate from 2011 using the 2010 Census data. Figure 2 (following) shows the tri-county region.
Figure 2: BCD Tri-County Regional Context

Source: Berkley, Charleston, Dorchester Council of Governments
West County

The West County sub-area (Figure 3) represents 15,289 households with an average household size of 2.46 persons, according to 2011 available statistics.

This sub-area includes the following zip codes:

- 29438
- 29487
- 29449
- 29455
- 29470
- 29426

**Figure 3: West County Sub-Area**

CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Baptist Hill Rural Recreation Site
- Caw Caw Interpretive Center
- Edisto Island (future park site)
- Haut Gap Rural Recreation Site
- Johns Island (future park site)
- Kiawah Beachwalker Park
- Limehouse Pointe (future park site)
- Meggett (future park site)
- Mullet Hall Equestrian Center
- Ravenel (future park site)
- Schroeder Blaney Rural Recreation Site
- Boat Landings: Bulow, Cherry Point, Dawhoo, Limehouse, Martin’s, Penny Creek, Steamboat, Toogoodoo, Willtown Bluff
Charleston Center

The Charleston Center sub-area (Figure 4) is 128.65 square miles and represents 61,538 households with an average household size of 2.2 persons, according to 2011 available statistics.

This sub-area includes the following zip codes:
29407       29439       29412
29414       29409       29424
29403       29401

Figure 4: Charleston Center Sub-Area

CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Bulow (future park site)
- East Arctic (future park site)
- Folly Beach County
- Folly Beach Edwin
- James Island County
- Lighthouse Inlet (future park site)
- Limehouse Point (future park site)
- McLeod Plantation (future park site)
- Old Town Creek (future park site)
- Secessionville (future park site)
- Skate Park
- Boat Landings: Folly River, Pierpont, Riverland Terrace, Sol Legare, Wappoo Cut
North Area

The North Area sub-area (Figure 5) represents 57,457 households with an average household size of 2.59 persons, according to 2011 available statistics.

This sub-area includes the following zip codes:
29456  29420  29405
29418  29423  29406
29485  29404

Zip code 29423 did not come up as an option for inclusion in the ESRI data. According to the Maps Zipcodes website (http://www.mapszipcode.com/south%20carolina/charleston/29423), this area is 0.04 square miles, which appears to be the Charleston Southern University campus, and has an additional population of 865.

Figure 5: North Area Sub-area

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile
CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:
- Ashley River (future park site)
- Cooper River Marina
- Wannamaker Park and Wannamaker North (future park site)
- Boat Landing: W O Thomas Jr.

East County

The East County sub-area (Figure 6) represents 35,964 households with an average household size of 2.44 persons, according to 2011 available statistics.

This sub-area includes the following zip codes:
29464  29466  29458
29482  29429  29451
29450

Figure 6: East County Sub-area

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile
CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Awendaw (future park site)
- Isle of Palms County
- Laurel Hill (future park site)
- McClellanville (future park site)
- Mt Pleasant Waterfront
- Palmetto Islands
- Rifle Range (future park site)
- St. James Santee Rural Recreation Site
- Thompson Hill Rural Recreation Site
- Boat Landings: Gadsonville, Paradise, Remleys Point, Shem Creek

**Population Comparisons**

**County and Tri-County**

For planning purposes, it is important to recognize that CCPRC’s service area within Charleston County comprises only about half of the population of the Tri-county Region (Berkeley, Charleston, and Dorchester Counties). According to the BCD Council of Governments, as shown in **Figure 7**, Charleston County’s 2010 population is 350,209. The larger service area of the Tri-County Region is almost double with 664,607 people. CCPRC’s facilities and programs and services serve populations outside of Charleston County in the Tri-county Region, creating a need to recognize the regional population when making decisions about future improvements to the park system.

**Figure 7: 2010 Charleston County and BCD Tri-County Population Comparison**

![2010 Charleston County and BCD Tri-County Population Comparison](image)

*Source: BCD Council of Governments, 2010*

When analyzing the Tri-County region as a service area, Charleston County is significantly more populated than both Berkeley and Dorchester Counties. Illustrated in **Figure 8**, Charleston County’s population is more than double the size of Dorchester County (136,555), and slightly less than double that of Berkeley County (177,843).

**Figure 8: BCD Tri-County Population Comparison**

![BCD Tri-County Population Comparison](image)

*Source: BCD Council of Governments*
Sub-areas

Clearly, the North Area and Charleston Center house the highest percentage of the population. Figure 9 illustrates the five-year growth rate and the percentages for each area are:

- West County: 4.2%
- Charleston Center: 5.2%
- North Area: 8.2%
- East County: 8.6%

Figure 9: 2011 Charleston County Sub-area Population Comparisons

**Age**

**County and Tri-County**

Understanding how age distribution in the CCPRC service area and in the Tri-County Region influences the planning of programs and services is important, as needs are different for each user group. For example, Baby Boomers may be attracted to culture and heritage programming or active, health enhancing activities, while younger families might enjoy youth sports or festivals. As shown in Figure 10, the comparison between the Charleston County and the Tri-County regions illustrates very little differentiation among the distribution of age cohorts. The majority of the population in both of the two service areas is closely balanced between those residents 15-54 years old. The lowest cohort for both areas is those residents 85 years and older. The median age for Charleston County is 36.6 years – slightly higher than the BCD Tri-County region (35.9 years).
Figure 10: 2011 Age Distribution Comparison – Charleston County and the Tri-County Region

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 projections based on 2010 U.S. Census data

Sub-areas
According to the 2010 Census, the median age County-wide is 35.4 years. According to ESRI, it varies between the sub-areas from a high in West County to a low in the North Area. **Figure 11** shows the median age comparison.

Figure 11: 2011 Sub-area Median Age Comparison

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile
The following age breakdown is used to separate the population into age user groups.

- **Under 5 years**: This group represents users of preschool programs and facilities. As trails and open space users, this age group is often in strollers. These individuals are the future participants in youth activities.

- **5 to 14 years**: This group represents current youth program participants.

- **15 to 24 years**: This group represents teen/young adult program participants moving out of the youth programs and into adult programs. Members of this age group are often seasonal employment seekers.

- **25 to 34 years**: This group represents potential adult program participants. Many in this age group are beginning long-term relationships and establishing families.

- **35 to 54 years**: This group represents users of a wide range of adult programming and park facilities. Their characteristics extend from having children using preschool and youth programs to becoming empty nesters.

- **55 to 64 years**: This group represents users of older adult programming exhibiting the characteristics of approaching retirement or already retired and typically enjoying grandchildren. This group may also be caring for older parents.

- **65 years plus**: Nationally, this group is increasing dramatically. Pew Research reports that by the time all Baby Boomers turn 65 in 2030, 15 percent of the nation’s population will be at least that old. Recreation centers, senior centers, and senior programs can be a significant link in the health care system. This group ranges from very healthy, active seniors to more physically inactive seniors.

The following charts illustrate the distribution of population between age cohorts and compares 2011 with 2016 for each sub-area.

**Figure 12: West County Population by Age Cohorts**

*Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile*
Figure 13: Charleston Center Population by Age Cohorts

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile

Figure 14: North Area Population by Age Cohorts

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile

Figure 15: East County Population by Age Cohorts

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile


Race/Ethnicity

County and Tri-County

Knowing the ethnic diversity make-up of a service area can help to understand cultural preferences for parks and recreation services. According to the BCD Council of Governments, both service areas have higher percentages of residents that are White Alone followed by Black or African American. Table 2 illustrates the percentages of population in each race as well as Hispanic Ethnicity (persons of Hispanic ethnicity may be of any race).

Table 2: 2011 Race/Ethnicity Comparisons – Charleston County and the BCD Tri-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Charleston County</th>
<th>BCD Tri-County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American Alone</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Alone</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone or Pacific Islander Alone</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander Alone</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race Alone</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BCD Council of Governments

Sub-areas

The race and ethnic fabric varies between the sub-areas. The following charts illustrate the distribution of population between races and compares 2011 with 2016 for each sub-area. In the West County sub-area, the 2011 Hispanic Origin population is seven percent.

Figure 16: West County Population by Race

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile
For 2011, the percentage of people of Hispanic origin in the Charleston Center sub-area was 2.6%.

In the North sub-area, the 2011 population percentage of people of Hispanic origin was 9.4%.
In the East County sub-area, the 2011 population of people of Hispanic origin is 2.7%.

**Education**

**County and Tri-County**

As shown in below Table 3, 36 percent of the population in Charleston County possess a bachelor’s degree or higher, as compared to 28.3 percent of residents in the Tri-County region. The highest ranking cohort in the County earned their high school degree (26.5%). According to a new U.S. Census Bureau study, education levels had more effect on earnings over a 40-year span in the workforce than any other demographic factor, such as gender, race, and ethnic origin.

**Table 3: 2010 Education Attainment Comparison – Charleston County and the BCD Tri-County Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Attainment</th>
<th>Charleston County</th>
<th>BCD Tri-County Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2010 Market Profile*
Household Income

County and Tri-County

According to ESRI, the estimated median household income for Charleston County is $42,786 – slightly lower than the Tri-County Region ($44,910). A comparison of household income, as shown in Figure 20, illustrates that residents in Charleston County generally earn slightly lower incomes than in the BCD Tri-County Region, except for the highest income brackets. The 2010 median household income in South Carolina was $42,018 – slightly lower than Charleston County. The median household income in the United States was $50,046 according to the 2010 Census, so the State and both the County and Tri-County Region are significantly lower than the national statistics.

Figure 20: 2010 Households by Income Comparison – Charleston County, BCD Tri-County Region

Sub-areas

The median income varies between the sub-areas from a high in the East County area to a low in the West County area. Figure 21 shows the median income comparison. East County is projected to have a substantial increase in the median income over the coming years.

Figure 21: 2011 Sub-area Median Income Comparisons

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile
The following charts illustrate the 2011 distribution of income for each sub-area.

**Figure 22: West County 2011 Distribution of Income**

![West County 2011 Distribution of Income](image)

*Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile*

**Figure 23: Charleston Center 2011 Distribution of Income**

![Charleston Center 2011 Distribution of Income](image)

*Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile*
Figure 24: North Area 2011 Distribution of Income

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile

Figure 25: East County 2011 Distribution of Income

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile
Market Segmentation in Charleston County and the BCD Tri-County Region

According to ESRI, “segmentation systems operate on the theory that people with similar tastes, lifestyles, and behaviors seek others with the same tastes—‘like seeks like.’ These behaviors can be measured, predicted, and targeted. [Our] segmentation system, Community Tapestry, combines the ‘who’ of lifestyle demography with the ‘where’ of local neighborhood geography to create a model of various lifestyle classifications or segments of actual neighborhoods with addresses—distinct behavioral market segments.” Each segment is named as a descriptor of typical lifestyle characteristics.

Understanding the dominant market segments in Charleston County and the BCD Region can contribute to the success of the Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission Park, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan. The 65-segment Tapestry Segmentation system classifies US neighborhoods based on their socioeconomic and demographic compositions. The possible segments include: Enterprising Professionals, Las Casas, Dorms to Diplomas, and Top Rung to Social Security Set. The top three market segments in Charleston County are “In Style, Aspiring Young Families, and Boomburgs,” and the top three market segments within the Tri-County Region include one of the same and two new segments: “Rural Bypasses, Aspiring Young Families, and Midland Crowd.”

A detailed description of these market segments are provided in Appendix B.

Market Spending

According to ESRI, in 2010, the annual average amount spent on entertainment and recreation per household in Charleston County was $3,024.40. This amount does not include travel. It aligns with, but is slightly less than, the national average of $3,223.68. Consumer spending shows the amount spent on goods and services by households that reside in the area. Table 4 below shows additional spending patterns for both Charleston County and the Tri-County Region.

Table 4: Market Spending – Charleston County and the BCD Tri-County Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charleston County</th>
<th>BCD Tri County Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apparel &amp; Services</td>
<td>$1,565</td>
<td>$1,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
<td>$1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Recreation</td>
<td>$3,024</td>
<td>$2,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food at Home</td>
<td>$4,165</td>
<td>$4,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Away from Home</td>
<td>$3,017</td>
<td>$2,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$3,435</td>
<td>$3,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Furnishings &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>$1,665</td>
<td>$1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>$1,483</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Goods</td>
<td>$22,132</td>
<td>$21,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>$14,436</td>
<td>$13,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/Video/Audio</td>
<td>$14,436</td>
<td>$1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance &amp; Repairs</td>
<td>$876</td>
<td>$865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI Business Information Systems, 2010 Market Profile
Population Forecasts

Although the future cannot be known with certainty, it is helpful to make assumptions about it for planning purposes. **Figure 26** provided by the BCD Council of Governments illustrates growth rates (by ranges) in the BCD Planning Areas.

Included in the CCPRC’s jurisdiction are the following areas:
- **East County**: No growth or population lost
- **North Area and West County**: 1% – 10% growth
- **West Ashley, James Island, and Edisto Island**: 10% – 25%
- **East Cooper and Johns Island**: 25% – 50% growth

**Figure 26**: BCD Population Growth Percentages by Planning Areas

Source: GIS and Information Resources Department March 25, 2011 for BCD Council of Governments
Figure 27 further illustrates population trending provided by ESRI during 2000-2016. The trend suggests steady upward growth for the County for the next ten years. The population projection for Charleston County at 2021 was calculated by using the growth factor of roughly five percent from 2011 to 2016 and adding it to the 2016 population estimate.

Figure 27: Charleston County Projected Population

Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Demographic and Income Profile

Summary of Key Demographics Analysis

In summary, key demographic trends to reference for future planning efforts for CCPRC are:

- According to the BCD Council of Government, the estimated 2010 population in Charleston County was 350,209, and according to ESRI, the 2011 population is 354,030. The capacity analysis for facilities, amenities, acreages, etc. will be analyzed in relation to quantity level of service (LOS) scores compared to current population ratios and will factor growth projection estimates at five and ten year forecasting increments.
- The median age for Charleston County (36.6 years) is higher than the BCD Tri-County region (35.9 years).
- Ethnicity in Charleston County and the BCD Tri-County Region is very similar. The highest ranking cohort for both areas is White Alone (Charleston 64.2%, BCD Tri-County Region 65.5%) Black or African American Alone follows for both service areas. (Charleston County 29.7%, Tri County Region 27.6%).
- Median household income is lower in Charleston County ($42,786) than the BCD Tri-County Region ($44,910).
- Education attainment for Charleston County residents indicates the highest cohort is those residents that possess a high school degree (26.5%).
- A steady 5% increase is projected for Charleston County’s population during the next five to ten years.

The Community Profile, spending and market information can help staff better target market programs and services in relation to service areas.
Chapter 3. Public Engagement
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A. Community and Stakeholder Input

As part of this comprehensive project, over 150 members attended six public meetings in June and July 2012 (summary responses are found in Appendix C). In addition, several small focus group meetings with staff, potential partners, and key stakeholders were also conducted.

Public meeting participants were asked to identify the key strengths and areas for improvement of the CCPRC system. They identified areas of the County that are underserved, facilities and programs that are not being provided, and what park improvements they think are needed. They were then asked to prioritize their ideas, along with how CCPRC should prioritize necessary new development or improvements.

In addition, the public was asked if the name “Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission” adequately represented what CCPRC provides, operates, and manages. The responses were used to help develop and finalize the statistically-valid random household survey sent to 12,000 residents.

Responses from the public were generally reflective of the overall community-wide survey results, with one exception. Those who participated in the focus groups and public meetings did not feel that the name “Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission” adequately reflected the breadth and magnitude of the services provided by CCPRC, and thought a broader name change might be warranted.

B. Statistically-Valid and Open-Link Survey Results

The complete survey report is found in Appendix D. The survey was conducted using three methods: 1) a mail-back survey, 2) an online invitation only survey, and 3) an open link online survey for members of the public who were not randomly selected to receive a survey in the mail. The analysis primarily focuses on surveys received via the first two methods. The responses were weighted to match the demographics of the CCPRC community.

Respondents were given the opportunity to state/comment on other CCPRC functions that are important to provide. Though comments varied considerably, some major themes were present. Many respondents advocated for better fiscal management and discounts for certain populations, an increase in dog parks/dog off-leash areas, connectivity and development of hiking/biking trails, more beach access, and natural resource/green space protection.

The programs commonly mentioned as important to develop included aquatic programs for youth and senior citizens, outdoor recreation and adventure programming for youth, and more music/dance/art programs. There were also frequent and passionately written comments regarding fiscal and social responsibility. Managing resources, both financial and natural, was very important to respondents.

High level analysis indicated that 94 percent of residents overall indicated that the “Operation and maintenance of existing park facilities” in the county was the most important aspect of current CCPRC functions. Other highly important CCPRC functions in priority order include “promote healthy, active lifestyles”; “acquire, manage, and protect open space”; “manage and protect historically or culturally significant areas”; “provide recreation programs and services for all age groups”; “connect people with nature”; and “provide water access facilities.”

Other highly important CCPRC functions include: “partner with local non-profits to serve special needs populations”; “provide environmental or natural history programs”; “provide a county-wide trail system”; “provide facilities for sports and special events”; “provide passive nature parks with passive recreation opportunities”; “provide large regional park facilities”; “provide cultural arts programs”; and “conduct major special events.”
According to survey respondents, the most important future facilities, amenities, and services to develop, improve, or expand over the next 5-10 years were to develop new walking/biking trails and greenways; improve or expand existing park facilities; and develop new parks on recently acquired lands.

In response to how much time respondents are willing to spend traveling to a CCPRC park facility, roughly one-fourth stated that they were willing to travel 15-minutes or less, about half were willing to travel 30-minutes or less, and one-fourth were willing to travel up to one hour.

Respondents were asked to identify the aspects of greenways and trails that are most important to them. Most aspects were rated as very important by 75 percent or more of respondents, with very few respondents reporting not very important. The following were rated “Very Important” by the highest majority of households:

- Restroom availability and maintenance (83%)
- Trailheads (with parking, access to water, restrooms) (82%)
- Signage, maps, and wayfinding on trails (78%)
- Trail maintenance (surface repair, weeds) (76%)
- Loop trails within parks (for fitness walking/jogging) (76%)
- Preservation, protection, and restoration of natural resources along greenway corridors (seating, water fountains, shade) (76%)

A series of financial questions provided a gauge as to satisfaction of value to fees charged as well as assessing the community’s willingness to invest in development projects now that the bond funded land acquisition is complete.

Respondents were asked how they would prefer to pay County Parks admission fees for day-use parks. The preferred method among residents was “pay per vehicle upon entrance (cyclists, pedestrians free),” followed by “annual pass for entrance,” and “pay per person upon entrance.”

After explaining: “Over the past 5 years, CCPRC has doubled the acreage in its park system, now totaling nearly 10,000 acres. As we dream about future improvements (keeping in mind that quality recreation facilities and programs cost money to provide and maintain), how much additional property tax would you be willing to pay annually to increase recreational opportunities in Charleston County?” Based on this information, most respondents (36%) stated that they would be willing to increase property taxes by $1 to $10 annually, 28% were willing to pay an $11 to $20 annual increase, and 17% indicated more than a $20 increase to property taxes. Less than 20% of respondents indicated that they would not be willing to increase property taxes.

If a bond referendum was identified as a viable funding source for parkland expansion, 73% of respondents said that they would support passing a vote for this option (31% “definitely support”; 42% “probably support”). Whereas nine percent said that they would not support passing a vote. Eighteen percent were neutral.

C. Summary of Key Findings from the Community

It is apparent from all of the community input that CCPRC parks, programs, and services are well loved and used. It is also apparent that water access, maintaining what the community already has, development of recently acquired properties, and trails are priorities for the Charleston County community. In addition, there appears to be support for a future taxation measure to develop the newly acquired properties, improve the system, and address prioritized unmet needs.
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A. Introduction

This section begins with a discussion of the current facility classification system followed by an inventory and analysis of the existing facilities within the jurisdiction of the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission (CCPRC). The existing conditions of recreation facilities were catalogued, evaluated, and assigned a functional rating to form an inventory to be used for a variety of purposes in preparing the master plan. The inventory was prepared using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology, aerial photography, and on-site visits to each property or facility operated by the Commission.

The information was compiled into a dataset that can be queried, sorted, and filtered to provide statistics and other information about the physical assets of CCPRC. Because assets are linked to the GIS, maps can also be generated from the information, such as the one shown below that shows all of the lands and other locations that make up the CCPRC system of physical assets. The section concludes with an overview of key findings regarding strengths and challenges of the trail system in Charleston County.

(Please note that the maps shown here are intended to allow the reader to understand which map is being discussed, but are not intended to be legible at this scale. Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.)

Map 1: Resource Map A: System Map

B. Existing Conditions

Park Classifications

The consultant team identified the various labels currently given to identify various park types within the CCPRC system. A distinction seems to exist between CCPRC staff terminology and public classification of recreation areas and public use sites. This may cause some confusion in reference to CCPRC properties both internally and in a public forum. Adoption of a clear and functional classification system is recommended to add greater clarity.
CCPRC should refine its terminology to best reflect and describe various properties and their associated uses. A simplified classification system has been developed based on client input. This classification is used throughout this document and may be summarized as follows:

A. Regional Parks
B. Special Use Facilities
C. Rural Recreation Sites
D. Undeveloped Park Lands

**Current Inventory of Parks and Facilities**

The current inventory compiled for this project as of October 2012 includes the following primary facilities. These have been grouped into the categories shown based on the proposed park classifications.

**Regional Parks**
Three large regional parks serve as cornerstones of the CCPRC system and offer a variety of recreation amenities. These three primary parks are:

- James Island County Park
- Palmetto Islands County Park
- Wannamaker County Park

Common amenities at these major regional parks include the following.

- Open Air and Climate Controlled Shelters
- Large Lawn Areas and Event Space
- Destination Playgrounds
- Multi-use Trails
- Concessions
- Dog Parks (dog off leash areas)
- Water Spray Features
- Aquatic Complex
- Water Access
Special Use Facilities

Special use facilities offer a variety of recreation opportunities from event facilities to nature education.

**Historic/Environmental Sites** are facilities specifically intended for educational and interpretive activities related to the mission of the Commission, including nature study, ecology, culture, history, the arts, and other such purposes.

These sites include:
- Caw Caw Interpretive Center
- Old Towne Creek County Park (*Future)
- McLeod Plantation (*Future)

**Water Access** consists of boat landings, swim beaches, fishing piers, and marinas.

**Boat landings** are facilities of particular importance due to the popularity of boat related recreation in Charleston County. Boat landings provide a variety of offerings and have been developed in different ways for different types of uses. First and foremost, they offer developed water access to boats. Others also offer fishing and crabbing access. A few offer places to view and enjoy the waterfront. Parking ranges from unstructured gravel lots to highly developed areas with paved surfacing.
The following boat landings are included in this inventory:

- Bulow Boat Landing
- Cherry Point Boat
- Dawhoo Boat Landing
- Folly River Landing
- Gadsonville Boat Landing
- Limehouse Boat Landing
- Martins Boat Landing
- Paradise Boat Landing
- Penny Creek Boat Landing
- Pierpont Boat Landing

- Remleys Point Boat Landing
- Riverland Terrace Boat Landing
- Shem Creek Boat Landing
- Sol Legre Boat Landing
- Steamboat Boat Landing
- Toogoodoo Boat Landing
- W.O. Thomas Jr. Boat Landing
- Wappoo Cut Boat Landing
- Willtown Bluff Boat Landing

*Beach parks, fishing piers, and marinas* may also be included as special use facilities. The current inventory of these facilities includes the following.

**Beach Parks**

- Folly Beach County Park
- Isle of Palms County Park
- Kiawah-Beachwalker Park

**Fishing Piers**

- Folly Beach Edwin S. Taylor Fishing Pier
- Mount Pleasant Memorial Waterfront Pier
**Marinas**

Cooper River Marina

**Venues**

*Lodging and Events* are facilities or locations specifically intended for lodging, camping, rental, or other such purposes that are not part of a regional park or other designated site.

Lodging and event venues currently included in this inventory included the following.

**Bulow Lake House**  
*Photo courtesy of ccprc.com*

*Equestrian Facilities* are facilities or locations specifically intended for equestrian activities.

Equestrian facilities currently included in this inventory included the following.

**Mullet Hall Equestrian Center**
Non-Traditional Recreation Areas are facilities specifically intended to target special interests not suitable for mixed uses including DogOLA (dog off-leash areas, typically fenced), Skateparks, ATV or BMX areas, Challenge Courses, etc.

Other special use facilities included in this inventory are:

- Skate Park (*Future)

The skate park is in a holding pattern, as an alternative site is yet to be identified.

Rural Recreation Sites
Rural Recreation facilities are typically associated with a local school and provide recreation opportunities that are more activity based than those found at the regional park.

The current inventory of rural recreation sites includes:

- Baptist Hill
- Haut Gap
- Schroeder Blaney
- St James Santee
- Thompson Hill

Common amenities include the following.

![Courts](image1.jpg)  ![Sports](image2.jpg)  ![Local Playgrounds](image3.jpg)  ![Trails and Walking Paths](image4.jpg)
While existing schools provide a great opportunity in these rural areas, challenges often exist with providing public access and welcome use of school grounds. Recent upgrades at Haut Gap are a significant step toward creating quality rural recreation opportunities. Another effective way of partnering with schools has been demonstrated in the Denver area through a program known as “Learning Landscapes.”

Learning Landscapes are creative play environments for school playgrounds. Learning Landscapes communicate educational ideas and messages via dynamic design. Each playground has its own unique learning theme around which the design and layout of the playground is based. Important elements include painted games, accessible playgrounds, custom shelters, outdoor classrooms, community gateways, art elements, gardens, and green space. The detailing of all of these components strives to communicate educational ideas relating to the playground’s overall theme. Learning Landscapes are not only valuable to the school and the students that use them, but have proven to be a bridge between the school and the surrounding community. The learning landscapes become valuable public spaces and an integral part of the fabric of neighborhood and community life. An important part of the Learning Landscape Design process is working with students, parents, teachers, and school administrators, as well as the broader community to design and construct each project. From initial design brain-storming sessions, to presentation of conceptual designs and master plans, to volunteer work days during construction, each learning landscape is a reflection of the community spirit in which it resides.

Undeveloped Properties
Undeveloped properties have potential to become regional parks or special use facilities in the future. Once developed, these properties would be moved into the appropriate category defined above. These include the following.

- Ashley River
- Awendaw
- Bulow
  - Limited recreation opportunities currently exist at Bulow Lake House
- East Arctic
- Edisto Island
- Johns Island
  - Recreation opportunities currently exist at Mullet Hall Equestrian Center and at trails associated with this facility.
- Laurel Hill
- Lighthouse Inlet Heritage Preserve
  - Limited recreation opportunities currently exist through general public access
- Limehouse Point
- McClellanville
- McLeod Plantation
- Meggett
- Old Towne Creek
- Ravenel
- Rifle Range
- Seccessionville

For the purposes of this inventory, a few of these sites were included in the overall level of service analysis, because they currently have limited public access. See Chapter 5, Undeveloped Lands – LOS Standards and Criteria for Undeveloped Spaces for a complete description of these sites.
Land Stewardship Zoning Designations
A hierarchy of land stewardship zones is recommended to designate open space within regional parks in order to protect the natural and cultural resources and define appropriate levels of public access, development, and maintenance. Guidelines for each land stewardship zone will provide a framework for long-term planning and management practices.

It is recommended that Land Use Plans reflecting land stewardship zone designations be determined through site inventories and utilization of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology, whereby lands can be mapped according to special landscape or resource features. These maps will serve as valuable tools for both planning and management. They are intended to provide guidance for managing existing conditions and desired future conditions of a property or facility.

General strategies for CCPRC land stewardship:
1. Conduct inventories of the natural and cultural resources for each undeveloped property.
2. Create Land Use Plans reflecting appropriate land stewardship zones based on the resource inventories to establish appropriate management and potential future uses.
3. Develop management plans and master plans for each site using the Land Use Plans as guidelines.
4. Develop planning guidelines to establish a consistent approach to park planning.
5. Establish goals for limiting development impact for each site.
6. Enhance habitat in natural areas.

Activity Zone
The Activity Zone allows for constructed or developed administrative, maintenance, and recreation sites, structures, and landscapes that accommodate concentrated use by visitors and staff. Examples include park offices, maintenance areas, parking lots, picnic areas, water parks, concessions areas, maintained meadows, and other recreation areas.
- These sites are either already developed, or are deemed to be the most suitable for development based on a site assessment.
- Impact to the site will be minimized to the greatest extent possible, utilizing a sustainable approach to structures and site improvements.
- Historic restoration, rehabilitation, or reconstruction for interpretation or adaptive reuse of historic structures will be undertaken only in conjunction with a historic restoration plan.
- Shorelines and surface waters may be used for recreation with constraints of maintaining public safety and water quality.
- High intensity of use and maintenance.

Conservation Zone
The Conservation Zone includes areas having typical yet important natural and cultural resources. Examples include areas having a diversity of wildlife and plant habitats, agricultural resources, and resilient cultural sites and landscapes. Management actions may include a wide range of potential recreation opportunities that are consistent and compatible with natural resource opportunities and goals.
- Utilize Best Management Practices for forestry and other resource management activities to encourage native biodiversity
- Protect and maintain water quality by providing for healthy ecosystems
- Provide safe and efficient trails and roads that minimize impact on natural and cultural resources while serving public needs and allowing visitors a variety of outdoor experiences
- Additional site inventory and analysis may be needed prior to management activities to fully evaluate potential impacts to resources and landscape features
• Moderate intensity of use and maintenance. Generally accommodates lower impact recreational activities

Preservation Zone
This zone includes unique and highly sensitive natural or cultural resources that require special management. Examples include rare, threatened, or endangered species habitats; fragile ecosystems; or archeological and cultural sites. Management objectives emphasize the protection of these resources from adverse impacts.
• Forest management will be utilized only to preserve and enhance resources.
• Only low-impact, non-motorized, sustainable recreation will be allowed, provided that the activities do not threaten resources.
• Existing trails and roads will be evaluated to ensure compatibility with identified features. New trails or roads may be constructed only after strict evaluation and determination that there are no suitable alternatives.
• Recreational use is lower-intensity and low impact. Maintenance for included historic sites or natural restoration areas may be more substantial. Recreation activities are resource-focused and must be compatible with resource preservation.

Marine Zone
The CCPRC may want to consider adding a “Marine Zone.” This is common in NPS management zoning of shoreline parks with water access. Since water activities such as swimming and boating are included in many CCPRC regional parks, a specific designation for these surface water uses may be helpful to guide maintenance and management decisions. For example, along waterways where the adjacent shorelines are not necessarily owned by CCPRC, such a marine zone could be useful. A marine zone designation can also accommodate water recreation at beach areas where land-based zoning may vary from one section of shoreline to another, but use of surface waters does not.

Significant Feature Overlay
Each of the land stewardship zones may be supplemented with significant feature overlays that identify specific resource features that are identified through inventory or research, and are formally designated. The overlays will provide more precise management guidance for identified resources and will serve to maintain and protect resources, regardless of the zone in which they occur. An example is a site that is under a conservation easement and subject to more specific restrictions.
• Specific management guidelines for significant feature overlays should be provided by specialists or conservation easement holders.
• Other examples may include temporary zoning considerations such as nesting areas, evolving resources such as partially developed park lands, or historic sites intended for adaptive re-use.

Cultural Resources Overlay
Cultural resources are defined as the collective evidence of the past activities and accomplishments of people. Buildings, objects, features, locations, and structures with scientific, historic, and cultural value are all examples of cultural resources. Cultural resources are finite and non-renewable resources that once destroyed cannot be returned to their original state.

Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, historic standing structures, bridges, cemeteries, and monuments, among others. Impacts to resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Places must be mitigated through excavation, avoidance, or preservation. All Federal and most State agencies are required to identify and protect cultural resources on lands that they manage.
Charleston County and the surrounding Lowcountry has a rich cultural history that contributes not only to local understanding of the past and how it informs current society, but to a greater population that desires to know the history of the region. It is critical that its cultural resources be protected just as passionately as its natural resources in order to make future generations aware of past societies and their contributions to the modern world.

As the population expands and development increases in and around Charleston County, CCPRC should continue to make efforts to protect and care for the unique cultural resources found throughout its parkland properties. In response to this commitment to preserve cultural resources, CCPRC is implementing a Cultural Resource Management Plan to be developed for all of CCPRC’s parkland, both developed and undeveloped, as an effective best management guide in the treatment of cultural resources within park boundaries. The plan will be consistent with federal and state regulations and guidelines and will include procedures for the identification and protection of all cultural resources. Additionally, the Cultural Resource Management Plan will be established to provide a consistent management approach throughout the park system. CCPRC wants to continue its efforts to promote cultural resource stewardship within the county and to protect these resources for present and future generations. The plan will include the following elements.

2. Definitions of historic and cultural resource types to include, but not to be limited to:
   a. Archaeological sites and districts
   b. Cemeteries
   c. Historic districts
   d. Sites
   e. Structures
   f. Cultural landscapes
   g. Museum objects, collections, and artifacts
   h. Ethnographic resources
3. Cultural resource planning recommendations to include strategies for:
   a. Conducting cultural resource surveys on parkland
   b. Documentation of cultural resources on parkland
   c. Land acquisition strategies
   d. Planning and treatment in development park master plans
   e. Planning and treatment in development of capital improvements projects
   f. Coordination with Planning Division staff
   g. Coordination with Interpretation Department staff
   h. Coordination with other agencies
   i. Human impact
   j. Unexploded ordnance
   k. Education
4. Development of contextual frameworks for existing historic and cultural resources at each park property to include, but not be limited to: identification, inventory, analysis, and evaluation.
5. Recommendations for protection and treatment of existing historic and cultural resources and establishment of preservation goals, objectives, priorities, methods, schedules, and evaluations of progress and success.
6. Process for review, revision, and update of historical and cultural resources identified or acquired in the future.
7. Recommended strategies for integrating the Cultural Resource Management Plan with other management plans including, but not limited to, existing and future Comprehensive Park Master Plans, Charleston County Historic Overlay Districts, and other resource management plans.
11. Establish a framework for pursuing National Register of Historic Places status on NRHP eligible projects.
12. Recommended procedures for addressing unexploded ordinance.
13. Recommended strategies for addressing human impact on historic and cultural resources.
14. Recommend strategies for stewardship education and interpretation of historic and cultural resources.
15. GIS mapping* of all cultural resources in all park properties, including properties surveyed by consultants other than New South Associates.
16. GIS mapping* to indicate recommended treatments of all cultural resources in all park properties, as established by the Cultural Resource Management Plan (i.e. sites to be protected, buffered, or recovered).
17. A matrix of all park properties indicating the type and quantity of resources present at each site.

The Cultural Resource Management Plan should be meshed with the CCPRC Natural Resource Management Plan as integrated components of the Park Site Planning Approach/Methodology. Through this integrated planning strategy, it will be possible to identify and establish appropriate use zones (Activity, Conservation, Preservation, and Significant Feature Overlays) within parkland properties and tailor master planning and associated design responses to reflect the appropriate zone.

C. GRASP® Level of Service Analysis Process

Inventory Summary Chart

Table 5 details the GRASP® Community Value score for every existing property in the CCPRC system.

Calculation of GRASP® Community Value

To produce the Perspectives (analytical maps), each inventoried component has been assigned a service value, or GRASP® score. By adding up all of the component scores at each location or facility, an overall GRASP® score was calculated for each facility. This score was assigned to a single point, typically the entrance to the facility. All components and quantities in the inventory were used in this calculation of overall scoring. The overall scoring serves as a ranking or means of measuring the level of service provided by one facility if compared to another facility. The higher the score, the greater the level of service provided to the community; therefore, in this analysis, the combined indoor and outdoor facilities at James Island County Park provide the highest level of service, while Martin’s Boat Landing and Peirpont Boat Landing provide the lowest level of service. The range was a high of 481.95 to a low of 4.4.

A complete inventory atlas with scoring was produced as a stand-alone staff level document. The following shows the overall scores for all facilities in the database.
# Table 5: GRASP® Community Score of Existing Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>GRASP® Community Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Island County</td>
<td>438.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto Shelter at James Island</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottages at James Island</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Store At James Island</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Center at James Island</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Island County Park Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>481.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker County</td>
<td>378.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Hall</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wannamaker County Park Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>378.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Islands</td>
<td>211.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Oak Shelter at Palmetto Islands</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palmetto Islands County Park Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>225.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caw Caw Interpretive Outdoor</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caw Caw Interpretive Indoor</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caw Caw Interpretive Center Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>169.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pleasant Fishing Pier Outdoor</td>
<td>148.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pleasant Fishing Pier Indoor</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt Pleasant Fishing Pier Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>157.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet Hall Equestrian</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly Beach Edwin Outdoor</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly Beach Fishing Pier Indoor</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folly Beach Edwin Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>112.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow Lakehouse Outdoor</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehouse at Bulow Indoor</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulow Lakehouse Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiawah Beachwalker</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper River Marina Outdoor</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper River Marina Indoor</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GRASP® Community Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooper River Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>GRASP® Community Score</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Palms County</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly Beach County</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Inlet Heritage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rural Recreation Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>GRASP® Community Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St James Santee Rec</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haut Gap Recreation</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Hill Rec</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder Blaney Rec</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder Blaney Rec Indoor</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total GRASP® Community Score**

| Schroeder Blaney Facilities     | 20.1                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>GRASP® Community Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Hill Recreation</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Hill High School Indoor</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total GRASP® Community Score**

| Baptist Hill Facilities         | 19.8                   |

**Boat Landings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>GRASP® Community Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Point Boat</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wappoo Cut Boat Land</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W O Thomas Jr Boat</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remley's Point Boat</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawhoo Boat Landing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly River Landing</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Boat Landing</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem Creek Boat Land</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow Boat Landing</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverland Terrace</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol Legare Boat Land</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Boat Landing</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toogoodoo Boat</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Boat Landing</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willtown Bluff Boat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsonville Boat Land</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Creek Boat Land</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin’s Boat Landing</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierpont Boat Landing</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS Score Methodology for CCPRC

Analysis
A number of different analyses were performed using the data from the inventory to gain an understanding of the current system of lands and facilities. The resulting findings can be combined with the results of other tools such as public surveys, focus groups, and the knowledge of CCPRC staff to develop recommendations for maintaining and enhancing the effectiveness of their services.

The functional ratings assigned to each site and its components were used to calculate a series of values that can then be used to compare facilities to one another and to other variables such as population density, demographics, and operational costs. Specific scoring for each facility can be found in the final inventory atlas (given to CCPRC as a staff level document).

Subareas
CCPRC covers a very large and diverse area. Parts of the County are quite urban, while others are extremely rural. Demographics vary from one part of the County to another as well, including such variables as age, ethnicity, and economic status. To allow for consideration of these variables, the CCPRC service area was divided into smaller areas for the purposes of analysis in this study.

The CCPRC boundary was used as the overall extent of the study area. Existing planning areas were combined or grouped to form four subareas for the purposes of this master plan. They are: West, East, Charleston Center, and North Area.

Please refer to Chapter 2. CCPRC – Perspective and Context, Section C. – Community Profile and Demographic Analysis for a complete demographic analysis and discussion.

Catchment Areas
The area around a park or other facility from which people come to use it is known as its catchment area. Catchment areas can be determined for entire sites as well as for specific components within a site. Catchment areas can be defined in terms of travel distance, travel time, or other criteria. For the purposes of this study, catchment areas are typically defined as an area from within which a majority of users are likely to come under a particular set of circumstances.

Catchment areas can be based on a radial distance from the feature being analyzed, or along travelways such as streets and trails. Both types have been used in the analyses for this study, depending upon the nature of the analysis and the available information used to conduct it. Typical catchment areas used throughout this plan are a five mile radius or 15-minute drive time.
Perspective A: Access to Regional Parks and Special Use Facilities

In general, it can be said that where CCPRC provides regional parks, the access and level of service is excellent. The facilities are well maintained and provide a variety of recreational opportunities. In addition, special use facilities supplement this level of service to users in these areas. Much of the Charleston Center and North Area subareas are well served. Opportunities exist through further enhancement of currently developed facilities or new amenities at currently undeveloped properties in the majority of those areas falling below the determined threshold. Perspective Map A (Map 2) shows the overall level of service provided by regional parks and special use facilities. (Note: Maps shown here are intended to allow the reader to understand which map is being discussed, but not intended to be legible at this scale. Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.)

Map 2: Perspective Map A: Access to Regional Parks and Special Use Facilities

A five-mile catchment area was used for each facility. In addition, a premium is given for access within one mile.

This essentially doubles the value for residents of users that live within close proximity to a facility. Darker gradients on the map indicate a higher level of service. In inset map PA-1 (Map 3), areas that are shown in purple have a level of service that exceeds a predetermined threshold score of 129.75. This value is equivalent to the average GRASP® score for all of the facilities in this portion of the analysis, including regional parks and special use facilities. Areas shaded in yellow can be considered areas of opportunity. These areas currently have some access to recreational opportunities but fail to meet the described threshold. (Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.)
Capacity and Value Analysis for the Three Main Regional Parks

CCPRC’s three main regional parks were compared to one another based on the value of their features and the population they serve in order to determine the best future treatment for each park.

Figure 28 shows the area that is within a 15-minute drive of the three parks. Table 6 shows the population within this 15-minute drive area for each park as determined using GIS and ESRI Business Analyst. Staff provided the number of visitors annually and is also shown in Table 25. From this information, it can be shown that James Island Park has 1.3 times as many people within a 15-minute drive than Palmetto Islands Park, yet it has three times as many visitors as Palmetto Islands. While not all visitors to each park come only from within the 15-minute drive time, and the annual visitor count for each park includes people who visit multiple times, it is nonetheless reasonable to assume that James Island may be drawing a greater proportion of the surrounding population to the park than Palmetto Islands. This suggests that it may be possible to increase the number of visitors from the area surrounding Palmetto Islands to bring the relationship between total population and annual visits more in line with that observed for James Island. In effect, there may be an “untapped market” for visitors in the area around Palmetto Islands.

A similar comparison between James Island Park and Wannamaker Park shows that James Island has only 1/3 the population that Wannamaker does within a 15-minute drive of the park, yet it has an annual number of visitors that is 1.26 times that of Wannamaker. Again, this suggests that James Island is capturing a much larger share of the population within a 15 minute drive of the park, and that there may be untapped market within a 15 minute drive of Wannamaker.
Table 6: Potential Users and Annual Users By Regional Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Park</th>
<th>Population within 15-minute drive</th>
<th>Annual Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Island County Park</td>
<td>87,558</td>
<td>543,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Islands County Park</td>
<td>65,403</td>
<td>183,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker County Park</td>
<td>270,909</td>
<td>433,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows the ratio when annual attendance at each park in the columns is compared to the annual attendance for each park in the rows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>James Island 543,899</th>
<th>Wannamaker 433,296</th>
<th>Palmetto Islands 183,330</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Island: 543,899</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker: 433,296</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Islands: 183,330</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRASP® scoring can be used as an indicator of park capacity because it combines the quantity of amenities with the functionality of each amenity in the park. An amenity with a lower functional score is likely to be compromised in its capacity, while an amenity with a high functional score is potentially able to serve a greater number of users while maintaining a quality user experience. Table 8 shows the GRASP® scoring for each park.
From Table 8 it can be determined that James Island has 1.23 times the GRASP® score of Wannamaker and 2.13 times the GRASP® score of Palmetto Islands. This suggests that James Island should be able to serve 1.23 times as many visitors as Wannamaker and 2.13 times the number of visitors as Palmetto Islands. (Table 9 shows these ratios.) As shown earlier, James Island is actually serving 1.26 times the number of visitors that Wannamaker is, so there is a close correlation between relative capacity as determined by GRASP® scores and the relative number of visitors at each park. On the other hand, the comparison for James Island and Palmetto Islands shows that the number of visitors at Palmetto Islands is less than its GRASP® score suggests it would accommodate at a visitor experience commensurate with James Island and Wannamaker. This analysis predicts that the visitor experience in terms of relative crowding of facilities should be similar at James Island and Wannamaker, but less crowded at Palmetto Islands by comparison. This seems to correlate with feedback from staff and the public that James Island feels crowded while Palmetto Islands feels underutilized.

Table 9: Overall GRASP Score by Regional Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall GRASP® Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Island County Park</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Islands County Park</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker County Park</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special uses at the regional parks can also impact the number of users attracted to a specific park. In comparing annual attendance at the three water park facilities (Table 10), it can be determined that Wannamaker is most affected by water park users.

Table 10: Water Park Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Visitors</th>
<th>Water Park Visitors</th>
<th>Water Park Percentage of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Island County Park</td>
<td>543,899</td>
<td>86,025</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Islands County Park</td>
<td>183,330</td>
<td>40,506</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker County Park</td>
<td>433,296</td>
<td>156,814</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the water park is not the main attraction at James Island, it might be concluded that other features are attracting visitors to this location. Availability of camping and cabins draws a significant number of annual visitors at over 20 percent of the total (Table 11).
Table 11: Camping and Cabin Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camping and Cabin Venue</th>
<th>Annual Visitors</th>
<th>Camping and Cabins</th>
<th>Percentage of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Island County Park</td>
<td>543,899</td>
<td>111,798</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition James Island has several unique offerings that appear to be drawing visitors. The dog park at James Island is more unique and therefore likely has a larger regional draw. The climbing and ropes course area at James Island also is unique to this facility. Finally, there are many special events that are unique to James Island such as Holiday Festival of Lights.

While all three regional parks are distinct, the goal is to create a quality user experience regardless of the park or the amenity while limiting the developed park footprint. Solutions and recommendations may differ greatly depending on the existing conditions, potential for expansion, or available users.

The analysis above leads to different findings for the future of each of the three parks. Based on feedback that James Island is operating at or near to the limits of its capacity, the finding would be that no additional facilities should be added at James Island. Existing amenities can be expanded, remodeled, repurposed, or reconfigured to maximize their effectiveness for the current visitor counts and ensure a high quality visitor experience, but attracting new visitors to James Island Park should be avoided.

Similarly, raising visitor counts for the existing facilities at Wannamaker is not recommended unless information is found to suggest that this could be done without degrading the visitor experience. However, to take advantage of the potential untapped market surrounding Wannamaker, it should be expanded with additional amenities, or enlargement of existing ones to accommodate more visitors.

Steps should be taken at Palmetto Islands to increase visitation for the existing amenities before expanding into new ones. This could be done by upgrading, remodeling, renovating, or otherwise rejuvenating the appeal of facilities at this park.

To summarize, the following key words express the future strategy for each of these parks:

James Island Park: **MAINTAIN & SUSTAIN**

Wannamaker Park: **EXPAND**

Palmetto Islands Park: **ENHANCE**

**Capacity and Value Analysis for the Special Use Facilities**

These following facilities tend to function more as special use facilities, and therefore a wider range in values become apparent with this analysis. *Figure 29* illustrates the 15-minute drive areas for special use facilities.
In addition, the specialized use of these facilities might attract users from beyond the 15-minute drive time. Mount Pleasant Memorial Waterfront Pier has the highest number of potential users. Lighthouse Inlet serves fewest potential users within 15-minutes. Caw Caw Interpretive Center earns the highest current GRASP® score while Lighthouse Inlet with its limited access and current use rates a very low GRASP® value. The GRASP® Index calculation (Table 12) would indicate that Caw Caw provides the greatest value per annual visitor among all special use facilities. The new skate park would provide the lowest GRASP® value per capita; however, it should be noted that this type of facility serves a much smaller base of potential users. In the end, available parking should be considered a major limiting factor at many of these special use facilities.

Table 12: Special Use Facilities GRASP®/Visitor Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Use Facilities</th>
<th>2012 ESRI Projected Population</th>
<th>2012 Annual Visitors</th>
<th>Overall GRASP Score</th>
<th>GRASP®/Annual Visitor per 1,000 Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caw Caw Interpretive</td>
<td>25,963</td>
<td>12,330</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pleasant Fishing Pier</td>
<td>165,113</td>
<td>198,738</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet Hall Equestrian</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly Beach Edwin</td>
<td>25,541</td>
<td>308,029</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow Lakehouse</td>
<td>90,174</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiawah Beachwalker</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>90,684</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper River Marina</td>
<td>29,695</td>
<td>56,882</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Palms</td>
<td>69,009</td>
<td>153,133</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly Beach County</td>
<td>9,915</td>
<td>88,116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>109,438**</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Inlet Existing</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2011 Visitors
**Assumes downtown Charleston location
E. Key Issues for Existing Regional Parks and Special Use Facilities

Through public and stakeholder input, consultant team observation and expertise, GRASP® analysis, and the needs assessment, the following key issues were identified for consideration:

• Wayfinding signage is needed for waterparks on adjacent highways.
• Complete the Folly Beach County Park re-nourishment project.
• Additional parking is needed at all three CCPRC beach properties.
• Wannamaker County Park may be at capacity, and phase 2 is warranted.
• Maintain and sustain amenities at James Island County Park with focus on upgrades and repurposing of existing amenities to enhance visitor experience.
• Enhance amenities at Palmetto Islands Park to increase annual visitors.

F. Short Term Opportunities – Future Considerations for Regional Parks and Special Use Facilities

System Wide or Multiple Location Recommendations:

• Continue to provide free open play areas (large un-programmed grassy areas/open turf) based on community demand.
• System-wide expansion/addition recreation opportunities that cater to niche users. One current example of this is the development of a disk golf course at James Island. Partner with user groups to identify and develop additional opportunities within regional parks, rural recreation, and special use facilities.
• System wide expansion of the QR code interpretation pilot program to other facilities for environmental, cultural, and historic learning.

Examples – QR Coded Signage

• Add mileage markers along internal park trails
• Add fitness stations or areas at regional parks

Examples – QR Coded Signage

• Add infrastructure to include camping and restrooms to support the paddle trail at parks located along the trail
• System-wide expansion of internal park trails

West County Sub-Area Recommendations

Kiawah Beachwalker (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
• Explore offsite solutions to parking issues
• Add office building/lifeguard building to replace temporary shed
• Upgrade shower facility with more showers

Central Charleston Sub-Area Recommendations

Edwin S Taylor Folly Beach Fishing Pier (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
• Explore offsite solutions to parking issues

Folly Beach County Park (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
• Complete the Folly Beach County Park re-nourishment project (funded in current fiscal year budget)
• Rebuild Folly Beach County Park and amenities based on outcome of reclamation.

James Island Improvements (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
• Update and freshen Splash Zone Water Park amenities.
• Consider adding yurts, tree house camping, additional cottages, a lodge, or other camping and overnight accommodations opportunities.
• Add gateway to destination playground to strengthen theme and create a sense of arrival.

• Update the master plan to address impact by the proposed I-526 within the northern boundary of the park.
Examples – Gateways

North Area Sub-Area Recommendations

Wannamaker Expansion (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)

- Because there is a Phase 2 major addition planned to Wannamaker Park South, and it should be valued as a high priority for future development, it is recommended that the Wannamaker North site be held in a more natural state for the foreseeable future. It would benefit the current user experience to expand the existing trail system and create more opportunities for observing wildlife through future construction of boardwalks and overlooks along the major Goose Creek wetland. These improvements, along with a dog park expansion and interpretive signage, would greatly enhance the user experience. (Please refer to the CCRPC Wannamaker Expansion site plans or greater legibility.)
Wannamaker Expansion

- Expand the north trail to include BMX course elements.
- Explore opportunity to collaborate with the City of Goose Creek to address needs on their adjacent land along the power line.
- Develop partnerships with adjacent Charleston Southern University for wetland research, trail use, recreational programming, etc.
- Phase 3 expansion of Wannamaker includes relocation of the existing dog park closer to the park entrance in conjunction with the expansion of Whirling Waters Water Park. The current dog park is located on future parking for the expansion and addition of the 3rd slide. Partner with user groups to create a destination dog park at its new location.
- Add gateway to destination playground to strengthen theme and create a sense of arrival.

East County Sub-Area Recommendations

Isle of Palms (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)

- Explore offsite solutions to parking issues
- Additional shade structures should be added that can be reserved/rented
- Add interpretative signage or QR code pilot site
- Add wayfinding and directions to other places along the beach

Palmetto Islands (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)

- Update Site Master Plan for Palmetto Islands including the following recommendations. The master plan should address the need for unification of the existing elements in the park perhaps through a central activity pod closer to the entrance. Addition of an activity/concession facility in a more visible location could allow for the existing concession to be converted to day camp use.

- Upgrades or refurbishment of the overlook tower at Palmetto Islands are warranted. Conduct a conditions and improvements assessment. Opportunity to add nature play and environmental learning area in association with the existing overlook tower. This could be combined and utilized by the day camp housed at Big Oak Shelter.

Overlook Tower at Palmetto Islands
• Continue to work with user groups and partners to upgrade dog park to be regional destination.
• Add gateway to destination playground to strengthen theme and create a sense of arrival.
• Update shelters to keep up with other rental markets. Placement of new shelters should take advantage to views and other natural features.
• Update and freshen Splash Island Water Park amenities.

G. Mid Term Opportunities – Future Considerations for Regional Parks and Special Use Facilities

System Wide or Multiple Location Recommendations

• Add mileage markers along internal park trails.
• Add fitness stations or areas at regional parks.
• System wide expansion of internal park trails.

Location To Be Determined:

• Consider adding public art installations or displays at all facilities.
• Add infrastructure to include camping and restrooms to support the paddle trail at parks located along the trail.
• Bike trails, mountain bike/BMX bike skills course (location to be determined).

For more examples of this please see: http://www.woodwardmtbpark.com/Woodward.html or www.hilride.com.

A comprehensive park design services based on real world experience. Hilride incorporates the most cutting edge concepts in mountain bike park design with on the ground experience working, riding, and filming in more than 750 riding destinations in 46 States, 9 Canadian Provinces, and 15 different countries. Every element in the park is inspired by real trails, bike parks, features, and destination riding areas. For more information visit www.hilride.com
Examples – Bike trails, Mountain Bike/BMX Bike Skills Course

- Canopy tour/tree to tree pedal tour. If sited at Caw Caw, it could incorporate an expanded level of educational experience. May also be appropriate at James Island with the current climbing wall and challenge course.
Examples – Canopy Tree Tours

West County Sub-Area Recommendations

Mullet Hall Equestrian (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
- Consider adding a covered arena.
- Continue to pursue other users beyond equestrian events. Harvestfest and ultimate Frisbee and great examples of opportunities that are available for acceptable uses.

North Area Sub-Area Recommendations:

Cooper River Marina (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
Current planning efforts are underway to address many of the different issues associated with Cooper River Marina.
- Consider parking lot improvements.
- Address siltation and needed repairs to docks or consider alternate uses, such as overnight accommodations if the marina is no longer viable.
- Consider a low entry dock/jetdocks for paddling trail access.

Wannamaker Expansion (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
- Consider creating a connection from the day park to the north trail by bridging the Goose Creek Reservoir.

East County Sub-Area Recommendations:

Mount Pleasant Waterfront (Regional Park and Special Use Facilities)
- Strengthen partnership with adjacent park facility for ongoing events and access. As management lease is renewed, explore opportunities for expansion of management of the surrounding land and amenities.
- Low entry dock for paddle trail access – upgrade to existing canoe and kayak access.
H. Longer Term Opportunities – Future Considerations for Regional Parks and Special Use Facilities

System Wide or Multiple Location Recommendations:

- Add mileage markers along internal park trails.
- Add fitness stations or areas at regional parks.
- System wide expansion of internal park trails.

General Regional Park and Special Use Facilities Recommendations:

- Updates/upgrades at James Island based on demand and future population growth.
- Expansion of Palmetto Island based on demand and future population growth.
- Expand boardwalk and trails at Palmetto Islands to connect and incorporate additional islands.
- Explore possible overnight lodging at underutilized Peninsula Center.
- Other park expansion and redevelopment as growth occurs or opportunities arise.

Central Charleston Sub-Area Recommendations:

Edwin S Taylor Folly Beach Fishing Pier
- As significant upgrades and repairs are required in the future, consider new opportunities to respond to current needs and demands.
- Hurricane preparedness and stabilization should also be considered.

North Area Sub-Area Recommendations:

Cooper River Marina
- Pending outcome of short-term planning efforts explore expansion opportunities.

East County Sub-Area Recommendations:

Isle of Palms
- Consider adding remaining amenities in original master plan.

I. Rural Recreation Analysis and Discussion

Perspective B: Service in Rural Areas

Provision of parks and recreation service in the rural areas of the CCPRC service area is different from the service provided by the typical CCPRC Regional Park or special use facility. CCPRC provides neighborhood park type facilities in areas where there is a need but little or no service is available from other providers. Typically, these services are provided at existing school facilities.

The thumbnail (Map 4) is from Perspective Map B (Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.) The map shows the overall level of service provided by rural recreation sites.
Service in rural areas was analyzed by using a threshold value of 38.4. This threshold is a standard GRASP® value for the typical neighborhood park found across the United States. It represents the value that a neighborhood park containing basic features such as a shade shelter, playground, and open turf area would attain under average conditions. Application of this threshold to the rural areas of Charleston County is shown in Map 5: Inset Map PB-1. *(Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.)* It shows where the service provided by existing rural recreation sites meets or exceeds this threshold in purple. Areas in yellow are served by an existing rural recreation facility, but the value provided by the facility falls below the threshold. Areas in gray lack any service provided by CCPRC.

**Rural Recreation Catchment Analysis**

While annual visitor data is not available for rural recreation sites, it is still informative to know the number of residents within a 15-minute drive. *Figure 30* shows 15-minute drive times for rural recreation sites. *Table 13* shows the populations in those catchment areas.
Figure 30: 15-minute Drive Areas for Rural Recreation Areas

Table 13: Rural Recreation Sites Catchment Area Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Recreation Site</th>
<th>2012 Population Within 15-Minute Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St James Santee</td>
<td>3,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haut Gap</td>
<td>32,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Hill</td>
<td>2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder Blaney</td>
<td>10,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Hill</td>
<td>9,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through public and stakeholder input, consultant team observation and expertise, GRASP® analysis, and the needs assessment, the following key issues were identified for consideration:

- Rural areas have gaps in level of service.
- There are opportunities to partner with the School District to utilize school sites for recreation facilities.
- Level of quality in amenities is not consistent across rural recreation sites.
- Rural recreation sites at school facilities should feel welcoming to users.
- Opportunities exist to strengthen educational experience and public involvement at school sites.

J. Key Issues for Rural Recreation Areas

K. Short Term Opportunities - Future Considerations in Rural Recreation Areas

System Wide Rural Recreation Recommendations

Address Rural Recreation Areas that currently lack or have low level of service. Map 6 shows the potential level of service coverage if facilities outlined in this plan are developed. Actual level of service will be determined by actual facilities provided. (Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.)
Current service is provided in two general levels: hub and satellite.

An example of a hub would be Haut Gap where a variety of local recreation opportunities are provided. An example of a spoke would be Baptist Hill where outdoor tennis courts are provided for public use and some access to the gymnasium is available.

- Continue to strengthen partnerships with schools to encourage public access at school based rural recreation sites. Incorporate creative play environments including gateways at rural recreation sites associated with schools as hub facilities.

**West County Sub-Area Recommendations:**

**Site Specific Improvements or Additional Services Rural Recreation:**

- Consider an additional amenity at Baptist Hill satellite site to increase level of service.
- Consider a learning landscape pilot program (perhaps at Schroeder Blaney) to increase level of service.
- Address lack of level of service in Southwestern part of County. Select sites that are well distributed in the area (perhaps Jane Edwards Elementary or Frierson Elementary Schools) and could provide reasonable hub or satellite opportunities.
- Consider a satellite facility (perhaps at Minnie Hughes Elementary School or Ellington Elementary School). This would positively impact the level of service in the northern portion of the West County subarea.
- Explore partnership with MeadWestvaco in the northern-most portion of the West County subarea. This area offers a unique challenge due to lack of school facilities in the area.

**East County Sub-Area Recommendations:**

**Site Specific Improvements or Additional Services Rural Recreation:**

- Consider adding satellite facility (perhaps at Lincoln High School) in the East County subarea similar to the tennis court and indoor gymnasium use at Baptist Hill, thus providing additional level of service in the distant East County subarea without full site development.
- Additional improvements appear warranted at Thompson Hill Park. Upgrades to the picnic grounds and the addition of a playground would help make this a significant facility in the East County subarea.
• Currently, there also exists a gap between level of service provided by Palmetto Islands County Park and Thompson Hill rural recreation site. The Town of Mount Pleasant’s Park West Facility is assumed to provide adequate level of service in this area, and therefore, no immediate needs are apparent.
• Additional improvements also appear warranted at Thompson Hill Park. Explore the possibility of upgrades to the picnic grounds and the addition of a playground. This would help make it a significant facility in the East County subarea, although physical space may be limited, and expansion of the developed footprint is known to be a difficult process.
• Add gateway and/or shelter near tennis courts at St. James Santee to welcome users to the site. Below are examples of “learning landscape gateways.” Users should feel welcome to use rural recreation during off hours, and in this case, because of the separation of the tennis courts, these could be used during school hours if not programmed by the school.

Examples – “Learning Landscape” Gateways

L. Mid to Long Term Opportunities – Future Considerations in Rural Recreation Areas

System Wide Rural Recreation Recommendations:

• As future hub and satellite facilities are developed, the GRASP® Index can provide a valuable resource tool to help gauge the amount or extent of development appropriate for each location. Actual distribution of service in these areas is likely as, or more important than, equity in service. The recent redevelopment at Haut Gap is a significant improvement in facility design and level of service provision in the rural areas. Further development in the rural recreation sites should be similar in quality and design aesthetic.
• Continue to explore other partnerships or develop schools listed above as an either/or situation to provide additional opportunities as population growth warrants.

• Address additional level of service in Southwestern part of County as warranted by population growth and future development of facilities at John’s Island.

M. Water Access Analysis and Discussion

Perspective C: Access to Water Recreation

Perspective Map C (Map 7) analyzes the different types of water access in CCPRC. (Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.) Each of the three maps is explained in the following sections.

Map 7: Perspective Map C: Access to Water Recreation

CCPRC is the primary supplier/manager of boat landing access in the region. The CCPRC currently operates, manages, or participates in a cooperative arrangement on 19 boat landings distributed throughout the County. Parking capacity and conflicts between motorized and non-motorized boating are two of the most important issues related to boat landings.

The thumbnail (Map 8) is from Map PC-1 which shows the distribution of boat landings and the relative parking capacity by graduated symbol at each facility. (Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.) A five mile, or approximately 15-minute drive time service area, has also been displayed. The current distribution shows relatively good access opportunities in the far West County subarea, in addition to the Charleston Center subarea. Gaps in access occur between the cluster on the west and the central in addition to a significant absence in the East County subarea. The South Carolina Paddling Trail is shown as a dashed blue line on the map for reference.
Access to water recreation is a very important part of CCPRC’s services. Two previous documents have addressed this issue. The findings of the 1997 Needs Assessment Study for Water-Based Recreation Programs and Facilities are 15 years old. Many of the recommendations are now complete, some are still relevant, and the needs assessment has been updated with the statistically-valid community survey conducted as part of this master plan process.

The *South Carolina Five Coastal County Boat Ramp Study* (JGT) (Year: 2007) again addresses many of the ongoing issues related to boat ramps and water access and its recommendations should be carefully considered.

As the population continues to grow, access to the water both for boating opportunities and other water based recreational activities becomes more limited. Parking at popular boat launches is already a major issue as well as conflicts between boaters, fishing and crabbing, and non-motorized users. More boat landings are needed.

The thumbnail (Map 10) is from Map PC-3 and shows combined water recreation access and distribution. In addition, future or undeveloped locations have also been identified in a gray hatch. (Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility.)

- With the acquisition of additional properties, CCPRC has the potential to provide additional water access to users throughout the county. Future development and access should not only address distribution across the county but also capacity of parking and user potential.

**N. Key Issues for Water Access**
O. Short Term Opportunities – Future Considerations for Water Access

- Continue to explore methods of monitoring parking at existing boat launches.
- Fishing and crabbing access at boat landings continues to cause conflict between boaters and fishermen. Consider providing separate access to fishing and crabbing in addition to non-motorized boat access.
- Acquire additional boat landings/water access in gaps. As population continues to grow, and access to the water both for boating opportunities and other water-based recreational activities becomes more limited, additional opportunities should be investigated.
- Explore opportunities to provide fishing and crabbing access in road right-of-way areas.
- Continue to explore opportunities to provide water access at creeks, rivers, and ponds within parks.
- Recent acquisition of properties includes opportunities to provide additional water access to users throughout the county. Explore and develop these opportunities especially where these properties can connect to the water trail.
- Consider acquisition in gaps in access that occur between the cluster on the west and the central in addition to a significant absence in the East County subarea. See Appendix H – Land Acquisition Strategies.

P. Mid to Long Term Opportunities

Future Considerations for Water Access

- Additional opportunities for acquisition of water access property should continue to be a priority. See Appendix H – Land Acquisition Strategies.
Chapter 5. Undeveloped Lands

LOS Standards and Criteria for Undeveloped Spaces
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- GRASP® Level of Service Analysis on Future Park Sites
- Community Identified Needs
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- Opportunities – Future Considerations for Undeveloped Lands
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In 2002, Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission (CCPRC) conducted an open space analysis comparing the population projections for the year 2015 to the recommended acreage standards for parkland. The following regional parkland needs for CCPRC were identified:

- East Cooper: 1,380 acres
- West Ashley: 1,240 acres
- North Charleston: 1,104 acres
- Charleston Peninsula: 630 acres
- James Island: 428 acres
- West County: 270 acres
- East County: 110 acres

In addition to the need for more parkland, a county-wide shortage of boat landings and bikeways/greenways (linkages) were identified.

On November 2, 2004, nearly 60 percent of voters approved a half-cent sales tax increase in a county-wide referendum. This tax increase, the “transportation sales tax,” was created to fund roadway and transportation improvements and to preserve land through a greenbelt program. The tax is expected to raise $1.3 billion for Charleston County over 25 years. A Greenbelt Advisory Board was established by Charleston County Council on June 6, 2006. This plan established three separate programs for land acquisition funding:

- The Rural Grant Program
- The Urban Grant Program
- The CCPRC Regional Parkland Program

The Comprehensive Greenbelt Plan allocated $36,000,000 to the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission for Regional Parkland Acquisition and established a 40,000 acre conservation goal. Regional Parks account for 12 percent, or 4,675, areas of the targeted 40,000 acres.

During the ensuing eight years, the following properties have been acquired in fulfillment of the Greenbelt plans goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne Creek</td>
<td>71.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awendaw</td>
<td>60.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow</td>
<td>1,951.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River</td>
<td>37.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Arctic</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Hill</td>
<td>746.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClellanville</td>
<td>812.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Plantation</td>
<td>36.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggett</td>
<td>475.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Range</td>
<td>245.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caw Caw (Ravenel)</td>
<td>394.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Point</td>
<td>85.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,918.67 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Introduction
Additional pre-existing undeveloped properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker North</td>
<td>610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River</td>
<td>37.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto</td>
<td>848.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Inlet</td>
<td>82.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionville</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Island</td>
<td>738.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,324.30 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCPRC has been successful in achieving its acquisition goal of 4,675 acres, having acquired 4,918.67 acres of new lands. Combined with the 2,324.30 acres of pre-existing undeveloped properties, many opportunities exist to greatly expand park and recreation experiences within the CCPRC service area and fulfill the Commission’s mission statement to “improve the quality of life in Charleston County by offering a diverse system of park facilities, programs, and services.”

### B. Existing Conditions

*Map 11* identifies the locations of undeveloped lands. (*Please note that the maps shown here are intended to allow the reader to understand which map is being discussed, but are not intended to be legible at this scale. Please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix C for greater legibility.)*

**Map 11: Resource Map A: System Map**

Each of the undeveloped parkland properties was evaluated based on visual observations of a number of key physical characteristics such as deep water access, topography, wetland quality, etc. In addition to ground truthing of observable physical conditions, research and evaluation of available studies was conducted that included archeological investigations, timber management plans, wildlife inventories, soils data, vegetative regimes summaries, and utility grid maps. Several of the undeveloped properties have limited current public access and where applicable were included in the level of service analysis for current parks in Chapter 4. Existing Developed Lands.

Charleston County has a rich heritage, and it is important that the cultural resources associated with past activities be documented and interpreted in such a way as to make them a “living” part of the park experience. Each property acquired by CCPRC is evaluated to determine its potential for contributions to the historical record. When necessary, more intensive archaeological studies are undertaken in order to fully understand a parkland’s specific contribution to the cultural heritage of the region.
The CCPRC’s Future Parks Analysis (Table 33), discussed later in this chapter, is a matrix that ranks each undeveloped property according to the presence of noteworthy natural features and its potential for significant cultural resources. Rankings are presented on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing features that are below expectations and 5 reflecting features that exceed expectations. This method of analysis is useful during the conceptual design process, as it identifies important criteria that should be addressed during the formation of Development Master Plans (site-based concept and development master planning efforts leading to construction or development projects).

The four sub-areas are consistent with the community demographic analysis discussed earlier and contain the following undeveloped parklands:

**West County**
- Caw Caw
- Edisto
- Johns Island
- Limehouse Point
- Meggett

**Charleston Center**
- Bulow
- East Arctic
- Lighthouse Inlet
- McLeod Plantation
- Old Towne Creek
- Secessionville

**North Area**
- Ashley River
- Wannamaker North

**East County**
- Awendaw
- Laurel Hill
- McClellanville
- Rifle Range

### C. West County Sub-Area

**Caw Caw (Ravenel) (394.54 acres)**

The Caw Caw tract consists of 41.16 acres of highland and 353.34 acres of marshland adjacent to the existing Caw Caw Interpretive Center along U. S. Highway 17 South.
- There exists a rich cultural history as former rice fields.
- Diverse marshland habitat is reflected throughout the site.
- Uplands consist of mixed hardwood forest.
- Property purchased in partnership with the Town of Ravenel with an understanding that they would participate in the master planning process
- Scenic vistas of Tea Farm Creek and the adjacent marshlands.
- The site is adjacent to the existing Caw Caw Interpretive Center, which should allow for the expansion of user opportunities and programs.
• The East Coast Greenway runs adjacent to the site.

**Edisto (848.16 acres)**

The Edisto Park site is located along Pine Landing Road on Edisto Island and is actually comprised of two distinct and almost contiguous properties. One tract lies to the north of Pine Landing Road and is known as Red Top. This site is in excess of three hundred acres with significant frontage along Russell Creek.

- The property has deep water access and a historic residential structure is situated on a bluff adjacent to the creek.

- There are a number of vegetative regimes on the property which include forested wetlands, young loblolly pine plantations, hardwood maritime forest, open fields (former agriculture), and salt marsh.
• The variety of habitat coupled with the underdeveloped nature of large adjacent tracts suggests significant potential for a variety of wildlife.
• The site is subject to a conservation easement through the Nature Conservancy which does place certain development parameters on the land.
• The tract to the south of Pine Landing Road is called Riverside and is in excess of 450 acres.
• The tract contains significant marshlands and associated frontage along the Edisto River.
• Spectacular vistas across the Edisto River to distant undeveloped lands are visible from the property.

![Image of wetlands]

• There is no highland immediately adjacent to the Edisto River frontage, and a conservation easement on the property contains considerable language that guides future development options for the land.
• The tract has numerous highland ridges that run toward the Edisto River, and these ridges slope downward to adjacent marshland. This topographic condition is somewhat unique to the lowcountry and is an interesting attribute of the property.
• A significant portion of the highland is mixed hardwood forest. Coupled with the adjacent marsh, these habitats offer many opportunities for wildlife.
• There are a number of dirt roads on the property that are suitable for trail development.

**Johns Island (738 acres)**

The Johns Island park site, located off of River Road, is situated between Mullet Hall Road and Blackground Road. Fifty acres of the tract is currently utilized for the Mullet Hall Equestrian Center. The property is located within a rural agricultural context, although plans exist for a large mixed-use community to be developed along its southern border.
• The tract has significant freshwater wetlands.
• While the majority of the property is wooded with mixed pine/hardwood forest, there are significant open areas that were former agricultural fields.
• Frontage along Briars Creek offers scenic views.
• Due to the Mullet Hall Equestrian facility, the property has a well-developed trail system.
• Public sewer is not currently available.
• The property has several miles of bridle trails that are suitable as primitive trails for pedestrian use.
Limehouse Point (85.59 acres)

The Limehouse Point property is located 1.25 miles south of the intersection of U.S. Highway 17 and Main Road. The property consists of a 25-acre highland area and a 12-acre wooded island along the Intracoastal Waterway with the remaining acreage in saltwater marshland. Freshwater wetlands have not been delineated, but based on visual observation, the potential exists that wetlands are present.

- Scenic marshland vistas of the Stono River (Intracoastal Waterway) and a 12-acre island.

- Adjacent to CSX railway.
- The site is adjacent to the S.C. Paddling Trail.
• The majority of the parcel is wooded with hardwoods of the Inland Maritime Forest regime.
• There are deed restrictions on the property.
• Good habitat diversity affords potential for a variety of wildlife.
• The very close proximity to West Ashley Greenway terminus offers an excellent opportunity for pedestrian linkages.

Meggett (475.09 acres)

The Meggett site is located along Ethel Post Office Road in the Town of Meggett. The property is heavily wooded with significant marsh frontage and access to a deep water creek from one of the three islands that exist within the tract.

• The property has a variety of habitats which include:
  ▪ Dry Mesic Forest
  ▪ Coastal Upland Mixed Forest
  ▪ Cultivated Lands
  ▪ Sandy Bare Marine Flats
  ▪ Wet Maritime Forest
  ▪ Mixed Mesic Forested Wetlands
  ▪ Freshwater Marsh/Emergent Wetlands
  ▪ Freshwater Gum Ponds

• With the variety of habitats and adjacent undeveloped lands, there is a high potential for wildlife diversity.
• The site has observable topographic relief which provides for interesting visual interest.
• The tract does not have access to municipal water or sewer but does contain some soils which would support septic systems.
• Drivable pervious roads on the property should provide for reasonable access to most portions of the park.

• There are outstanding off-site vistas from the property of the surrounding marshland, Toogoodoo Creek (or River; these two terms are commonly used interchangeably), and Intracoastal Waterway.
• A sandy marsh flat and old dock provide for a very unique pedestrian access to the adjacent deep water creek. There are deed restrictions prohibiting structures on a portion of the property.
Bulow (1951.44 acres)

The future Bulow Park site is composed of the former Bulow Hunt Club property (323 acres) and the former Long Savannah Tract (1628.44 acres) creating the Commission’s largest and most environmentally diverse parkland. Located at the edge of Charleston County’s urban growth boundary, the park is ideally positioned within an area anticipated to experience rapid residential and commercial growth over the next 10-year period.

- The property has a long history both as an agricultural plantation and a phosphate mining operation and contains a significant African American Cemetery that dates back to the late 19th Century.
- The land reflects significant freshwater wetlands, in excess of 1,000 acres, with a diverse range of plant communities ranging from bottom land hardwood forest to damp grasslands to transitional maritime scrub.
- A rich vegetative palette offers excellent habitat for a wide range of wildlife.
- The Bulow Hunt Club component of the property supports a rental lodge, +/- 16 acre lake, event island, skeet range, and boardwalk, as well as an extensive pervious trail system.

- Significant scenic off site vistas of the Rantowles Creek headwaters can be taken in from the property.
- There are numerous land use easements on the property, including a conservation easement held by Wetlands America Trust.
- The East Coast Greenway and West Ashley Greenway are within two miles of the property. Channelized canals that connect to Rantowles Creek provide water access to the property. Opportunities for a connection should be investigated.
East Arctic (0.91 acres)

The property is split in half by East Arctic Avenue creating two roughly equal parcels. One of the parcels has direct frontage on the Atlantic Ocean while the other has excellent vehicular access as it is bordered by East Ashley, East Arctic, and 2nd Avenue. Beach access is the number one need expressed by the public. Due to uncertainties associated with the restoration of the Folly Beach County Park, emphasis should be placed on creating additional opportunities for the public to enjoy the beach.

- The site is within 700 ft. of the commercial center of Folly Beach including the Edwin S. Taylor Folly Beach pier.
- Parking has been developed on the parcel previously and as such very little vegetation is present.
- The dunes will need to be protected as part of any future development.
- To date, no archaeological surveys of the site have been conducted, and thus, little is known about its historical significance.

Lighthouse Inlet (82.48 acres)

Lighthouse Inlet is located at the northeastern tip of Folly Island, overlooking Morris Island Lighthouse. The site is bounded by the Atlantic Ocean and salt marsh, with access from the terminus of Ashley Avenue.

- Lighthouse Inlet has an important ecology, containing a mixture of maritime forest, maritime grassland, interdune pond, salt-shrub thicket, salt marsh, and salt flats, along with beach dune habitat.
- These habitats are used by many species of concern, including the federally threatened piper plover, the island grass lizard, and the loggerhead sea turtle (one turtle nest was located on a site visit on July 5, 2012).
- The site also has a large variety of birds (85 species were documented during a bird study conducted in 2007).

- The site is primarily used for viewing the Morris Island Lighthouse, located a short distance offshore.
- The site contains a 2,000-foot former road that takes visitors from the end of Ashley Avenue to the dunes and the beach.
• There are large sand dunes (15-20 feet high) located on the property. Most are covered with beach shrub vegetation.
• There are four concrete building foundations on the site from the Coast Guard Occupation period, from the 1940s to 1989.
• A Coast Guard tower base is located on the beach.
• Hidden in the dune vegetation is the remnant of a Union battery from the Civil War, constructed in 1863.
• The South Carolina Department of Natural Resources Heritage Trust program holds a conservation easement on the property with terms that stress that the essential cultural and natural character of the property be maintained.
• The park site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a former encampment and battery site (constructed in 1863) of Union troops during the Civil War.
• The Civil War Archeological site known as Folly North covers the entire site.

**McLeod Plantation (36.90 acres)**

The McLeod property is the remnant of a historic plantation on James Island located at the intersection of Folly Road and Country Club Road. Many of the original structures remain today, and various restoration/stabilization efforts are underway to provide for public interpretation of this significant cultural resource.

• The house sits on a high point, overlooking a former agricultural field.
• Two oak-lined allées are on the site, one from the Intracoastal Waterway to the main house, the other from the Main house toward Folly Road, where the slave cabins are located.
• The site has a significant number of grand live oaks, including the “McLeod Oak,” which is believed to be over 1,000 years old.
• The field is currently small grassland.
• 13 structures remain on the site:
  - Main House
  - 5 Slave Cabins
  - (Cotton) Gin House
  - Double Cabin (Overseer’s House)
  - Garage/Carriage House
  - Dairy
  - Kitchen
  - Privy
  - Barn
• A slave cemetery is located on site, on the parcel adjacent to the Intracoastal Waterway.
• The site has deep water frontage along the Intracoastal Waterway.
• The Historic Charleston Foundation maintains authority to approve/disapprove any changes to the property/structures.
• Current development, use, or renovation restrictions include:
  ▪ No renovation of existing structures for anything other than museum sites.
  ▪ No overnight cabins or lodging is allowed.
• Due to the site’s location within an urban context, as well as close proximity to the West Ashley Greenway, there are significant opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian linkages.

Old Towne Creek (71.34 acres)

The tract is located along Old Towne Road within the City of Charleston and adjacent to Charles Towne Landing.
• The property is the site of a former farm and equestrian facility. It contains a number of serviceable structures (three dwelling units, two stables, and out buildings) associated with those former uses, as well as several archaeological sites.

• The property is partially wooded with numerous open meadow areas and significant marsh frontage, including access to a deep water creek. There are several historic Live Oaks on the property.

• The Historic Charleston Foundation holds a conservation easement on a portion of the property with a number of conditions that would focus on a more passive use of the land that maintains and celebrates its cultural identity and limits opportunities for certain types of active recreation uses.
• Old Town Creek is a very picturesque site with existing trails and walking opportunities situated within a suburban context of medium density housing. Due to the site’s location within a developed area, there is much potential for trail linkages to adjacent residential neighborhoods and possibly Charles Towne Landing.

Secessionville (8.30 acres)

The Secessionville tract is located within a single family residential subdivision off of Fort Lamar Road on James Island. The site has 1.8 acres of highland with the remainder being marshland along Seaside Creek.
• The site is wooded predominantly in hardwoods.
• The immediate surrounding area has a rich cultural history as the Battle of Secessionville (Civil War) occurred on and around the property.
• The site offers scenic vistas down Seaside Creek to Clark Sound.
• There is a cemetery within the property.
• Remnants of the fortification from the Battle of Secessionville, known as Fort Lamar, is directly adjacent to the property and is protected and interpreted by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

E. North Sub Area

Ashley River (37.36 acres)

The Ashley River tract is located between Dorchester Road and the Ashley River and is within the corporate limits of North Charleston.
• The parcel is mostly wooded with a mixture of second growth pine and pine/mixed hardwood forest.
• This site is adjacent to an existing residential subdivision and is situated within a highly
developed segment of the Dorchester Road corridor. The proximity to a residential development
provides an excellent opportunity for a bicycle and pedestrian connection.
• The site has deepwater access and 90 feet of frontage along the Ashley River.
• There are expansive off site views of the Ashley River and plantation lands across the river.
  Scenic vistas across the Ashley River and its associated marshlands to unspoiled plantation
  properties on the other side of the river, contribute immeasurably to the value of this unique
  suburban parkland.

• Within the Ashley River, and adjacent to the property, is a historic wooden vessel (Malcolm Boat)
  that will need to be considered in any development scenario. An archaeological survey has been
  conducted on the tract.
• Additionally, there are policies and recommendations for development and conservation of
  resources along the Ashley River which will need to be addressed as part of any planning efforts.

Wannamaker North (610 + acres)

The Wannamaker North site is part of the existing Wannamaker County Park. Over 400 wooded acres
lie to the north of the Goose Creek reservoir headwaters, which make up another 200+ wetland
acres of parkland property. An eight-mile biking trail was constructed in 2011 that provides a level of
access to trail bikers and walkers that was not previously available. The Wannamaker North tract has
many attractive natural features including varied topography, freshwater wetlands, mixed hardwood
forest, and rich wildlife habitat. The park is adjacent to the extensive Crowfield Plantation residential
development and is very accessible.
F. East County Sub Area

Awendaw (60.69 acres)

The tract is composed of 55.59 acres of forested highland, 4.9 acres of wetland, and 0.2 acres of DHEC-OCRM (Ocean and Coastal Resource Management) jurisdictional wetlands. The property is located along Doar Road within the corporate limits of the Town of Awendaw.

- There is a Memorandum of Understanding with the Town of Awendaw addressing future planning for the tract and site availability for their Blue Crab Festival.
- Previous studies have identified three archaeological sites that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
- With frontage along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, the parcel possesses significant off-site vistas and deep water access.
- The site is adjacent to the East Coast Greenway.

- The property is primarily wooded with mixed hardwoods, although some clearings exist as part of a power easement and former subdivision development.
- A grant agreement limits the property to passive park use consisting of public passive recreation and water oriented activities.
- There is a serviceable dirt road on the property that leads to an existing boardwalk and pierhead at the Waterway.
- The tract does not currently have public water or sewer service.
- The property has significant topographic relief from Doar Road to the wetland which bisects the parcel.
Laurel Hill (746.65 acres)

This is the site of a former plantation located off of Highway 41 in Mount Pleasant. The tract is surrounded by single family residential development making it one of the largest undeveloped properties in the East Cooper area.

- Due to the site’s adjacency to large residential developments, there are great opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian linkages. Additionally, the tract is adjacent to the East Coast Greenway.
- The majority of the site is wooded with mixed pine and hardwood forest; Wells Fargo retains rights to manage the timber on the property.
- There are significant freshwater wetlands to be found which include a ten acre freshwater pond.
- The property contains several significant archaeological sites including a scenic live oak allées leading to the location of the former plantation house and a “slave row” area next to the side of the main house and a cemetery.
- The land is held in trust by Wells Fargo for the Estate of the previous Owner, John D. Muller Jr.; CCPRC has acquired a 25 year lease, renewable for up to three additional 25 year terms.
- Guiding principles were developed as part of the lease, which reflect Mr. Miller’s desire that the property remain in a natural state that would be appropriate for passive recreation.
- There is a fairly extensive dirt road system that could be incorporated into a trail system.
McClellanville (812.55 acres)

The McClellanville property is located along Highway 17 North approximately .5 miles south of the Town of McClellanville. The site is composed of two parcels; a southern tract of 545.72 acres and a northern tract of 266.78 acres.

- McClellanville is composed of 79 percent upland forest, which has been converted from longleaf pine flatwoods and South Atlantic inland maritime forest to loblolly pine forest (approximately seven to 25 years in age), 20 percent intact freshwater forested wetlands, and one percent surface roads.
- The property was purchased in partnership with The Nature Conservancy, which received a grant from the Greenbelt Bank Board rural greenbelt program to hold a conservation easement on the property. The conservation easement applied certain development restrictions on the property.
- The property is designated as an important bird area by the National Audubon Society and American Bird Conservancy, and is located within a priority region of the South Atlantic migratory bird initiative.
- The site has not been researched with respect to archeology or historic/cultural resources.
- The site has an active forest management plan designed to insure maintenance and restoration of native timber and freshwater wetland communities.
- The East Coast Greenway runs adjacent to the site.

Rifle Range (245.61 acres)

The Rifle Range tract is located along Rifle Range Road in the Town of Mount Pleasant approximately two miles north of the Isle of Palms connector. The property was acquired jointly with the Town of Mount Pleasant and will be master planned jointly to address the needs of both entities. The property is adjacent to residential development and lies within the projected growth corridor for the Town.

- The site is mostly wooded with significant freshwater wetlands and large freshwater pond. There are two large open meadow areas which are in all likelihood remnant agricultural fields.
There is a privately owned historic cemetery within the site containing graves from as early as 1727. Additionally there are several graves from the Civil War within the cemetery.

The tract contains numerous large live oaks in excess of 36 inches in diameter.

A portion of the western property line for the tract served as a Civil war battery line.

This property contains drivable dirt roads, which provide good access to the majority of the site.

The site is adjacent to the East Coast Greenway.

G. Future Parks Analysis and Suitable Uses Charts

The following charts offer initial guidance for future decision making with regard to the site’s potential for development. The Future Park Analysis Chart (Table 14), focuses primarily on physical features/determinants and a range of associated rankings for each determinant (1=Low Value/Below Expectations to 5=High Value/Exceeds Expectations). Due to the diversity of each property across the spectrum of analysis criteria, it was determined that a range of 1 through 5 would establish an appropriate balance for the identification of meaningful qualitative distinctions without being either overly simplistic or complex.

The Suitable Uses Chart (Table 15), reflects the potential for a property to accommodate a variety of recreational uses associated with the CCPRC Park System based on an understanding of the site’s respective analysis values, uses in other respective parks, and understanding of stakeholder sensitivities and associated empirical data. The chart is to be used as a general guide to potential recreation opportunities that may exist within each property.

The working definitions for the Future Parks Analysis can be found in Appendix D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Wetland Quality</th>
<th>Habitat Diversity</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Hydrology</th>
<th>Utility Proximity</th>
<th>Proximity to Population Centers</th>
<th>Topographic Variety</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Hydrology</th>
<th>Utility Proximity</th>
<th>Proximity to Population Centers</th>
<th>Topographic Variety</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River</td>
<td>37.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker North</td>
<td>610.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>166.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Port</td>
<td>71.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desoto</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West County Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto</td>
<td>848.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caw Caw (Ravenel)</td>
<td>394.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Island</td>
<td>738.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Point</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Center Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggy Road</td>
<td>475.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne Creek</td>
<td>71.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow</td>
<td>1951.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Arctic</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Inlet</td>
<td>82.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Plantation</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionville</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston North</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker North</td>
<td>610.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston South</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCants</td>
<td>245.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Adventure Sports</td>
<td>Archery/Skeet/Shooting Range</td>
<td>Aquatic Feature-Spray</td>
<td>Aquatic Feature-Complex</td>
<td>Active Rural Recreation Elements</td>
<td>Birding</td>
<td>Water Trail</td>
<td>Camping/Campsites</td>
<td>RV Camping/Cabins</td>
<td>Climbing Wall/Structure</td>
<td>Cultural/Historical/Archeology</td>
<td>Nature/History Center</td>
<td>Disc Golf</td>
<td>Dog Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggett</td>
<td>475.09</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto</td>
<td>848.16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caw Caw (Ravenel)</td>
<td>394.54</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Island</td>
<td>738.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Point</td>
<td>85.58</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne Creek</td>
<td>71.34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow</td>
<td>1951.44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Arctic</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Inlet</td>
<td>82.48</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Plantation</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionville</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River</td>
<td>37.36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker North</td>
<td>610.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awendaw</td>
<td>60.69</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Area Sub-Area</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Center Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Area Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific final recommendations for parkland development should not be proposed until individual planning efforts are executed for the properties. Many of these tracts will require public involvement in the planning process through visioning or charrette activities. Once this input is provided, it should be synthesized with additional quantitative analysis to determine the desired mix of uses and their respective locations and relationships within the park.

**H. GRASP® LOS Analysis on Future Park Sites**

The locations of existing future park sites, with a 5-mile radius, were shown in Perspective A. The area within a 15-minute drive to these facilities is shown in Figure 31. Population projections through 2022 have been prepared and are shown in Table 16.

**Figure 31: 15-Minute Drive Areas for Future Park Sites**

![Figure 31: 15-Minute Drive Areas for Future Park Sites](image)

*Source: ESRI Business Analyst*

**Table 16: Undeveloped Sites 15-Minute Drive Time 2012 and 2022 Population Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undeveloped Sites 15-Minute Drive Time</th>
<th>2012 Population*</th>
<th>2022 Population Projection*</th>
<th>ESRI % Growth Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West County Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caw Caw (Ravenel)</td>
<td>13,361</td>
<td>14,996</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto Island</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Island</td>
<td>7,831</td>
<td>8,876</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Point</td>
<td>83,360</td>
<td>97,132</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggett</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Center Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow</td>
<td>77,397</td>
<td>97,431</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Arctic</td>
<td>23,918</td>
<td>27,057</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Inlet Heritage Preserve</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Plantation</td>
<td>109,260</td>
<td>122,834</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne Creek</td>
<td>193,488</td>
<td>217,739</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionville</td>
<td>39,299</td>
<td>43,375</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Sites 15-Minute Drive Time</td>
<td>2012 Population*</td>
<td>2022 Population Projection*</td>
<td>ESRI % Growth Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River</td>
<td>174,624</td>
<td>202,480</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Sub-Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awendaw</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Hill</td>
<td>47,793</td>
<td>54,683</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClellanville</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Range</td>
<td>88,360</td>
<td>102,731</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2012 and 2022 population projections based on the ESRI % Growth Factor

### Future Regional Parks or Special Use Facilities

In the future, as undeveloped parks are developed and classified as Regional Parks or Special Use Facilities, level of service should continue to be evaluated and updated.

**Perspective Map E: Potential Level of Service (Map 12)** Parks illustrates the potential level of service coverage (please refer to the larger maps found in Appendix E for greater legibility). The light purple hatch in this map indicates the catchment area for these future facilities. Level of service and potential GRASP® scores for each of these facilities will depend on the amount and type of amenities at each facility.

### Map 12: Perspective E: Potential Level of Service Impact of Currently Undeveloped Parks

### Future Considerations for Future Parks

Priority should be given to undeveloped properties that could serve residents within the Wannamaker catchment area and include Ashley River, Bulow, and Old Town Creek.

Continue to explore opportunities for acquisition of property suitable at premier event space to lighten the load on James Island County Park (see Appendix H – Land Acquisition Strategies).
I. Community Identified Needs

The following summary addresses public input from each sub-area gathered through community meetings and the project survey. It reveals valuable local knowledge regarding the needs and desires of sub-area users.

West County Sub-Area Needs Assessment

When asked to rank the level of importance per various CCPRC functions, the top seven responses were:

1. Operate and maintain existing parks facilities
2. Acquire, manage, and protect open space
3. Promote healthy, active lifestyles
4. Connect people with nature
5. Provide water access facilities
6. Provide recreation programs and services for all age groups
7. Manage or protect historically or culturally significant areas

When asked the most important facilities to be expanded or improved, the top seven responses were:

1. Beach access
2. Trails
3. Children’s playgrounds
4. Waterparks
5. Dog off leash areas
6. Canoe/kayak/SUP access
7. Picnic areas

At 29 percent, West County residents expressed the second highest willingness to drive up to one hour to a CCPRC park. Fifty-three percent (53%) of respondents indicated a willingness to travel up to 30 minutes to a park.

Eighty percent of the West County respondents indicated that trails and parking were the most important activities/services that should be offered for undeveloped sites.

During the community meetings, it was requested that as new parks and facilities were constructed, it was important to improve what existed within rural areas, and that CCPRC should strategically acquire smaller tracts in association with schools in rural areas.

Proximity to parklands and opportunities for transportation alternatives to access properties was important the rural areas of the sub-area. It was also mentioned that county parks should benefit everyone in the county, so a weighted average between geography/proximity and population should be considered in developing parklands.
Charleston Center Sub-Area Needs Assessment

When asked to rank the level of importance per various CCPRC functions, the top seven responses were:
1. Operate and maintain existing parks facilities
2. Acquire, manage, and protect open space
3. Promote healthy, active lifestyles
4. Connect people with nature
5. Provide water access facilities (beach, boat, etc.)
6. Provide recreation programs and services for all age groups
7. Provide a county-wide trail system

When asked the most important facilities to be expanded or improved, the top seven responses were:
1. Beach access
2. Trails
3. Children’s playgrounds
4. Dog off leash areas
5. Waterparks
6. Picnic areas
7. Canoe/kayak/SUP access

At 22 percent, Charleston Center residents expressed the least willingness to drive up to an hour to a CCPRC park, but the most willingness (at 56 percent) to drive up to 30 minutes to a county park.

Eighty-three percent (83%) of Charleston Center respondents indicated that trails and parking were the most important activities/services that should be offered for undeveloped sites.

During the community meetings, areas of special interest included: identifying recreation opportunities at urban infill sites, working closer with schools on sharing facilities, and transportation opportunities for urban inner city youth.

North Sub-Area Needs Assessment

When asked to rank the level of importance of various CCPRC functions, the top seven responses were:
1. Operate and maintain existing parks facilities
2. Acquire, manage, and protect open space
3. Promote healthy, active lifestyles
4. Manage and protect historically or culturally significant areas
5. Provide recreation programs and services for all age groups
6. Provide water access facilities (beach, boat, etc.)
7. Connect people with nature

When asked the most important facilities to be expanded or improved, the top seven responses were:
1. Beach access
2. Trails
3. Children’s playgrounds
4. Waterparks
5. Picnic areas
6. Dog off leash areas
7. Spray splash pool and canoe/kayak/SUP access
At 33 percent, North sub-area residents expressed the highest willingness to drive up to an hour to a CCPRC park. Forty-seven percent (47%) were willing to drive up to 30 minutes to access a park.

Sixty-three percent (63%) of North sub-area respondents indicated that trails and parking were the most important activities/services that should be offered for undeveloped sites. While this is a majority, it is the lowest percentage of the four sub-areas.

During the community meetings, it was expressed that the area was underserved and that more parks should be developed. More fishing and crabbing opportunities were desired.

**East County Sub-Area Needs Assessment**

When asked to rank the level of importance per various CCPRC functions, the top seven responses were:

1. Operate and maintain existing parks facilities
2. Acquire, manage, and protect open space
3. Connect people with nature
4. Promote healthy, active lifestyles
5. Manage and protect historically or culturally significant areas
6. Provide water access facilities (beach, boat, etc.)
7. Provide recreation programs and services for all age groups

When asked the most important facilities to be expanded or improved, the top seven responses were:

1. Trails
2. Beach access
3. Children’s playgrounds
4. Waterparks
5. Canoe/kayak/SUP access
6. Dog off leash areas
7. Picnic areas

East County sub-area residents expressed the second least willingness (23 percent) to drive up to an hour to a CCPRC park and were the most willing (24 percent) to travel 15 minutes or less to access a CCPRC property.

Eighty percent (80%) of East County sub-area respondents indicated that trails and parking were the most desirable activities/services offered for undeveloped sites.

During the community meetings, residents expressed a desire for more services and activities in the rural component of the sub-area. Additionally, more opportunities for accessing parklands by bike were mentioned.

In summary, it would appear that there is strong consensus throughout the county that CCPRC’s primary emphasis should be on the operation and maintenance of existing parks while at the same time continuing to acquire, manage, and protect open space, and by staying focused on these activities, the important functions of connecting people with nature and promoting healthy, active lifestyles can be addressed. Specific facilities that are universally desired by county residents include beach and water access, trail development, and children’s playgrounds. As recommendations for undeveloped lands are offered, they should be responsive to the needs identified by the community in strong measure.
There are a number of significant criteria that will drive the planning and development of undeveloped lands in the coming years. Each of the following items should be considered not only within the context of the individual property but also within the framework of the overall park system. The criteria are shown in no particular order of importance as they should all be evaluated equally in the determination of parkland development prioritization and planning.

- GRASP® level of service (LOS)/accessibility to user population
- Programming based on community identified needs/survey results/public input meetings
- Connectivity/trails
- Maintenance and protection of natural and cultural resources
- Access to water
- Impacts/development considerations:
  - Environmental sensitivity
  - Physical conditions of site
  - Deed restrictions/conservation easements
  - Adjacent existing development/surrounding context
  - Population context
  - Political considerations

Revenue potential/funding – Significant financial resources will be required to implement the planning and construction necessary to realize the recommendations of this plan. CCPRC will need to consider a number of possible revenue streams as well as establishing priorities for respective projects that are based on balancing expenses with known revenue streams. Possible funding mechanisms could include:

- Revenue bonds
- Increasing user fees
- Create sponsorship opportunities for capital improvements
- Grants
- Expand existing or create new revenue generating features/activities
- Improve attendance by marketing to new and different user groups
- Financial partnerships/joint ventures

The undeveloped lands recommendations of this plan address the community identified goals reflected through the survey and public input meetings. Proposed improvements associated with each property are organized by sub-area. Priorities for the implementation of the recommendations will be established based on level of service (LOS) data reflected through the GRASP® Index, user populations/geo-equity, and the achievement of balance between expenses and incoming revenue.

Table 17 indicates that based on 2022 population projections and the current level of service per capita ratio range of 1.5 to 5.6 of existing day use parks, undeveloped sites could support a total GRASP® score in the given range. A GRASP Index Range of 1.5 to 5.6 would be similar to current development and capacity at existing regional parks.
While a new regional park, similar to the existing parks, may be supported in some locations, the rural character and population density in outlying areas may be more conducive to special use facilities at most locations. Regional attractions that draw from greater than a 15-minute drive should be considered as well. Based strictly on potential numbers of people with access to future parks, new regional parks of some scale may be supported at Old Town Creek and Ashley River. Limehouse Point, McLeod Plantation, Rifle Range, Bulow, Laurel Hill, and Secessionville could possibly support a regional park in the future but may be more appropriate for a special use facility that draws from a larger audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Parks</th>
<th>2022 Population Projection</th>
<th>2022 Overall GRASP® Score Range (1.5-5.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Inlet Heritage Preserve</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionville Future</td>
<td>43,375</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River Future Park Site</td>
<td>202,480</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenel Future Park</td>
<td>14,996</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Creek Future Park Site</td>
<td>217,739</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awendaw Future Park</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Point Future Park Site</td>
<td>97,132</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Island Future Park</td>
<td>8,876</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggett Future Park</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Plantation</td>
<td>122,834</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Hill</td>
<td>54,683</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClellanville Future</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Arctic Future</td>
<td>27,057</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto Island Future</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Range Future</td>
<td>102,731</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow Lakehouse</td>
<td>97,431</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Future Park GRASP® Score Per Capita Range

Based on the existing regional park range of overall GRASP® Index (1.5 to 5.6), the future parks have a potential user base which would require a variety of amenities to serve it. Using the GRASP® Index and the population within a 15-minute drive, the overall GRASP® score can be calculated based on those ranges and the future populations of these catchment areas for the future parks. Based on this index, one can calculate a specific target score of future development of these properties. This would indicate that in some cases very little development is appropriate, for example at Awendaw (3-12), while others could possibly support much more development, like Old Town Creek (290-1084). It should also be pointed out that a few of these future parks currently have some access that exceeds the projected score given, which could indicate that these fall into a lower priority for immediate development.

Final recommendations for specific park features should not be proposed until the visioning and charette processes for each site are completed and synthesized with quantitative analysis. Refer to Table 14 for opportunities available within each property.
Additional Considerations

Incremental utilization of undeveloped parcels prior to significant development is suggested. Minimal parking should be provided at the entrance to parcels and bicycle and pedestrian access only. Utilize existing roads and trails and improve as needed to provide reasonable access to natural resources.

Identify potential for trail linkages between individual parks and to adjacent residential areas in order to increase pedestrian and bicycle access.

The development of community-oriented active recreation components should be focused at rural recreation sites when property is available for development or re-development. These sites tend to be in closer proximity to user populations, are more accessible, and have water and sewer availability. The more remote park sites such as Edisto, Meggett, and McClellanville are highly valued for natural and/or cultural resources and absent of public water and sewer in some cases. These tracts are more conducive to passive recreation and preservation.

Priority should be given to undeveloped properties that could serve residents within the Wannamaker catchment area including the Ashley River, Bulow, and Old Towne Creek.

L. West County Sub-Area Recommendations for Future Development

Caw Caw (Ravenel)

- Prepare an update to the Caw Caw Master Plan to facilitate compatible and complementary uses and develop a connection with adjacent Caw Caw Nature Center. Develop parking facilities and a rental shelter with associated events meadow and playground. Execute a topographic and tree survey.
- The site is suited for consideration of a fishing/crabbing pier and kayak launch. This facility could act as a point of entry for day paddling trips or as a destination as a spur trail to a larger Blueway Trail. Develop fishing/crabbing pier and kayak launch/water amenities for Blueway Trail.
- Support development of the East Coast Greenway segments that connect to the site.
- Establish interpretive/educational signage along expanded trail system.
Edisto
Due to the remoteness of the Edisto park parcels and the lack of population density within the service area, it is suggested that the park not be significantly developed until the surrounding areas reflect appropriate residential growth. However, because of the high quality of both cultural and natural resources associated with these parklands and the expressed desire of the public to have access the water and preservation lands, it would be prudent to develop a Preliminary Access Plan that would address construction of limited parking with an associated trailhead.

- A more complete archaeological study should be executed on the Riverside tract.
- A Conceptual Master Plan should be developed for the Riverside tract, and the Red Top Conceptual Master Plan should be updated to be used as a reference for future park planning. Topographic and tree surveys should be executed.
- Implement a primitive multi-use trail system on the Riverside tract that will allow patrons the opportunity to experience a variety of the site’s natural attributes, especially the marsh and associated marsh islands. Develop boardwalks to provide access to the islands.
- Implement a primitive multi-use trail system on the Red Top site as well that will take advantage of Russell Creek and plantation grounds views. Facilitate birding and wildlife observation opportunities.
- A feasibility study should be developed for future development of water access amenities.
- Due to the park’s remoteness and its unique natural and cultural resource features, including an existing plantation house, a special opportunity exists for CCPRC to investigate the potential for an eco-retreat facility to be located at the Red Top Plantation house site. The existing structure could be renovated and additional structures built that would serve an educational function through establishment of a nature center and facilitation of conference and eco-tourism activities. It is recommend that a feasibility study be conducted to evaluate the opportunity.
- The Red Top site provides a high quality destination as a spur off the South Carolina Paddling Trail. Water access amenities should be constructed to serve as Blueway Trail connector.
- Establish interpretive signage throughout the park that would educate and inform park users as to the park’s rich cultural and natural resource heritage.
**Johns Island**

Existing population densities in the service area for the Johns Island park property do not warrant significant investment at this time. While the land area for this park will support numerous uses associated with a regional park, there is strong public support for preserving properties in their natural state. Johns Island has a well-developed multi-use primitive trail system that affords the public the opportunity to experience the park. Reevaluate and update the 2009 Conceptual Master Plan as necessary in light of user input from PROST Master Plan. There may be uses proposed in the 2009 Master Plan that could be reconsidered in light of survey results, i.e., the Farm Park component could be downsized or re-tasked for a more publicly desired use such as un-programmed fields and open turf or a festival venue. A multi-use trail system could be expanded to access high value natural areas, especially along the marsh frontage.

- Construct a covered arena for Mullet Hall Equestrian Center expansion.
- Execute a topographic and tree survey of areas proposed for development as part of the Master Plan update.
- Execute a Cultural Resources Study.
- Prepare a Forestry Management Plan.
- More developed wayfinding signage coupled with interpretive/cultural educational signage could significantly contribute to the user experience along the trail system.
- Establish bicycle and pedestrian access to the site from the adjacent future mixed-use community as it is developed.
- Implement Phase One of the Master Plan (day park).

---

**Limehouse Pointe**

- Prepare a Master Plan/Preliminary Access Plan to help guide future development and arrange site program elements. The plan should address limited parking for a trailhead and boardwalk access to the island as well as water-based amenities.
- Execute topographic, wetlands, and tree survey for the property prior to implementation of master planning process. A Cultural Resource Study should be conducted, along with a Forestry Management Plan and a Preliminary Access Plan.
- Develop the recommended trail connection from the West Ashley Greenway to the property, as described in *Chapter 6. The Trail System Today*, and establish a southern trailhead.
- Construct a pedestrian boardwalk to the island along the Stono River. Construct pierhead, kayak launching dock, and shelter.
• Construct primitive camping amenities to serve a Bluetrail connection. This site has tremendous potential to serve as an intermediate stop along the South Carolina Paddling Trail (Blueway) or as a day trip launch for excursions to Caw Caw Park, the future Bulow Park, and associated nature features along Wallace and Rantowles Creeks.

Meggett

Due to the remoteness of the Meggett tract and the lack of population density within the service area, it is suggested that the park not be significantly developed until the surrounding areas reflect appropriate residential growth to justify more intensive parkland development. However, because of the high quality of environmental and scenic resources associated with this park, and the expressed desire of the public to have access the water and preserved natural lands, a preliminary level of facilities seem appropriate.
• To accomplish this, a Preliminary Access Plan should be prepared that would address construction of a parking lot and trailhead near an entrance off of Ethel Post Office Road. Additionally, using existing dirt roads when possible, establish a primitive multi-use trail system to allow patrons the opportunity to explore the natural variety offered by the site.
• Prepare a Conceptual Master Plan for the property to be used as a reference for future park planning. As part of the master planning process, execute a topographic and tree survey.
• Develop a feasibility study for future development of water access amenities. This site is an excellent location for day trips or as an intermediate stopover for longer kayak/canoe excursions as part of the South Carolina Paddling Trail.
• Develop a Master Plan for the property.
• Implement Phase One of the Master Plan focusing on expansion of the trail system, access to natural features, and development of water-based amenities.
• Establish interpretive/educational signage throughout the park summarizing the property’s cultural and environmental attributes.
M. Charleston Center Sub-Area Recommendations for Future Development

Bulow

Due to its vast size and location, Bulow is well-suited to be CCPRC’s next large regional park, as it can accommodate a variety of uses while still preserving significant amounts of natural habitat. Refine existing Conceptual Plan into a Phased Master Plan in order to incorporate the Bulow Lakehouse property and better address potential uses and associated development costs.

- Execute topographic and tree survey for the areas associated with Phase One development. Re-evaluate freshwater wetlands.
- Prepare a Preliminary Access Plan that would utilize the Bulow Lakehouse parcel as a trailhead for a multi-use trail system integrating the larger Bulow tract with the Lakehouse tract. Implement the Preliminary Access and Trails Improvement Plan.
- Implement Phase One of the Master Plan, which could include development of typical regional park elements including vehicular access and associated parking for picnicking, shelters, trails, and other park amenities. Additional Phase One elements could include wetland boardwalks and access to channelized rice canals.
- Evaluate opportunities for outdoor activities such as archery, skeet, disc golf, dog park, and destination playground as part of Phase One of the Master Plan.
- Execute interpretive/educational signage throughout the park celebrating the property’s rich cultural and natural heritage.
- Connect the site to the East Coast Greenway and neighborhoods due east of the site through development of recommended trails described in Chapter 6. The Trail System Today.

East Arctic

- Develop a Master Plan to provide for parking and beach access. Execute topographic survey.
- Consider the opportunity to develop the beachfront tract as a special use venue that would not only serve as beach access with showers and changing facilities, but also as a location for small revenue generating group functions. This facility should be primarily constructed as a raised deck complex on pilings to comply with FEMA requirements.
Lighthouse Inlet

- Develop Phase One of the existing Master Plan to provide more controlled pedestrian access and limited parking.
- Execute interpretive/educational signage throughout the park summarizing the property’s special cultural and environmental significance.
- Due to the park’s unique geography, a wide variety of birds visit the site. Investigate the possibility of adding a birding blind to the Master Plan.

McLeod

- Develop Phase One of the Master Plan to facilitate public access to the site including parking, visitors center, picnic shelter, restrooms, and improved circulation.
- Finalize protection of existing structures.
- Continue efforts with permitting agencies to facilitate an appropriate level of water access to the site.
- Complete remaining phases of the Master Plan.
- Pursue trail connections between the site and nearby neighborhoods as recommended in Chapter 6. The Trail System Today. Support development of the Battery to Beach Bicycling Route to link the West Ashley Greenway to the site.
Old Towne Creek

- Complete a Management and Recovery Plan for archaeological mitigation if it is determined that future development will negatively impact cultural resources.
- Develop a feasibility study that would explore possibilities for repurposing the existing residential structures. As part of the plan, evaluate the site as a venue for special events through improvements to parking as well as the rehabilitation of existing structures such as the stables.
- Execute topographic, wetlands, and tree surveys for the property prior to implementation of the master planning process. Evaluate opportunities for picnicking and a playground as part of the master planning process.
- Conduct a public input process to gather and synthesize user recommendations for the use and development of the parkland. Develop a Master Plan for the site.
- Execute interpretive/educational signage throughout the park summarizing the property’s cultural significance.
- Improve water access and amenities. The creek is suited for launching canoes and kayaks, as the park has the potential to become a spur destination as a part of a larger overall Blueway Trail network.
- Execute improvements to the existing bridle trail and expand the multi-use trail system to provide internal linkages. Develop bicycle and pedestrian connections from the internal trail system to the adjacent Charles Towne Landing, surrounding neighborhoods, and the nearby West Ashley Bikeway, as recommended in Chapter 6. The Trail System Today. Consider incorporating fitness components into the trail system.
Secessionville

This property poses several challenges to development as CCPRC parkland. While the history associated with the site would certainly be of interest to a wide segment of CCPRC patrons, the small size of the tract and its remote location within an established residential subdivision define it more as a neighborhood park than as a recreation experience that the Commission is typically accustomed to delivering.

Due to the significant historic and cultural attributes of the site, it seems more appropriate that it be integrated into the larger context of the Battle of Secessionville through incorporation within the adjacent Fort Lamar Historic Site, which is protected and interpreted by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. It is recommended that CCPRC work toward transferring the property to the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources Heritage Program for the expansion of the Fort Lamar Heritage Preserve.

- Create and implement interpretive signage package to integrate site and adjacent Fort Lamar Historic Site.

N. Sub-Area Recommendations for Future Development

Ashley River

- Develop a phased Site Master Plan to provide for water based activities and passive recreation. Possible suitable uses to consider would be an internal trail system, picnicking, and an events venue.
- The Site Master Plan should include a feasibility study update that would evaluate the potential for the site to accommodate a competitive rowing venue. The geography and alignment of the river at the park site is conducive to rowing events.
- Execute a topographic and tree survey prior to development of any improvements.
- Implement Phase One of Master Plan.
• Evaluate bicycle and pedestrian connection to adjacent neighborhood, as recommended in Chapter 6. The Trail System Today. Consider the potential for incorporating a fitness component to the trail system.
• Execute interpretive/educational signage throughout the park celebrating the property’s rich cultural heritage in association with the Ashley River.
• Implement fishing/crabbing and kayak launch facilities along the Ashley River. The site offers an outstanding venue as a point of embarkation for day kayak trips to the plantations of the Ashley River as well as an excellent interpretive opportunity.

Wannamaker North

Because there is a major addition planned to Wannamaker Park South, and it should be valued as a high priority for future development, it is recommended that the Wannamaker North site be held in a more natural state for the foreseeable future. It would benefit the current user experience to expand the existing multi-use trail system and create more opportunities observing wildlife through future construction of boardwalks and overlooks along the major Goose Creek wetland. Evaluate the feasibility of constructing a pedestrian bridge across the reservoir/swamp connecting the north and south components of the park. These improvements along with interpretive signage would greatly enhance the user experience.
  • Evaluate feasibility of a BMX track.
  • Connect nearby residential areas and Charleston Southern University to the site through development of recommended trails described in Chapter 6. The Trail System Today.

0. East County Sub-Area Recommendations for Future Development

Awendaw

The park’s location along the Intracoastal Waterway affords an excellent opportunity to develop facilities to serve patrons interested in ecology, fishing, and crabbing, as well as paddling enthusiasts. The site’s close proximity to the South Carolina Paddling Trail is suitable for facilities for both day use and overnight paddlers. Execute a Feasibility Study addressing primitive camping facilities and/or eco-lodging to support the South Carolina Paddling Trail, nature oriented patrons. Execute and repair/improvements to the existing dock to provide for water based activities.
• Implement a public planning process to include representatives from the Town of Awendaw to develop a Conceptual Master Development Plan for the park. The plan should consider the opportunity for special events such as hosting Awendaw’s annual Blue Crab Festival.
• Archaeological mitigation and recovery efforts should be completed as directed by previous studies if it is determined that future development will negatively impact cultural resources. A topographic and tree survey should be conducted prior to implementation of park facilities.
• Due to the park’s remote location and surrounding low population density, it may be several years before substantial construction is initiated on the site. It is, however, suggested that the early development of some parking be considered along with the creation of a multi-use primitive trail system to allow park users the opportunity to experience the natural resources that the site has to offer.
• Prepare and implement a Preliminary Access Plan.
• Develop phased Master Plan for the property and implement Phase One to include eco-lodging.
• Support development of the East Coast Greenway segments that connect to the site.
• Place interpretive/educational signage throughout the park summarizing the properties cultural significance.

Laurel Hill

• Prepare topographic, wetland, and tree surveys of areas directly impacted by proposed Master Plan activities. Develop a Preliminary Access Plan to facilitate improved vehicular access and site utilization for special event opportunities.
• Improve primitive/nature trail conditions through forest management practices and incorporation of existing pervious roads. Make better use of utility easements for trail and road access. Provide bicycle and pedestrian connectivity with adjacent residential neighborhoods through short linkages from residential streets to trail access points and through supporting development of the East Coast Greenway. Create more loop trails opportunities.
• Refine the current Master Plan in conjunction with an updated Forest Management Plan to identify areas for future passive activities. Suitable activities might include picnicking, urban camping, disc golf, or day camping.
• Execute interpretive/education signage throughout the park summarizing the property’s cultural significance.
• Develop more picnic nodes.
• Develop restroom facilities.
McClellanville

- Refine the Conceptual Master Plan to assist with the guidance of forest management practices in relationship to the organization of future structure for trails and park elements.
- Due to the park’s size, current natural attributes, and location at the northern edge of Charleston County, it has the potential of becoming a future regional park. However, because of the lack of population density within its service area, it would be prudent to develop the site in a measured manner commensurate with the population it serves. Develop a Preliminary Access Plan to include parking and a primitive multi-use trail system. Construct Preliminary Access Plan components.
- Support development of the East Coast Greenway segments that connect to the site. Consider the alternative trail alignment recommended due west of the site, as described in Chapter 6. The Trail System Today.
Rifle Range

- Prepare a phased Master Plan in concert with the Town of Mount Pleasant to be used as a guide for future development.
- Execute interpretive/educational signage throughout the park promoting the property’s cultural and environmental significance.
- Existing dirt roads and cleared routes could be improved to the level of primitive multi-use trails to provide patrons with a reasonable level of access to the property.
- Based on the Master Plan, develop preliminary parking and public access facilities.
- Support development of the East Coast Greenway segments that connect to the site. Execute Phase One of the Master Plan.
Chapter 6. The Trail System

Today
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- Opportunities – Future Considerations for Trails
- West County Sub-Area Trail Recommendations
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- North County Sub-Area Trail Recommendations
- East County Sub-Area Trail Recommendations
- Implementation Strategies
A. Introduction

This section provides an inventory and analysis of the overall trail network within the jurisdiction of the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission (CCPRC). The existing condition of the trails network is assessed based on a review of background documents, data collection, and field investigation. The section concludes with an overview of key findings regarding strengths and challenges of the trail system in Charleston County.

Review of Background Documents

A review of existing trail planning documents and trail planning efforts provides information related to past assessments of the trail network and previously proposed trail recommendations. The review informs the development of this Plan by providing a better understanding of the current relevance of previous recommendations, previously identified goals of the trail network, and opportunities not yet realized. In addition, the review of planning documents supplements the analysis of the physical environment.

Data Collection

Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission staff, related planning agencies, and stakeholders provided baseline information about the existing trail network. Through a geographic information systems (GIS) map of the trail and bikeway network, provided by Berkeley Charleston Dorchester (BCD) Council of Governments (COG), the consultant team gained a general understanding of the overall network and identified trail segments for field investigation.

Field Investigation

Field research in Charleston County involved verifying the existence of trail segments, examining the quality of trail design, maintenance, and user experience, studying bicycle and pedestrian access to the trails, and preparing a photographic inventory. This on-the-ground investigation is the most direct means of understanding the role of the trail network within the context of the region’s cultural and natural heritage. The field research is documented with field notes, field measurements, and digital photography. County staff conducted additional field investigation using global positioning systems (GPS) as a tool for mapping and analysis of existing trails.

This section includes three major elements:
- Review of Existing Trail Plans
- Trails Inventory Table and Map
- Photo Inventory of Existing Trails

B. Review of Existing Trail Plans

Nine relevant plans exist, and two regional trail routing efforts, the East Coast Greenway and Palmetto Trail, are currently active within the County. The nine plans reviewed for this Plan are listed and described in Table 18 and are summarized in Appendix A. The background document review included an assessment of trail-related planning documents.
Table 18: Trail-Related Planning Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year (most recent first)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Edisto Plan</td>
<td>East Edisto</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATS Long Range Transportation Plan 2030</td>
<td>Charleston Area Transportation Study (CHATS)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston County Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Charleston County</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)</td>
<td>South Carolina Parks Recreation Tourism</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Bicycle Master Plan 2012</td>
<td>City of Charleston</td>
<td>Authored in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston County Comprehensive Greenbelt Plan</td>
<td>Charleston County</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Charleston Dorchester Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Action Plan</td>
<td>Berkeley Charleston Dorchester Council of Governments (BCDCOG)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive CCPRC Trails Study and Recommendation</td>
<td>Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission (CCPRC)</td>
<td>2003 (updated 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATS and Charleston County Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>CHATS, Charleston County</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Other Relevant Trails Planning Efforts

In addition, several other relevant trails planning efforts provide additional perspective into this plan and are summarized in Appendix A.

- East Coast Greenway Alliance
- Palmetto Trail
- Battery to Beach Route
- Low Country Low Line
- Southeast Coast Saltwater Paddling Trail

D. Trail Trends

South Carolina ranks 49th among states for bicycling safety according to a report by the Alliance for Biking & Walking. The “Bicycling and Walking in the U.S.: 2012 Benchmarking Report” shows that while 2.1 percent of work trips in South Carolina are by bicycle or on foot, bicyclists and pedestrians account for 11.9 percent of traffic fatalities in the state.

South Carolina spends just 0.6 percent of its federal transportation dollars on biking and walking, ranking 46th among states for investing in biking and walking.

Currently, South Carolina biking and walking funding works out to just $0.95 per person, compared to the national average of $2.17. Without funding, infrastructure cannot be improved to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, keeping South Carolina the second most unsafe state in which to ride a bike.
Numerous successful projects across the state have been funded in part with federal dollars through threatened programs like Transportation Enhancements, including trails in Greenville, Charleston, and Spartanburg. With continued investment, bicycling and walking can become easier and safer and can be considered a realistic transportation choice for South Carolina residents.

One example of statewide initiatives that support bicycling and walking is the Palmetto Conservation Foundation’s Palmetto Trail, a vision of more than 425 miles of hiking and bicycling paths exploring lakes, mountain ridges, and forests, that is two-thirds complete with nearly 290 miles open to the public. Some sections feature urban bikeways, greenways, and rail-to-trail conversions; others feature the history, culture, and geography of the Palmetto State.

An in-depth trends analysis is provided in Appendix G.

E. Existing Conditions

Trails Inventory Table and Map

This section provides an inventory of the existing trail network based on data collection and field investigation. Table 19 provides a summary of trail examined along with numerical ratings of the trail’s surface quality, crossing facilities, and the overall user experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Adjacent to</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Width (ft)</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Surface Quality*</th>
<th>Crossing Quality*</th>
<th>Notes about Crossings</th>
<th>Environment/Comfort*</th>
<th>Destinations Served</th>
<th>Primary Access Road</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>General Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ashley River Road Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Bee’s Ferry Road</td>
<td>Ashley River Road</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ladder striped crosswalks with signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drayton Hall Elementary</td>
<td>Ashley River Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Merges with the sidewalk for the duration of the bridge; and merges into sidewalk where it ends near Center Street; Marked with “bike lane” signage, but essentially serving as substandard sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ben Sawyer Blvd Bikeway</td>
<td>Hwy 703 in Sullivan’s Island</td>
<td>Center Street</td>
<td>Ben Sawyer Blvd</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 Ladder-striped crosswalk (faded), no signage or other treatments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sullivan’s Island community and beaches; commercial development on mainland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carolina Bay Path</td>
<td>Savannah Hwy</td>
<td>Carolina Bay Drive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most intersections do not have crosswalks or signage; however, near the end of the road, there are a few intersections with ladder-stripe crosswalk and ADA accessible ramps.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Connects residential development to Savannah Hwy</td>
<td>Savannah Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a wide sidewalk. The developer added 4’ of sidewalk onto an original 6’ wide sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Folly Beach Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Bur Clare Road</td>
<td>Folly River Bridge</td>
<td>Hwy 171</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.5-5</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Folly Beach, commercial development, some residential neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ends abruptly at Folly Beach; Sidewalks double as bikeway for some sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>George Griffith Road Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>50 yards west of Folly Road</td>
<td>Riverland Drive</td>
<td>George Griffith Road</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 Ladder striped crosswalk, signage, yet no crosswalk to connect neighborhood on south side of George Griffith Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods, Walmart, Dill Sanctuary</td>
<td>Folly Road and Riverland Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost connects to James Island Park and Folly Road Bike Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hwy 78 Bikeway</td>
<td>University Blvd</td>
<td>Medical Plaza Drive</td>
<td>Hwy 78</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Two-stripe crosswalk (faded), no signage or other markings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wannamaker Park entrance, some commercial development, and potentially other destinations west of Wannamaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes pedestrian lighting and sufficient grassy buffer from Hwy 78 traffic; has no clear way to access/enter onto the trail at its eastern terminus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Trail/Park Name</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Adjacent to</td>
<td>Length (mi)</td>
<td>Width (ft)</td>
<td>Surface Type</td>
<td>Surface Quality</td>
<td>Crossing Quality</td>
<td>Notes about Crossings</td>
<td>Environment/ Comfort*</td>
<td>Destinations Served</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>General Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Isle of Palms Hwy 517 Bikeway</td>
<td>Hwy 17</td>
<td>Hwy 703**</td>
<td>Hwy 517, with wide right of way grassy buffer; transitions to wide shoulders</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADA curb ramps, minimal crosswalk striping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Residential development along Hwy 517, Isle of Palms community and beaches</td>
<td>Primary Access Road</td>
<td>Is one-sided, until development, then becomes trail on both sides of roadway and merges to 8-10 foot shoulders when bridge begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>James Island County Park - Blue</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Park circulator roadway, and wooded areas</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crossing from parking lot to trail access; includes stop sign for vehicles (not for trail user) and striped crosswalk; no curb exists, ADA accessible; “stop” pavement marking for trail users is faded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>James Island County Park Amenities - Splash Zone, Edisto Hall</td>
<td>Primary Access Road</td>
<td>Need improved access onto and off of trails to connect directly to park amenities (several “goat trails” currently exist).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>James Island County Park - Green</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Park circulator, and wooded areas</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Striped crosswalk with stop sign for vehicles and stop pavement marking for trail users</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>James Island County Park Amenities - Splash Zone, Edisto Hall, Climbing Wall, campground</td>
<td>Primary Access Road</td>
<td>Need improved access onto and off of trails to connect directly to park amenities (several “goat trails” currently exist).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>James Island County Park - Orange</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Park circulator roadway, and small lake</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only one along trail; None from parking lots to trail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>James Island County Park Amenities - Splash Zone, Edisto Hall</td>
<td>Primary Access Road</td>
<td>Need improved access onto and off of trails to connect directly to park amenities (several “goat trails” currently exist).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mary Ader Ave Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>West Ashley High School</td>
<td>West Ashley Park</td>
<td>Mary Ader Ave</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asphalt/Concrete</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Well-designed crossing at Glenn McConnell Highway with two-striped crosswalk, refuge median, pedestrian countdown signals, and ADA curb ramps; little to no crossing treatments elsewhere</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>West Ashley High School, West Ashley Park, and dense residential development on both sides of highway</td>
<td>Primary Access Road</td>
<td>A portion of this path (Ashley Park Townhomes) is a wide sidewalk (about 8’). There is a significant crack in one section of pavement. Otherwise, it is in very good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Palmetto Islands County Park - Needlerush Parkway</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Wooded Areas and Coastal Marsh</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bollards used at crossings, slightly raised crosswalks with striping, and signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Palmetto Islands County Park Amenities (All)</td>
<td>Primary Access Road</td>
<td>Potential candidate for a recommended greenway facility (east of Whipple Road) along Long Point Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Crossing Quality:**
  - 1: Poor
  - 2: Fair
  - 3: Good
  - 4: Very Good
  - 5: Excellent
- **Surface Quality:**
  - 1: Poor
  - 2: Fair
  - 3: Good
  - 4: Very Good
  - 5: Excellent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Trail/Park Name</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Adjacent to</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Adjacent (ft)</th>
<th>Width (ft)</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Surface Quality*</th>
<th>Cross Quality*</th>
<th>Notes about Crossings</th>
<th>Notes about Crossings</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Trail/Park Name</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Adjacent to</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Adjacent (ft)</th>
<th>Width (ft)</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Surface Quality*</th>
<th>Cross Quality*</th>
<th>Notes about Crossings</th>
<th>Notes about Crossings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Wooded Areas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (including North Trail)</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Natural Surface</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creek crossings are well-designed and constructed for trail users; transition from trail to parking lot safe and visible.</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park Amenities (All)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Wooded Areas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (including North Trail)</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Natural Surface</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creek crossings are well-designed and constructed for trail users; transition from trail to parking lot safe and visible.</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park Amenities (All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Wooded Areas</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ladder-striped crosswalk, &quot;stop&quot; pavement marking for trail users and signage, with &quot;stop&quot; signs for vehicles and trail users</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park Amenities (All)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Wooded Areas</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ladder-striped crosswalk, &quot;stop&quot; pavement marking for trail users and signage, with &quot;stop&quot; signs for vehicles and trail users</td>
<td>Wannamaker County Park Amenities (All)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Ashley Bikeway</td>
<td>Maryville Neighborhood</td>
<td>Ashley River</td>
<td>Former Rail Bed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>W.L. Stephens Aquatic Center and neighborhoods</td>
<td>Multiple Roads Connect</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Ashley Bikeway</td>
<td>Maryville Neighborhood</td>
<td>Ashley River</td>
<td>Former Rail Bed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>W.L. Stephens Aquatic Center and neighborhoods</td>
<td>Multiple Roads Connect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway</td>
<td>Albemarle Road (near Ashley River)</td>
<td>Former Rail Bed and Current Powerline Easement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>Asphalt, with some unpaved sections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>In neighborhoods: two-striped crosswalk, stop sign for trail users, no signage for vehicles, bollards used on trail; At Hwy 171: no clear crossing at Hwy 171, though re-routing trail users to nearby intersection provides pedestrian treatments; At Farmfield Ave: Trail crossing signage with flashing light, raised crosswalk, and bollards.</td>
<td>Residential Neighborhood; Hotels and marina; Ends at Porter Gaud School/Ballfields</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway</td>
<td>Albemarle Road (near Ashley River)</td>
<td>Former Rail Bed and Current Powerline Easement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>Asphalt, with some unpaved sections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>In neighborhoods: two-striped crosswalk, stop sign for trail users, no signage for vehicles, bollards used on trail; At Hwy 171: no clear crossing at Hwy 171, though re-routing trail users to nearby intersection provides pedestrian treatments; At Farmfield Ave: Trail crossing signage with flashing light, raised crosswalk, and bollards.</td>
<td>Residential Neighborhood; Hotels and marina; Ends at Porter Gaud School/Ballfields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway Connector</td>
<td>Few feet south of Savannah Hwy</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway</td>
<td>Farmfield Ave</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No pavement markings or signage at driveway aprons</td>
<td>Savannah Hwy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway Connector</td>
<td>Few feet south of Savannah Hwy</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway</td>
<td>Farmfield Ave</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No pavement markings or signage at driveway aprons</td>
<td>Savannah Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A photo inventory of trails illustrates the character and quality of the existing trail network. The images below depict representative trail segments of the broader network of trail facilities. Characteristics of trails that relate to the overall strengths and deficiencies of the trail network, as described in the Key Findings section of this Chapter, are visible in the trail images.

As shown below, the internal trails of CCPRC park facilities are well constructed and well maintained. The trails inventory identified a limited number of areas where maintenance could be improved – particularly pavement condition. Circulator road crossings generally favor the trail user over the motor vehicle, which is appropriate for interior park trails and low-volume interior roads, though it is applied inconsistently. The internal trail network also capitalizes on scenic landscapes and attractive vistas, and has further opportunities to do so.

James Island County Park
Mullet Hall Equestrian Center*

*Photos courtesy of National Recreation Trails and CCPRC

Palmetto Islands County Park
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The photo inventory of trail network connections and on-street bikeways and walkways also provides examples of characteristic strengths and deficiencies, such as:

- Low-visibility crosswalks at an intersection on the Ashley River Road Multi-Use Path
- ADA curb ramps on the Carolina Bay Path
- Sufficient trail width on the Highway 78 Bikeway
- Pedestrian signals at an intersection on the Mary Ader Avenue Multi-Use Path
- No crosswalks at a driveway on the West Ashley Greenway Connector (Farmfield Ave)
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Isle of Palms Highway 517 Bikeway

Mary Ader Ave Multi-Use Path

West Ashley Bikeway

West Ashley Greenway

West Ashley Greenway Connector
Overview

As a whole, Charleston County has qualities naturally suited for bicycling, walking, and trail activity and for trail and greenway development. The County benefits from:

- Scenic, protected natural areas and undevelopable wetlands
- Flat terrain
- Climate for year-round bicycling and walking
- Relatively dense, mixed-use areas (such as North Charleston)
- Master-planned bike and walk friendly developments (such as I'on Village)
- Bike and walk friendly beach communities (such as Isle of Palms)
- Popular recreation amenities and outdoor attractions
- Segments of two long-distance trails, (the Palmetto Trail and the East Coast Greenway)

Efforts of the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission are bolstered by the bicycle, pedestrian, and trail planning initiatives of local and regional partners, particularly BCD COG. The region has been successful in using Transportation Enhancement Funds to build multi-use trails in Summerville, trails and sidewalks in Mount Pleasant, and many other projects. BCD COG has successfully secured funds for and developed the East Coast Greenway trail study and the regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan. Local, robust advocacy efforts led to the development of the Ravenel Bridge multi-use path, which provides an important transportation connection and recreation amenity and a crucial link in the East Coast Greenway.

As previously shown in Table 19, the level of service analysis assigned scores to surface quality, crossing quality, and user experience of existing trails. Within the Charleston County trails system, user experience received the highest scores (average 4.3), followed by surface quality (average 3.9), and then crossing quality (average 3.5). These scores suggest both an opportunity to further capitalize on the strength of trail user experiences and an opportunity to improve surface quality and crossing design.

The following provides a summary of strengths and challenges of the existing trail and greenway environment in Charleston County. Recognizing the importance of safe and convenient access to trails for trail users, this section includes opportunities and constraints related to the on-street bikeway and walkway network, as well.

Strengths of Existing Trail and Greenway Conditions

**Rail Easements**: Abandoned railroad tracks provide a linear right of way suitable for developing rails-to-trail greenways. The West Ashley Greenway is an example of a rails-to-trail facility in Charleston County.

**Utility Easements**: Utility corridors provide an undeveloped right of way suitable for developing greenways. Charleston County has many power line corridors offering linear off-street connections. The Ashley River Road multi-use path is a perfect example of a trail within an existing utility corridor. That power line easement, as well as others identified in the county, is owned by South Carolina Electric and Gas (SCE&G).
**Waterways:** In addition to providing a scenic and attractive trail location, waterways provide a linear corridor suitable for developing greenways that is generally unsuited for other types of development. The West Ashley Bikeway and Awendaw Passage of the Palmetto Trail provide two examples of trails along waterways in Charleston County. Additionally, CCPRC circulates interior park trails adjacent to waterways, such as at Palmetto Islands County Park.

**Interior Park Trails:** CCPRC has developed a significant amount of trails within its large acreage, regional parks. The trails generally have a crushed gravel or paved surface and are well constructed and maintained. James Island, Palmetto Islands, and Wannamaker Parks offer examples.

**Low-Speed, Low-Volume Roads:** Neighborhood streets, including those in beach communities, generally have low-speed, low-volume traffic. These are likely candidates for bicycling routes to provide connectivity to parks and trails.

**Deficiencies of Existing Trail and Greenway Conditions**

**Connectivity Gaps:** There is a lack of connectivity between existing trails. Additionally, major barriers (as noted in this section) make connecting trails more difficult. The George Griffith Road multi-use path is an example of an existing facility that is very close to but does not connect to other existing facilities, namely, the James Island Park trails and the Folly Road bike lane.

**Lack of Signage:** Existing trails do not have sufficient signage directing trail users to nearby destinations. Additionally, limited to no signage is available to direct bicyclists along preferred bicycling routes or to existing trails and recreation amenities. The East Coast Greenway is one example of a preferred route that is not identified by consistent, visible signage.

**Discontinuous Bike Facilities:** Existing on-street bikeways do not connect to one another and as a result, often end abruptly. The bikes lane leading into Folly Beach (Highway 171) is one example.

**Roadway Barriers:** Wide, high-volume arterials with high speeds are difficult and often unsafe to cross and present a barrier for bikeway, walkway, or greenway users. Additionally, elevated roadways or overpasses present a more definitive barrier for crossing movements and for connecting trails on either side of it.

**Geographic Barriers:** Charleston County has several major rivers and large wetland areas that serve as natural geographic barriers. Trail bridges or boardwalks are required to create a continuous trail network.

**Insufficient Trail Crossings:** Within CCPRC parks, crosswalks and signage sufficiently stop or slow motor vehicles at trail crossings, though consistency of trail crossing treatments throughout all parks is needed to reinforce safe motorist and trail user behavior. Trail crossings outside of park boundaries generally lack sufficient treatments, such as pavement markings, signage, ADA curb ramps, etc. The intersection of the West Ashley Greenway and Highway 171 is one example.

**Narrow Lanes:** Many roads connecting to parks and trails in Charleston County do not have sufficient width to allow space for bicyclists. These roads have little or no shoulder and have relatively high vehicle travel speeds which pose multiple hazards for bicyclists. Riverland Drive, which provides access to James Island County Park, is one example.
Different user groups have different trail requirements. In most cases, one trail can serve multiple user groups. However, most trails are designed with one primary group of users in mind and are managed for multiple uses. Additionally, the skill of the user can also affect the requirements. Trails are typically designed for the average skilled user. The following narrative examines the needs of each identified user group. They are not presented to illustrate how trail design can affect trail experience.

Natural Surface Trails

Hiking Trails
Hiking trails are usually the most intimate trail type. The tread width is typically between eighteen inches and six feet. A typical hiking trail designed for hikers to walk side-by-side or for two-way travel has a tread width of three to six feet. In addition to horizontal space, vertical clearance to overhead obstructions such as branches should be eight to ten feet. Hikers will have minimal impact to the compaction and displacement of the trail surface. Hikers experience the corridor at a slower pace than other user groups, so careful consideration must be paid to views and creating the trail user experience.

Equestrian Trails
Equestrian trails (or bridle paths) must consider the behavior and physical characteristics of horses. Whether or not equestrians can share the trail with other user groups often depends on the local customs and characteristics of both equestrians and other trail users. A typical two-way equestrian trail is five to ten feet wide with a twelve foot vertical clearance. Horses tend to compact the trail at a much higher rate than hikers and create a trail tread that is trenched.

Mountain Biking Trails
Most mountain bikers (or off-road bicyclists) seek natural and challenging trails and can cover much greater distance than a typical equestrian or hiker. Also, cyclists tend to create ruts along desire lines when riding. As part of a shared use system, it is usually most appropriate to design the pathway as a trail that is typically considered more of a beginner trail in terms of curve radii and trail obstacles. Two way travel requires a minimum of six feet horizontal clearance and eight to ten feet of vertical clearance.

Water-Based Trails
Water-based trails (or Blueways) are marked routes on navigable waterways such as rivers, lakes, canals, and coastlines. Water trails are intended for people using small non-motorized boats such as kayaks, canoes, rafts, or rowboats. Facilities and infrastructure that support water trails include trailheads with parking and informational and directional signage, water access points for put-in and take-out of watercraft, and may even include picnic or camping facilities along the route.

Paved Trails

Pedestrian Trails
Most paved trails intended for pedestrians are designed to a standard suitable for users of all abilities, including individuals who are disabled, families with small children, and elderly individuals. Grades should be kept to an average of five percent or less, and grades over six percent are only suitable for limited distances. Two-way travel requires a minimum of five to six feet horizontal clearance and eight to ten feet of vertical clearance.
Bicycle Trails
Different types of cyclists prefer different types of facilities. A family with young children usually prefers to travel on shared use paths and quiet streets and will generally not travel distances greater than a few miles. Controlled traffic access, quality of the experience, and comfort facilities are of high importance. Comfort facilities such as restrooms, water, rest areas, and signs/maps are keys to the enjoyment of a trail. Recreational cyclists will often travel to destinations that are bike friendly such as trails or low-traffic roads. These cyclists often seek out trails or routes that are greater than twenty miles and have connections to campgrounds or areas with unique scenic qualities. These users tend to value the experience they have with nature on their rides. Fitness cyclists are concerned more with exercise than experiencing nature. These types of cyclists value trails or roads that allow them to travel at faster speeds with minimal user conflicts and like to travel distances of twenty or more miles.

Transportation cyclists do not depend on trails, but will use them if they are direct and safe. These commuter cyclists have different motivations for using a bicycle as their mode of transportation and will travel at high variations of speeds. Their primary barrier is the lack of a safe route to get to their desired destination.

Federal standards require a minimum trail width of eight to twelve feet with physical separation between two-way facilities and automobile traffic. Physical separation can either be in the form of a five foot (minimum) buffer or a railing. Trail crossings must be carefully designed and should be limited in number.

I. Community Identified Needs

The Plan development process included a multi-faceted public outreach campaign. Public input provides valuable local knowledge and reveals the needs of trail-users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and those aspiring to engage in more bicycling, walking, and trail activities in the future.

The following section provides a summary of trails-related information shared by community members through the project survey and multiple focus group and public meetings. Two trails-specific focus group meetings were held in June 2012 and November 2012. The results of those two meetings are included within the summary below. More information about the public outreach campaign is provided in Chapter 2. Public Engagement and Identified Needs of this Plan.

Trail Focused Survey Results

Survey results (Appendix D) indicate that existing trails are an important amenity valued by respondents. Trails are also a high priority in terms of future development. The following brief summary outlines how survey respondents feel about trails in their community.

Current Trail Use
When asked how important current facilities were to a respondent’s household, trails ranked third after beach access and children’s playgrounds. However, when respondents were asked which facility type they used most frequently, trails ranked as the second most frequently used type of facility after beach access. When asked if trails met the needs of a respondent’s current household, the results indicated that trail facilities were viewed less favorably than other facilities that ranked higher such as playgrounds, beach access, picnic areas, water parks, and spray play splash pool. These results indicate that while trails are valued and used regularly by survey respondents the quantity, quality, and condition of these facilities may need some improvement.
Priority for Future Trail Development and Use
The survey indicated that trails were a priority for additions, expansion, and improvement coming in second only to beach access and scoring higher than other top priorities like playgrounds, water parks, and picnic areas. Seventy three percent (73%) of respondents felt that developing new walking and biking trails and greenways was very important, while just four percent felt it was not at all important. Likewise, 55 percent of respondents felt that purchasing land for trails and open space was very important with 19 percent indicating that it was not important.

When asked to prioritize future programs and facilities, a majority of respondents (61 percent) indicated that trails were a desired facility for future development. A new water trail system was also prioritized by respondents (61 percent). The only future program or facility that scored higher than trails and water trails was new nature programs, with 67 percent of respondents indicating that this was a top priority. It is important to note that the creation of new trails, both on land and on water, would support and help facilitate future nature programs.

Trail Essentials: What do Respondents Desire in a Trail System?
Survey respondents were asked to prioritize improvements to the trail system. Improvements that ranked highest were restroom availability and maintenance (83 percent), trailheads with parking, access to water, restrooms (82 percent), and signage maps/wayfinding on trails (78 percent). Preservation, protection, and restoration of natural resources along greenway corridors (76 percent) also ranked high, as did loop trails within parks (76 percent). Likewise, when respondents were asked what the three most important aspects of greenways and trails were, 50 percent identified restroom availability and maintenance; 43 percent identified Loop Trails; and 38 percent identified amenities along trails such as seating, water, fountains, and shade.

Focus Groups and Public Meetings
As discussed in Chapter 2. Public Engagement and Identified Needs, the focus groups and public meetings conducted for this Plan covered a broad range of topics related to parks, recreation, open space, and trails in Charleston County. Based on a review of public comments recorded within each of these meetings, the following section discusses trails-related needs and desires.

Access to Resources
In general, participants identified the need to improve access to trails in urban and underserved areas as a priority. Improving and repairing existing trail infrastructure was identified as a need as was increasing and improving ADA access within existing parks. The public and stakeholders also identified expanding trail access to specific user groups such as hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrians. While there was a strong desire to expand the trail system to undeveloped areas, the need to protect the natural and undeveloped character of these places was also identified as a priority.

Needs/Desires:
- Improve access to trails in underserved urban areas.
  - Based on population density
  - When asked about underserved areas, the commission noted West Ashley and the airport, as well as “places where people can walk or ride bikes to.”
  - Preliminary basic access (trails, dock, signage, restroom, trailhead, etc.) to the undeveloped properties in harmony with the development process
- Provide more trails in undeveloped parks for hiking, mountain biking, equestrian, and ATV use.
- Improve and increase accessible (ADA) trail network within parks and open spaces.
- Connect trails to municipal parks.
• Improve and repair existing trails connecting parks and open spaces.
• Expand trail network while protecting undeveloped character of rural parks.
  ▪ Trails in new properties
  ▪ Connector trails between parks and mountain bike trails

**Connectivity**
Participants identified the need to improve trail connectivity between both existing developed parks and undeveloped park sites. Both on-street and off-street connectivity was emphasized as well as the desire to improve connectivity to existing trails. Improving public (motorized) transportation to parks was also identified as a need.

**Needs/Desires:**
**Active Transportation**
• Create regional trail routes connecting to areas outside of the City of Charleston.
• Establish spur trails to small municipalities and to schools.
• Improve trail connectivity between developed parks and between developed parks and residential areas both in terms of on-street and off-street trail facilities.
  ▪ Lack of non-motorized connection between parks
  ▪ Need more connectivity and trails, both on-street and off-street facilities
  ▪ Non-motorized access should be highest priority (adjacent neighborhoods first, then other parks)
• Improve trail connectivity to undeveloped properties (parks/open spaces).
  ▪ Basic access to undeveloped properties (trails, etc.)
• Improve trail connectivity to the East Coast Greenway.
  ▪ Trail connections to the greenbelt projects and parks

**Transit**
• Improve public transportation serving parks and trailheads.

**Amenities and Programs**
Amenities identified as a need by participants range from establishing new blueway trails to improving wayfinding for the trail system. The desire to add distance markers and fitness stations in parks and along trails was mentioned as was the desire to provide opportunities for educational programs to increase safety and understanding of natural resources.

**Needs/Desires:**
**Amenities**
• Provide fitness stations in parks and along trails.
• Provide distance markers along trails.
• Improve wayfinding signage.
  ▪ Signage describing amenities in each park
  ▪ Brand and/or rename CCPRC Trails
• Provide unpaved trails for multiple user groups
• Expand mountain biking trails
• Develop blueway trails.
  ▪ Connect with Kayak/Canoe, overnight camping, restroom facilities, coordinated with other public entities

**Programs**
• Offer bicycle safety course.
• Offer an eco-tourism program (associated with blueway trail).
Resource Protection and Visitor Experience
A need to expand the trail system was balanced with a desire to protect natural resources and the undeveloped character of properties. A desire to locate new trails which improve access to points of interest and key destinations was also expressed.

Needs/Desires:
- Create bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are comfortable and safe.
- Develop trail experiences that celebrate and protect the scenic and undeveloped character of the landscape.
  - Important not to overdevelop land – maintain trees and natural areas
  - Promotion and provision as beautiful/scenic
  - CCPRC should capitalize on the natural resources of the new land acquisitions
  - A good example is Wannamaker Park, where activities are focused in one area, and the trails go off into nature
  - Blueways
- Expand and develop the trail system to connect to key points of interest.
  - Trails should lead to or pass something significant.

J. Key Trail Findings from User Needs Assessment

Public input on the existing trail network and future trail needs and desires was sought via a series of stakeholder meetings as well as a statistically-valid survey. Four key findings have been identified and are outlined below.

- Trails are frequently used by the community. The existing trail system is well utilized and appreciated by residents. It is clear that there is broad support for trails in the community and that trails are considered a valued part of the services provided by CCPRC.

- An improved and expanded trail system is desired by the community. Existing trails need to be improved by increasing amenities like directional signage, access to restrooms, shade, and water. New trails that increase connectivity, provide ADA access, and diversify the types of visitor experiences (water trails, hiking, cycling, equestrian use, etc.) are also a community priority.

- Trails are important for both transportation and recreation purposes. Residents value and utilize trails for both recreation and transportation needs. In order to increase access to recreation resources in the community, more developed (urban) areas are in need of improved trail connectivity between parks and other key destinations. Trails are also viewed as important recreation experiences and the desire to improve this experience via an expanded trail network, improvement of existing trails, and diversification of trail type or experience (water trails, hiking, cycling, equestrian use, etc.) was also a key finding of the public input process.

- Trails should be designed to protect natural areas but also to allow greater access to natural settings and experiences. Access to nature and providing people with the ability to connect and enjoy natural settings was a key finding of the public process that is supported by existing trails and an expanded trail network. Natural settings should be thoughtfully and sensitively incorporated into the trail network to ensure that the community can enjoy these settings while also protecting them for future generations.
Overview of Trail Recommendations

The trail recommendations of this Plan address the community-identified goals of expanding Charleston County’s existing trail system and creating bicycle and pedestrian access to park and recreation facilities. Recommendations build on the strengths of the existing CCPRC parks and recreation system and previous bicycle, pedestrian, and trail planning efforts. Proposed improvements are organized as follows:

- Recommended Trail Facility Types
- Regional Trails
- Interior Park Trails
- Water-based Trials
- Trail Network Recommendations by Sub-Area
- Implementation Strategies

Recommended Trail Facility Types

Paved Shoulder/Bike Lane: Paved shoulders are the part of a roadway which is contiguous and on the same level as the regularly traveled portion of the roadway. While there is no minimum width in paved shoulders, a minimum width of four feet is preferred for safe and comfortable bicycling. Ideally, paved shoulders should be included in the construction of new roadways and/or the upgrade of existing roadways, especially where there is a need to more safely accommodate bicycles.

Neighborhood Greenway: Neighborhood greenways are low-volume, low-speed streets modified to enhance pedestrian and bicyclist comfort by using treatments such as signage, pavement markings, traffic calming and/or traffic reduction, and intersection modifications. These treatments allow through movements of bicyclists and pedestrians while discouraging similar through trips by non-local motorized traffic. Sidewalks are constructed on streets where they do not exist already.

Shared-use Path: Shared-use paths are physically separated from motor vehicle traffic, and can be located either within the highway right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way. By definition, they accommodate multiple types of users, most notably, bicyclists and pedestrians, and are typically bi-directional. The presence of multi-use paths should not necessarily preclude the provision of parallel on-road bicycle facilities (such as paved shoulders or bicycle lanes). Similarly, a cyclist is not required to use the trail instead of the roadway.

Shared-use Path Along Roadways: Shared-use paths located within the highway right-of-way are also referred to as “Sideways.” Sideways provide a comfortable walking space for pedestrians and enables children and recreational bicyclists to ride without the discomfort of riding in a busy street. This configuration works best along roadways with limited drive-way crossings and with services primarily located on one side of the roadway, or along a riverfront or other natural feature. Where a roadway currently uses drainage ditches, constructing curb and gutter may be required.

Primitive Trails: Primitive trails are unpaved, natural surface trails, ranging in character from two foot-wide path to a twelve foot-wide mulched trail. This type of trail can be used in environmentally sensitive areas, in areas where the typical paved cross-section cannot fit, or in areas where frequent use is unexpected or undesirable. A wide natural surface trail can also be used to preserve the natural context of the trail’s surroundings. Primitive trails may be accessible for use by one of more of the following user groups: hikers, naturalists, off-road bicyclists, and equestrians.
Boardwalks: Typically, this plan recommends paved asphalt surface for multi-use paths although an alternative type of boardwalk design is required in some areas. Boardwalk or wood surfaces are typically required when crossing wetlands or other poorly drained areas. They are constructed of wooden planks or recycled material planks that form the top layer of the boardwalk. The recycled material has gained popularity in recent years since it lasts much longer than wood, especially in wet conditions. A number of low-impact support systems are also available that reduce the disturbance within wetland areas to the greatest extent possible.

Water-based Trails: Water-based trails, or “blueways,” provide recreational non-motorized boating opportunities along waterways. South Carolina's coastal plain, comprised of small creeks and rivers, sheltered estuarine waters, and open expanses of large rivers and sounds, offers a variety of paddling experiences. These diverse waterways provide opportunities for all levels of paddling skills, from beginners to experts. For this plan, a key aspect of blueway recommendations is where to site new non-motorized boat launches.

Regional Trails Recommendations
- Partner and share resources with BCDCOG, SCDOT, and other organizations to ensure that development of the East Coast Greenway is a priority.
- Coordinate with BCDCOG to consider alternative alignments of the East Coast Greenway.
- Collaborate with the Palmetto Conservation Foundation in efforts to promote usage of and create linkages to the Palmetto Trail.

East Coast Greenway
The East Coast Greenway remains the crucial linchpin in the County’s overall trail network. This nationally significant greenway serves as an east-west spine and as a signature trail for the region. The proposed countywide trail network creates links to this central corridor and development of the greenway is a priority for connectivity of the overall network. This Plan identifies alternative alignments for certain segments of the East Coast Greenway. Those routes are noted in the following summary of recommendations for consideration by the Berkeley Charleston Dorchester Council of Government (BCDCOG), which is leading the campaign to implement the greenway, and the CCPRC.

Palmetto Trail
The Palmetto Trail is a valuable asset for the trail network. Though the route does not provide a cross-county link among residential areas and destinations, it does provide an accessible hiking and biking facility for the eastern portion of Charleston County. The trail also links directly to the East Coast Greenway. Additionally, the Palmetto Trail adds significant value as a tourist destination and as the western terminus of a nearly continuous statewide mountains-to-sea trail. As gaps in the Upstate portion of the Palmetto Trail are closed, the Awendaw Passage of the Palmetto Trail will only increase in value and usage.

Interior Park Trails
The interior park trails of CCPRC are well-designed and popular among local residents. As discussed in the Trails Inventory section, CCPRC trails capitalize on existing landmarks and scenic natural features and will benefit from a continued effort to do so. Opportunities exist to improve the pavement quality and maintenance of CCPRC trails. Additionally, Chapter 4. Developed Lands and Chapter 5. Undeveloped Lands of this Plan provide site-specific recommendations for expansion of the interior trail network, such as at Wannamaker Park and Old Towne Creek Future Park Site, among others.

Chapter 6: The Trail System Today
The Trail User Needs Analysis of this Plan discusses community-identified priorities for interior park trails. These priorities are reflected in the recommendations below.

**Interior Park Trail Recommendations:**

Improve interior park trails through:

- Increasing trail access to vistas, waterway features, and historic or cultural sites.
- Ensuring consistency of signage at trail crossings.
- Constructing primitive trails within undeveloped park sites and allowing access for public use.
- Ensuring that interior park trails serve a variety of user groups ranging from off-road bicyclists to equestrians to birdwatchers.
- As future park sites are developed and existing park sites are expanded, establishing new trails within the sites (including new park developments within the MeadWestvaco East Edisto property).

**Water-based Trails**

The planned blueways within Charleston County play an important role within the county’s overall trail network and parks and recreation system. In particular, as an effort coordinated by the National Parks Service, the Southeast Coast Saltwater Paddling Trail is a priority project for development and promotion.

**Blueway Trail Recommendations:**

Improve the blueway trail network through:

- Developing a comprehensive user-friendly map featuring countywide blueway access information and blueway safety information (hardcopy and online).
- Providing clear blueway signage, from both the road and the water that corresponds to the user map to identify public access points.
- Creating new non-motorized boat access points for blueways (see design guidelines for more information about blueway development).
- Prioritizing blueway development along corridors with existing CCPRC properties and public access areas, such as the route extending west from the Charleston peninsula to Folly Beach (which includes Wappoo Cut Boat Landing/McLeod Plantation, James Island County Park, and Folly Beach County Park).
- Considering opportunities to create spur blueway trails, such as a blueway route extending to the Caw Caw Interpretive Center.

**Trail Network Recommendations by Sub-Area**

Based on community-identified goals and priorities, the Trail Network recommendations focus on access to county park and recreation sites. The “bicycling-shed” and “pedestrian-shed” of each existing and future CCPRC site reflects the distance that an average bicyclists or walker is willing to traverse to reach a destination. Facilities such as Haut Gap Recreation Site capture numerous neighborhoods within their catchment area and present opportunities for creating family-friendly trail linkages for both bicycling and walking. In more rural areas of the county, locations like the Meggett Future Park Site, capture less residential areas within their biking and walking-sheds, and thus, are best accessed by fitness or touring cyclists. Figures 39 through 42 illustrate the “bicycling-shed” and “pedestrian-shed” of existing and future CCPRC sites.
The Trail Network recommendations, as shown in Figures 32 through 39, capitalize on existing bicycle, pedestrian, and trail facilities, as well as previously planned routes that serve key destinations. The East Coast Greenway serves as the spine of the countywide trail network. The Battery to Beach bicycling route is an important link in the bicycling network. The Low Country Low Line will serve as a signature linchpin for trail connections to the Charleston peninsula. Each of these routes has already reached the phase of feasibility study or implementation and benefits from existing community-based support. Each is a priority for implementation within this Plan. CCPRC is a key partner in the efforts of BCDCOG and local community groups to implement these routes.

Additional priority trail segments are identified by sub-area. CCPRC has the capacity to lead trail development efforts that provide direct connections to park sites and that can be developed outside of the roadway right-of-way. In particular, many of the priority trail segments identified can be developed within power line easement corridors or abandoned rail corridors. CCPRC will partner with BCDCOG, local municipalities, and SCDOT in developing priority trail connections segments that are proposed within the roadway right-of-way.

Figure 32: Resource Map E: West County Sub-Area Trail Map
Figure 33: Resource Map C: Charleston Center Sub-Area Trail Map

Figure 34: Resource Map B: North Sub-Area Trail Map
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Figure 35: Resource Map D: East County Sub-Area Trail Map

Figure 36: Resource Map F: Proposed and Existing Trails – North County
Figure 37: Resource Map G: Proposed and Existing Trails – Charleston Center

Figure 38: Resource Map H: Proposed and Existing Trails – East County
L. West County Sub-Area Trail Recommendations

Edisto Island Future Park Site

Nestled in the westernmost corner of the Charleston County, this scenic park site is surrounded by rural land. A proposed paved shoulder along Pine Landing Road and a previously recommended bikeway along Highway 174 (from Edisto Beach to Highway 164) will provide access to the site. Recommendations related to interior park trails are discussed in Chapter 5. Undeveloped Lands.

Meggett Future Park Site

The Meggett Future Park Site is best accessed by proposed paved shoulders along existing roads. Ethel Post Office Road (west of Highway 165) and Highway 165, from Ethel Post Office Road to Toogoodoo Road, provide a scenic rural bikeway route. A minimum of 4’ shoulders are typically recommended. However, due to environmental constraints along one section of Highway 165 (extensive wetland areas on either side of the road), any additional width for shoulders that can be provided, either through travel lane narrowing and/or the addition of shoulders less than 4’, is preferable to current conditions. A recommended shared-use path along Toogoodoo Road, as well as a shared-use path paralleling Coastline Road (near Meggett’s town center) provides off-street trail connections that link the future park site to the East Coast Greenway. Recommendations related to interior park trails are discussed in Chapter V – Undeveloped Lands.
Baptist Hill Recreation Site/Blaney Recreation Site/Ravenel Future Park Site

The recreation site at Blaney Elementary School is best accessed by a previously recommended bikeway along Highway 164. This paved shoulder corridor, coupled with a proposed shared-use path along Baptist Hill Road from Toogoodoo Road to Highway 162, will provide access to Baptist Hill Recreation Site.

A regional connector which provides access to each of these sites is recommended through a combination of shared-use paths along roadways and a rail-to-trail conversion. The shared-use paths along roadways are proposed for Highway 165 from Toogoodoo (at Exile Road) to Highway 17, Toogoodoo Road from Highway 165 (at Exile Road) to Summit Plantation Road, and Summit Plantation Road to connect the proposed rail-trail to Toogoodoo Road.

The proposed rail trail utilizes a former rail bed from Highway 174 to Summit Plantation Drive. Abandoned in the 1960s, the rail line stretches west-east, just south of, and parallel to, Toogoodoo Road. The corridor remains intact west of Summit Plantation Road and provides a scenic off-road route. At one point along the route (east of Parishville Road), the rail bed provides a land bridge across a marsh, save for a relatively narrow inlet waterway that divides the land bridge. Piers of the former rail line still stand in the water. This segment requires construction of a bridge which will serve as a scenic landmark and viewing area.

Caw Caw Interpretive Center

The currently adopted East Coast Greenway route is within the right of way of Highway 17 and provides direct access to the Caw Caw Interpretive Center. This Plan recommends consideration of an alternative alignment for this segment of the East Coast Greenway – extending both east and west of the Caw Caw entrance.

West of the Caw Caw entrance, a power line easement extends west-east from Buckhorn Road to Highway 17, paralleling Highway 17. The easement provides sufficient width of undevelopable linear space for trail development. The easement encounters only three cross streets. Intersection improvements to provide a safe crossing at those locations are necessary. Additionally, significant improvements are necessary where the trail must cross Highway 17 to reach the Caw Caw Interpretive Center, such as high visibility crosswalks, median refuge, and consideration of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB). A shared-use path along Buckhorn Road connecting the power line easement alternative alignment to the current East Coast Greenway alignment on Highway 17 is also recommended.

East of the Caw Caw entrance, the same power easement continues to offer sufficient width of linear space for trail development. The trail alignment then shifts south through a forested area and connects to a rail-with-trail opportunity. This active rail line extends west from the existing West Ashley Greenway trail facility and provides an appropriate alternative route for the East Coast Greenway, which also utilizes the West Ashley Greenway.

An additional proposed shared-use path extends south of Highway 17 and the Caw Caw Interpretive Center. The proposed trail extends through property managed by the Department of Natural Resources and links to the Dixie Plantation property of the College of Charleston. This trail terminates at the western shore of the Stono River providing a potential scenic vista and blueway access point.
Limehouse Point Future Park Sites

Limehouse Point Future Park Site is situated between an active rail line and a major highway (Main Road), both of which limit existing bicycle and pedestrian access. A safe route to the park site is best provided through a new proposed rail trail connecting directly to the West Ashley Greenway. This extension of the popular West Ashley Greenway rail-trail extends west from the current terminus of the trail and provides a potential new location for a trailhead. The West Ashley Greenway is a facility of the City of Charleston Parks Department.

Additional connections to the park site include a shared-use path along Main Road from the rail-trail to the East Coast Greenway alignment along Highway 17 and recommended bikeway along Main Road south of the rail-trail to Haute Gap Recreation Site.

Haut Gap Recreation Site

Located at Haut Gap Middle School, the Haut Gap Recreation site is bordered by multiple, relatively dense neighborhoods. Trail access to the site is best served by a series of shared-use paths along roadways and off-street shared use paths that link directly to the adjacent neighborhoods. The low-volume, low-speed roads within the neighborhoods provide safe connections to the proposed trails for nearby residents of all ages. The proposed improvements include creating shared-use paths from Maybank Highway to Bohicket Road at two locations.

The first location is directly east of the school property, with the trail following the eastern edge of the school’s parcel and linking to Hay Road at Maybank Highway. Intersection improvements to provide a highly visible and safe crossing at Hay Road are necessary. The second location is northeast of and parallel to Berryhill Road. Though no utility easements are present, the trail follows a continuous undeveloped corridor with existing informal trails. The two shared-use paths are linked by a shared-use path along Bohicket Road. While fewer driveways and more right of way exist on the southbound side of Bohicket Road, developing the path along the southbound side would require two unsignalized crossings.

Kiawah Beachwalker Park Located within the scenic resort community of Kiawah Island, the Kiawah Beachwalker Park is currently accessible by a family-friendly and comfortable shared-use path along Beachwalker Drive. The existing path connects to Kiawah Island Parkway, which is a previously proposed bikeway. No further recommendations are needed.

Future Johns Island County Park/Mullet Hall Equestrian Center

The Mullet Hall Equestrian Center and Future Johns Island County Park site is located within a rural area dominated by agricultural fields. The site is accessed by way of Betsy Kerrison Parkway/Bohicket Road and River Road, both of which include a previously proposed bikeway. No further recommendations for trail access are needed. Interior park trail expansion recommendations are discussed in Chapter 5. Undeveloped Lands.

Table 20 details the West County sub-area trail priorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Accessed</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meggett Future Park Site</td>
<td>Undeveloped Corridor</td>
<td>Toogoodoo Road</td>
<td>Churches Flat Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Hill Recreation Site</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td>Highway 174</td>
<td>Summit Plantation Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Buckhorn Road</td>
<td>Caw Caw Interpretive Center Entrance</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Caw Caw Interpretive Center Entrance</td>
<td>Proposed Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail with Trail</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway (west)</td>
<td>Proposed Stono River Connector</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Corridor</td>
<td>Proposed Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Stono River</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckhorn Road</td>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alternative Alignment</td>
<td>Highway 17</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Point Future Park Site</td>
<td>McLeod Mill Road</td>
<td>Park Entrance</td>
<td>Proposed West Ashley Greenway Extension</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Corridor</td>
<td>Maybank Highway</td>
<td>Bohicket Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohicket Road</td>
<td>Proposed Connector (north)</td>
<td>Proposed Connector (south)</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Corridor</td>
<td>Bohicket Road</td>
<td>W Amy Lane</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Existing and Future Folly Beach Park Sites

Folly Beach is a priority destination for CCPRC patrons. CCPRC sites on the island include Folly River Landing, Folly Beach County Park, East Arctic Future Park Site, Folly Beach Pier, and Lighthouse Inlet Heritage Preserve Future Park. West/East Ashley Avenue, which covers the length of the island, has a constrained right of way and is a crucial corridor for accessing sites on the island. This Plan recommends an on-street paved shoulder/bike lane facility from Folly Beach County Park on the west end to Lighthouse Inlet Heritage Future Park on the east end. Additionally, on-street improvements on Center Street and the existing bikeway route on Folly Road are recommended. As part of the Battery to Beach bicycling route, this corridor is a priority for on-street improvements.

Secessionville Future Park Site

This Plan recommends a paved shoulder/bike lane facility on Fort Lamar Road from Old Military Road to the Secessionville Future Park Site. The facility will connect to the Battery to Beach bicycling route on Old Military Road.

James Island County Park

Trail access to James Island County Park is best served by a series of off-street shared-use paths and shared-use paths along roadways. An existing shared-use path along George L. Griffith Boulevard provides an important connection to Folly Road and the neighborhoods that are within that area. A short connection on the eastern end of George L. Griffith Boulevard will complete the route. At its western end, this Plan proposes shared-use paths extending both north and south along Riverland Drive.

South of George L. Griffith, a shared-use path is proposed within the road right of way of both Riverland Drive and the easternmost portion of Grimball Road. The final stretch of trail along Grimball Road, connecting Riverland Drive to Folly Road, is important to link trail users directly to the bike lane along Folly Road, the commercial destinations at this intersection, and the residential areas that lie just across Folly Road.

North of George L. Griffith, a proposed shared-use path extends within a power line easement that runs parallel to, but separated from the southbound lane of Riverland Drive. A bridge is required to cross the marsh before reaching the entrance of James Island County Park. The path continues north along Riverland Drive and east along Camp Road. This Plan recommends a shared-use path along the roadway for Riverland Drive north of the entrance of James Island County Park to Hollings Road and for Camp Road from Riverland Drive to Fort Johnson Road. Camp Road links directly to the Battery to Beach bicycling route, as well as numerous neighborhoods. A shared-use path is also recommended along Hollings Road to connect to additional neighborhoods.

Another opportunity for trail development within a power line easement is provided north of Hollings Road, directly west of Stefan Street. This off-street trail facility will provide a bicycle and pedestrian connection for neighborhoods north of Maybank Highway.
**McLeod Plantation Future Park Site**

Recommended improvements for accessing James Island County Park will benefit the McLeod Plantation Future Park Site. The proposed Hollings Road shared-use path will provide an east-west connection. Further access is provided by low-volume, low-speed residential streets, identified as proposed neighborhood greenways.

**Old Towne Creek Future Park Site**

Shared-use paths along Wappoo Road and Ashley Hall Road will provide important bicycle and pedestrian connections near the Old Towne Creek Future Park Site. Additionally, improvements along Wappoo Road will link directly to the West Ashley Greenway, the East Coast Greenway, and the West Ashley Bikeway. The two shared-use paths will connect to the park site and adjacent neighborhoods through low-volume, low-speed residential streets.

**Bulow Future Park Site**

Due north of the Limehouse Point Future Park Site, the Bulow Future Park Site benefits from the proposed shared-use path along Main Road and along Bees Ferry Road, providing bicycle and pedestrian access for neighborhoods south of Highway 17. This Plan recommends a trail within the power line easement that extends east from the park site at Bear Swamp Road. This proposed trail connects to the recommended shared-use path along Main Road and continues east to connect to existing trails on West Bridge Road and Highway 61. Numerous residential areas are linked to the park through this series of trail connections.

While the proposed path along Bees Ferry Road, in particular, will provide an important east-west connection parallel to this path, the shared-use path proposed within this Plan will provide a different user experience suitable for a wider variety of ages and abilities, will more directly link residential areas to the Bulow park site, and will also provide a direct link to the existing shared-use paths at W. Bridge Road and Ashley River Road (Highway 61). As a long-term trail priority, this Plan additionally proposes an ambitious trail bridge stretching across the Ashley River that will connect from this proposed shared-use path directly to the Ashley River Future Park Site and the proposed trail network of the North Charleston area.

Recommendations related to interior park trails are discussed in *Chapter 5. Undeveloped Lands*.

**Downtown Charleston**

The previously proposed Low Country Low Line trail will follow the path of I-26 into the heart of the Charleston peninsula. This trail will provide direct access to downtown Charleston, as well as a CCPRC site at I-26 and the Arthur J. Ravenel Bridge (future plans for this site are yet to be determined). This Plan proposes a neighborhood greenway facility to link the Low Country Low Line route to the City of Charleston’s Hampton Park.

*Table 21* details the Charleston Center sub-area trail priorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Accessed</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne Creek Future Park Site</td>
<td>Wappoo Road</td>
<td>West Ashley Greenway</td>
<td>Wappoo Road at Jessamine Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Maybank Highway</td>
<td>Hollings Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollings Road</td>
<td>Fleming Road</td>
<td>Riverland Drive</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverland Drive</td>
<td>Hollings Road</td>
<td>James Island Parkway</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>James Island Parkway</td>
<td>George L Griffith Boulevard</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George L Griffith Boulevard</td>
<td>Proposed Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Folly Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Road</td>
<td>Riverland Drive</td>
<td>Fort Johnson Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulow Future Park Site</td>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Bear Swamp Road</td>
<td>West Bridge Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Charleston</td>
<td>Low Country Low Line</td>
<td>King Street Extension</td>
<td>Highway 17</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cooper River Marina

The Cooper River Marina is located at the southernmost end of the North County Sub-Area. Stakeholder input garnered through the planning process, suggested a strong demand for bicycling access to the site. This Plan recommends an on-street bike lane facility extending from Meeting Street (Highway 52), along Reynolds Avenue, Hobson Avenue, and Holland Street, to the Marina. This proposed route will also link bicyclists to the proposed rail-trail that parallels Meeting Street.

Ashley River Future Park Site/Wannamaker County Park

The North County Sub-Area is a primarily suburban area dominated by residential growth and commercial corridors. This Plan recommends two regional trails linking the north area to the Charleston peninsula and connecting directly to Wannamaker County Park, at the northeastern edge of the region, and the Ashley River Future Park Site at the southwestern end of the area. Both trails link directly to the northern terminus of the proposed Low Country Low Line, paralleling King Street Ext; however, the routes diverge at the intersection of Tuxbury Lane and Spruill Avenue.

On the west side of the North County Sub-Area, the proposed trail utilizes a continuous power line easement corridor extending from neighborhoods north of Wannamaker County Park to Interstate 526. The trail crosses Interstate 26 and an active CSX rail line. As no bicycle or pedestrian-friendly overpasses or underpasses at Interstate 26 currently exist near the trail, this Plan recommends constructing a shared-use path along Highway 78 at Charleston Southern University. A new at-grade railroad crossing is required at the CSX rail line, due north of Palmetto Commerce Parkway. Spur trails connect the regional trail spine to multiple neighborhoods and communities such as Ladson and Hanahan. A shared-use path along Dorchester Road is recommended to connect to the Ashley River Future Park Site.

On the east side of the North County Sub-Area, the proposed trail utilizes two continuous CSX railroad corridors (with some segments active and others abandoned). Just north of the intersection of Hyde Avenue and Braddock Avenue, the trail will take a sharp turn left, heading west parallel to Interstate 526. A majority of this area below Interstate 526 is owned by the City of North Charleston, which has long-term plans to develop boardwalk paths along it. The proposed shared-use path could be constructed as multi-use boardwalks within this city-owned property. Directly east of the intersection of Interstate 526 and Highway 52, the proposed shared-use path will intersect with another CSX north-south railroad corridor and follow this corridor all the way to Wannamaker Park. A spur trail links the corridor to the airport, the Boeing facility, the Centre Point shopping area, and the Ashley River Future Park Site.

Table 22 details the North County sub-area trail priorities.
Table 22: North County Sub-Area Trail Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Accessed</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Saint James Avenue</td>
<td>Highway 78 at Charleston Southern University</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 78</td>
<td>Charleston Southern University</td>
<td>Powerline Easement</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Highway 78</td>
<td>Interstate 526 at Dorchester Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Brandywine Blvd (at Highway 52)</td>
<td>Interstate 526</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I526</td>
<td>Proposed I526 to Wannamaker Connector</td>
<td>Proposed Low Country Low Line to I526 Connector</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail with Trail/Rail Trail</td>
<td>Tuxbury Lane at Spruill Avenue</td>
<td>Interstate 526</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaux Parkway – Aviation Avenue – International Blvd</td>
<td>Fighter Drive</td>
<td>Ashley River Future Park Site (with spur trail to Centre Point Drive)</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Proposed I-526 to Wannamaker Connector</td>
<td>Aviation Avenue</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0. East County Sub-Area

Palmetto Islands County Park/Rifle Range Future Park Site

The Town of Mount Pleasant has made significant progress developing a bicycle and pedestrian network, including recent bike lane, sidewalk, and shared-use path enhancements. This Plan recommends capitalizing on the existing improvements, in particular the Sweetgrass Basket Parkway shared-use path, to create a broader trail connection linking Palmetto Islands County Park, the Rifle Range Future Park Site, the East Coast Greenway, and numerous residential areas and commercial and institutional destinations.

The proposed trail utilizes a power line easement that extends from the southern boundary of Palmetto Islands County Park to Mathis Ferry Road near Highway 17. This easement passes along scenic inlet waterways after the trail heads west and crosses over Mt. Royall Drive. Boardwalk facilities may be required and wildlife viewing areas are recommended for this short segment. The easement then passes by several residential areas. As it meets Lillie and Rebecca Lane, the trail may continue as a paved shared-use path, or could become an on-street neighborhood greenway for this short one-block segment of roadway. Future plans for construction of new homes on this street and the preferences of adjacent homeowners will determine the most appropriate facility type for this segment.
When the trail passes Buist Academy, it becomes a shared-use path along a roadway. Following the path of Mathis Ferry Road (and briefly, Lymington Drive) and Highway 17, the proposed trail alignment is within the roadway right of way. The short segment extending from Lymington Drive to Market Center Boulevard requires further study to determine available right-of-way and the feasibility of potential alternative alignments (such as maneuvering the trail behind homes fronting Highway 17). The trail ultimately links to the existing Sweetgrass Basket Parkway, by way of the Isle of Palms Connector. The trail continues east from the end of Sweetgrass Basket Parkway along an undeveloped corridor (though no known utility easement exists) to connect directly to the Rifle Range Future Park Site.

Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are required to create a safe trail crossing at Highway 17 and the Isle of Palms Connector. This Plan recommends widening existing sidewalks or narrow trails that occur along this segment (such as the trails near Candlewood Drive) to allow for a comfortable and consistent shared-use path experience across the overall network.

The Plan also recognizes current efforts by the Town of Mount Pleasant to create a bicycle and pedestrian linkage to the historic Palmetto Fort at the coast. A proposed shared-use path connects Highway 17 to the north side of the Rifle Range Future Park Site and to the East Coast Greenway corridor. Utilizing interior park trails, the path will connect to another proposed shared-use path extending south near Tarrington Lane.

All Other Existing and Future Park Sites in The East County Sub-Area
The current route for East Coast Greenway links to every park site within the East County Sub-Area, other than Palmetto Islands County Park. The list of sites that are touched by the route include Rifle Range Future Park Site, discussed previously, along with Mt. Pleasant Memorial Waterfront Park Pier, Isle of Palms County Park, Laurel Hill Plantation Future Park Site, Awendaw Future Park Site, Thompson Hill Recreation Site, Saint James Santee Recreation Site, and McClellanville Future Park Site. This Plan recommends consideration of an alternative alignment for the East Coast Greenway that would retain a direct connection to three park sites, but offer a more scenic, off-road trail experience. The alternative alignment extends from the Awendaw Future Park Site to the McClellanville Future Park Site by way of the Saint James Santee Recreation Site.

Due east of the Awendaw Future Park Site, where Doar Road curves north, a power line easement extends through forested, undeveloped lands at the coastal edge of Francis Marion National Forest. The easement offers a continuous linear corridor that connects directly to the existing Palmetto Trail and that crosses Highway 17 at the exact location of Saint James Santee Recreation Site. The proposed trail continues east until Tibwin Road, which borders the McClellanville Future Park Site.

*Table 23* details the East County sub-area trail priorities.
Table 23: East County Sub-Area Trail Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Accessed</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Islands County Park</td>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Southern end of park property</td>
<td>Mathis Ferry Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathis Ferry Road-Highway 17</td>
<td>Whipple Road</td>
<td>Isle of Palms Connector</td>
<td>Shared-use Path Along Roadway</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Range Future Park Site</td>
<td>Undeveloped Corridor</td>
<td>Eastern terminus of Sweetgrass Basket Parkway</td>
<td>Park entrance on Rifle Range Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undeveloped Corridor</td>
<td>Highway 17</td>
<td>Proposed Trail extending west from Sweetgrass Basket Parkway</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undeveloped Corridor</td>
<td>Rifle Range Road</td>
<td>Palmetto Fort</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awendaw/Saint James/Santee/Mcclellanville Sites</td>
<td>Power Line Easement</td>
<td>Doar Road</td>
<td>Tibwin Road</td>
<td>Shared-use Path</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P. Implementation Strategies

Partnerships

The trail network recommendations include a variety of trail facility types and corridor types. Additionally, the network crosses jurisdictional and agency boundaries across the county. Implementation of the trail network will require coordination and resource-sharing among multiple agencies and organizations including the BCDCOG, SCDOT, local utility companies, each municipality, the East Coast Greenway Alliance, Charleston Moves, and others.

Priority Trail Projects

Each proposed trail project provides an important link within the overall trail network. The priority projects identified in this Plan, however, provide a useful roadmap for pursuing near-term projects that meet multiple community objectives. By moving forward quickly on priority trail projects, agencies in the region will demonstrate their commitment to carrying out this plan and will better sustain enthusiasm generated during the public outreach stages of the planning process.
Trail Design and Development

Consistency in facility design and construction is also crucial to successful implementation. With a connected network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities across the county, trail users value consistency in design quality, safety, signage, and comfort level. The Design Guidelines, provided separately to CCPRC as a staff-level resource document, are a tool for designing facilities to standards of best practice and can be shared with other trail developing agencies. See Figure 40 for the typical steps in the trail development process.

Figure 40: Typical Trail Development Process Steps

Land Acquisition

Development of the recommended greenway network is contingent on successful land acquisition strategy. There are many different ways to secure trail right-of-way for greenway systems. It will be necessary to work with some landowners to secure trail right-of-way when it does not exist. Appendix H provides a list of specific strategies including the formation of partnerships and a toolbox of acquisition options.
Chapter 7. Programs and Services

- Introduction
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- Opportunities – Future Considerations for Programs
- Operational Recommendations
- New Programmatic Recommendations
A. Introduction

The programs and services offered by Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission (CCPRC) center around nature and the environment, history, outdoor recreation, summer camps, swimming and waterpark activities, climbing, and adventure programming. Many of the major services and facility operations were visited and analyzed by the consultant team.

B. Existing Conditions

CCPRC has a very well rounded variety of programs and services in the aquatics and beach operations which are listed below. There are always new ideas to implement additional programs, and the CCPRC strives to continuously improve its excellent program offerings. In addition, interpretive and nature centers as well as concession operations are discussed.

Aquatics

Whirlin’ Waters Adventure Waterpark is the largest of three waterparks operated by the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission. It was named one of the Top 5 Public Waterparks in the United States in 2011 by Aquatics International magazine. The aquatic facility is located in North Charleston’s Wannamaker County Park and has a regional draw including great tourism and visitor participation. The facility is open during the summer months from 10:00 am through 6:00 p.m. seven days a week, and on weekends from mid-August through Labor Day. There are seven different aquatic activity pools for all ages including:

- Riptide Run mat racer slide – 347 feet and 6 lanes of sliding
- The Big Kahuna wave pool – 27,000 square feet of different wave actions
- Tubular Twister multi-slide complex – 3 different selections of thrilling spills, each approximately 300 feet long
- Big Splash Tree House water play structure – 66 interactive play elements, pinwheels, troughs, body slides, jets, waterwheels, and a giant bucket that dumps 1,000 gallons of water
- Rollin’ River lazy river – 870 feet of relaxation
- Otter Bay kiddie pool area – 6 lane racer slide, sprays, and 10 different spray geysers
- Lily Pad Lagoon toddler play area – shallow pool and 3 different spray geysers
- Luau Landing – a beautiful area specifically designed for group use
Splash Zone Family Waterpark is the mid-sized of three waterparks operated by Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission. It is located in James Island County Park with a community-wide draw. The facility is open during the summer months from 10:00 am through 6:00 p.m. seven days a week and weekends from mid-August through Labor Day. There are four different aquatic activity pools for all ages including:

- Two 200-foot slides
- A 500-foot lazy river channel featuring sprays and a waterfall
- Leisure pool with sloping beach like zero-depth entry
- Caribbean water play structure with interactive elements and slides

Splash Island Family Waterpark is the smallest of three waterparks operated by the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission. It is located in Mount Pleasant at Palmetto Islands County Park with a neighborhood and community-wide draw. The facility is open during the summer from 10:00 am through 6:00 p.m. seven days a week, and on weekends from mid-August through Labor Day. There are four different aquatic activity pools for all ages including:

- A thrilling 200-foot body flume slide
- A 16-foot otter slide
- Leisure pool with sloping beach like zero-depth entry with sprays, waterfalls, and geysers
- The Cyclone – swirling water ride

Additional water play areas: Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission also operates a Spray Play Area in James Island County Park and a Sprinkler in Wannamaker County Park. The spraygrounds are open April through September from 10:00 am through 6:00 p.m. daily.

The condition of all the aquatic facilities was excellent. All of the water features were functioning very well and the entire facility was extremely clean and trash free. Staff was easy to identify and extremely friendly, informed, helpful, and very professional.

Beach Operations

Folly Beach County Park, at the west end of Folly Island situated between the Atlantic Ocean and the Folly River, was established in 1982 and has served over 100,000 visitors per year providing parking, beach access, rental equipment, concessions, and lifeguards for those visiting the South Carolina coast.

During 2010, Folly Beach County Park began to feel the effects of erosion. The sand dunes that had once protected the park were damaged by high surf. This continued damage resulted in the closing of over half the parking areas in 2010 and even more in 2011.

In August 2011, Hurricane Irene passed the South Carolina coast. Even though this powerful storm did not make landfall in the state, its effects were significant. The park was damaged so badly that it closed for the remainder of 2011. In the days after the storm, the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission was granted a 30-day emergency permit to perform actions to protect the park and restore dunes. Work was done around the clock, including scraping the beach and trucking in compatible sand in a race against the time and Mother Nature. Unfortunately, Folly Beach continued to receive high surf and damaging winds from other storms during the fall. This ongoing damage and loss has resulted in Folly Beach County Park’s continued closure through 2012.
Because erosion is a chronic issue on Folly Beach, CCPRC is taking steps to implement a long term stabilization plan which includes a large-scale beach re-nourishment project and corresponding construction of a terminal groin on the western edge of the Park. CCPRC is hopeful that this beautiful park that so many have enjoyed for so many years will be available for patrons to experience once again.

The Folly Beach County Park once included:
- Beautiful 2,000 feet of ocean frontage
- 100-Car Parking Lot
- Dressing Areas, Restrooms, and Showers (removed due to erosion)
- Snack Bar seasonally – snacks, beverages, and umbrella and beach chair rentals (removed due to erosion)
- Picnic Area seasonally (removed due to erosion)
- Lifeguards are on duty seasonally
- Covered Picnic Shelter and Grills (removed due to erosion)
- Umbrella

The items removed due to erosion need to be rebuilt.

**Isle of Palms County Park** was developed by the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission in 1996 in response to public demand for improved beach access in the East Cooper area. The park is operated for the enjoyment of the citizens and visitors of Charleston County. Isle of Palms County Park offers beautiful ocean frontage and includes these year-round beach park features:
- 350-Car Parking Lot
- Dressing areas, Restrooms, and Showers
- Vending, picnic area, and grills
- Sand volleyball court
- Boardwalks and handicap accessible ramps
- Drink vending
- Children’s play area

Seasonal beach park features include:
- Lifeguards
- Outdoor showers
- Ice cream, drinks, and basic snack foods
- Retail area
- Beach chair, bag toss game, and umbrella rentals
- Beach accessible wheelchair
Kiawah Beachwalker Park is located on a stunning barrier island on the west end of Kiawah Island. It offers ocean frontage and a river view, along with the only public beach access on beautiful Kiawah Island. The park is operated through a cooperative agreement between Kiawah Development Partners (KDP), Charleston County Council, and the CCPRC. Lifeguards are on duty seasonally along a beachfront designated swimming area. Dogs must be leashed at all times.

Year-round beach park features include:
- 150-Car Parking Lot
- Dressing areas, restrooms, and showers
- Picnic area and grills
- Boardwalks and handicap accessible ramps
- Drink vending

Seasonal beach park features include:
- Lifeguards
- Outdoor showers
- Snack bar
- Beach chair and umbrella rentals
- Beach accessible wheelchair

The condition of all the beach facilities was excellent. The entire area from the parking lots to the beaches and in-between was extremely clean and trash free. Staff was easy to identify and extremely friendly, informed, helpful, and very professional.

A recent regulatory approval for KDP to construct a seawall clears the way for a 50 lot development on the adjacent spit of land, bisecting the park with an access road. Consideration may need to be given to an alternate site, or modifications to the existing site.

Caw Caw Interpretive Center

The Caw Caw Interpretive Center is a vast 654-acre site rich in natural, cultural, and historical resources located at 5200 Savannah Highway (175) in Ravenel. It is open Wednesdays through Sundays from 9:00 am through 5:00 p.m. year round. This beautiful site features:
- Over 7 miles of beautiful trails with trailside exhibits
- Elevated boardwalks through wetlands
- Environmental and social studies education programs from pre-school through college level
- Interpretive exhibits, displays, gift shop, and programs
- Former 18th and 19th century rice fields and one of the important sites of the Stono Rebellion
- Thousands of naturalized tea plants from 20th century tea farm
- Areas actively managed for wildlife including waterfowl, songbirds, otters, deer, and more
- Favorited habitats for rare wildlife including wood storks, swallow-tailed kites, bald eagles, etc.
- Wet Laboratory and Classroom
The overall condition of the Caw Caw Interpretive Center was excellent. All of the natural features, as well as the buildings, were functioning very well and the entire grounds were extremely clean and trash free. The exhibit areas and gift shop were very attractive and upscale. Staff was easy to identify and extremely friendly, informed, helpful, and very professional.

Concessions

Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission operates their own concessions at many of the active recreational facilities within their system. Those concessions include:

- Whirlin' Waters Adventure Waterpark – snack bar, kiosks, souvenir and gift shop, snack carts
- Splash Zone Waterpark – snack bar, snack and essentials cart
- Splash Island Waterpark – snack bar, snack and essentials cart
- Folly Beach Fishing Pier Souvenir and Gift Shop – snacks, souvenirs, bait, fishing gear, etc.
- Kiawah Beachwalker Park Snack Bar
- Copper River Marina Ships/Convenient Store
- Isle of Palms County Park Snack Cart – snacks, essentials, and umbrella and chair rentals

The overall condition of all the concession facilities was excellent. All of the concession stands, snack bars, kiosks, and convenience store, souvenir, and gift shops were functioning very well, and the facilities, as well as the surrounding grounds, were extremely clean and trash free. The eating areas were well shaded, very well utilized, and attractive. Staff was easy to identify and extremely friendly, informed, helpful, and very professional. Pricing of items was universal throughout the system for like items. Each individual point of sale location had appropriate customized inventory that adapted to the activities and clientele.

Aquatics, Beach Operations, and Open Water Activities (summer only)

The CCPRC offers a wide variety of programs, services, and activities related to aquatics, beach operations, and open water during the warmer months of the year. Summer is the banner season for these activities although spring and fall offer many open water and paddling programs.
There are approximately 110 annual aquatics, beach operations, and open water programs in approximately 27 categories including:

- Swim Safe Low Country
- Junior Lifeguarding Program
- Special Events
- Children’s Birthday Parties
- Private Group Party Rentals
- Beach Bird Walks – Folly Beach and Beachwalker Park
- Surf Seining
- ACA Instruction Certification Courses – L-2 Stand Up Paddleboard Instructor Certification
- Sea Kayak Instructional Classes
- Kayak Rolling and Rescues
- Kayak The Surf Zone – Beginner Short Boat Surf Kayaking
- Whitewater Paddling
- After Work Paddling Tours
- Local Canoe Trips
- Local Sea Kayak Trips
- Stand Up Paddleboard (SUP) Trips
- Power Paddle Camp Southeast
- Adaptive Paddling
- Beginner Sailing – Basic Sailing
- Sailing Camp
- Parent and Child Samplers – Canoe, Kayak, and SUP
- Parent and Child Trips
- After School Adventures
- Home School Days
- Little Explorers
- Boy Scout Canoe Merit Badge

Many of these activities are offered several times each season or year. The aquatics, beach operations, and open water programs are very well received and very well attended. The pricing of programs is very reasonable for what is received by patrons, and is a great value. The CCPRC aquatics, beach operations, and open water programmers have a great rapport with their customers and seem to have a vast majority of the public market of these types of programs.

C. Programs and Services Trends

Water access is a popular recreational activity in the Charleston County. In addition to highly utilized boat ramps and docks, fishing piers, and beaches, all water access shows high demand and is used recreationally year-round to kayak, canoe, standup paddle, fish and crab, swim, etc.

Popular national trends include:

- Biking and cycling
- Fitness and wellness activities
- Festivals and events
- Water parks and water activities
- Outdoor recreation and ecotourism
- Nature and environmental programs
Regarding festivals and events, according to the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism and a study conducted for them on **Tourism Product Development Concept Plan for the Charleston Region** by Tourism Development International, the Charleston region enjoys a prominent tourism presence and a distinct competitive advantage on the national, and even the world stage. Not only is the Charleston area a destination wedding venue, top reasons for this competitive position include:

- The excellently preserved downtown area of the Charleston peninsula.
- The extensive and varied coastline comprised of beaches, marshes, and inlets affording a wide range of recreational and wildlife study possibilities.
- The extensive visitor infrastructure and facilities in the City of Charleston, along the coast, and at other visitor nodes along the interstate and in communities like Mount Pleasant, North Charleston, and Summerville.
- The Ashley and Cooper Rivers running through Dorchester and Berkeley counties into the ocean at Charleston, and the plantation houses and other natural and historic sites of interest along the rivers.
- A series of significant historic and natural sites in the [tri-county] area.

The following key industry and behavioral trends are reflective of Charleston County. These will be important to evaluate for future planning efforts.

Active transportation programs, policy, and funding are getting recognition in communities across the Country.

There is an increasing trend toward indoor leisure and therapeutic pools. Additional amenities like “spraypads” are becoming increasingly popular as well.

The top five athletic activities ranked by total participation included: exercise walking, exercising with equipment, swimming, camping, and aerobic exercising.

The United Health Foundation has ranked South Carolina 45th in its 2011 *State Health Rankings*.

Therapeutic recreation programs and inclusion services are considered an important trend when planning for the future.

Fitness programs, educational programs, teen programs, mind body balance, and active adults were listed at the top of the ten programs parks and recreation departments are planning to add within the next three years.

The most common programs offered in communities are holiday events and other special events, fitness programs, educational programs, day camps, and summer camps; mind-body/balance programs such as yoga, tai chi, Pilates, and martial arts; and youth sports teams.

Trails, parks, and playgrounds are among the five most important community amenities considered when selecting a home.

National trends in the delivery of parks and recreation systems reflect more partnerships and contractual agreements reaching out to the edges of the community to support specialized services.
The majority of Americans agree that preserving undeveloped land for outdoor recreation is important. A large percentage of outdoor participants also believe that developing local parks and hiking and walking trails is important and that there should be more outdoor education and activities during the school day.

An in-depth trends analysis is provided in Appendix G.

D. Alternative Providers and Other Facilities Uses

The Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission is charged with the responsibility to provide park and recreation services, but not to duplicate services provided by the other municipalities and special recreation districts existing in its service area. Although municipalities and private recreational service providers within Charleston County operate their own recreational programs, they are not considered competitive recreation service providers.

One of the prime responsibilities of the CCPRC is the development of a countywide park system. These parks are generally of a size and scope that would not be developed by other municipalities and public service districts.

The programming within the park system emphasizes passive activities, outdoor recreation, environmental education, and recreational services to the unincorporated portions of the county for which the CCPRC is the only provider. In addition, the CCPRC maintains public beach access, which other agencies cannot provide. Each park facility offers a variety of programming generally directed toward the natural features and characteristics of the site. Each municipality operates their own active recreation and sports programs without any competition from the CCPRC.

E. Key Issues for Programs

Through public and stakeholder input, survey results, consultant team observation and expertise, and the needs assessment, the following key issues were identified for consideration:

- Because of weather and environmental issues related to Low Country living, and the proximity to many bodies of open water, all Charleston County youth should know how to swim and feel comfortable in the water.
- Wedding venues and event destinations are an opportunity for service expansion in Charleston County.
- Ecotourism is a program area ripe for expansion.
- Nature programs and environmental education are highly valued.
- Festivals are well attended and desired services.
- Providing recreation opportunities to rural recreation sites will require partnerships and creative, leveraged uses of existing resources. CCPRC-owned and managed sites as well as those managed by schools should be invested in as growth and demand necessitate.
Whirlin’ Waters Adventure Waterpark
- Add wayfinding signage on Highways 52 and 26 like the ice rink in North Charleston
- Pave parking lot to cut down on dust and improve aesthetics
- Add a fourth slide to the existing tower
- Add an additional “family raft ride” beyond of lazy river

Splash Zone Family Waterpark
- Add wayfinding signage on Highways 171 and 700
- Parking lots need to be expanded

Splash Island Family Waterpark
- Add wayfinding signage on Highways 526 and 17

Aquatics Programs
Continue efforts for Water Safety Programs and Swim Lessons for youth.

Continue to partner with all Charleston County agencies that operate aquatic and/or open water facilities as well as aquatic and/or open water activities, such as municipalities, school districts, beaches, and the private sector, to institute a mandatory program through the schools to teach youth to swim.

CCPRC should consider building and/or operating community sized swimming pools on strategically located rural school campuses to fill the gap in the opportunity for youth to swim during the summer months to supplement the portable pool program that is currently being developed.

Beach Programs

Sand Volleyball
Sand Volleyball Tournaments and Leagues are growing in popularity and can have a huge economic impact for the community if linked to major tournament organizations.

Over-The-Line
Over-the-line is a bat and ball sport – a game related to baseball and softball. Like those games, there is the batter, pitcher, and fielders. Only three people per team are needed, so it is considerably easier to get a good informal game going and would create a unique sand or beach activity that could become a long lasting trend that CCPRC could be known for on the east coast, as San Diego is known on the west coast. The name “over-the-line” is a registered trademark of the Old Mission Beach Athletic Club (OMBAC) of San Diego, California, which organizes an annual tournament that is one of the city's largest summer social events. It is also known as OTL (also trademarked by OMBAC). OMBAC allows other organizations to license the trademark for their own events for a nominal fee. To see the potential magnitude of this unique sports program visit www.ombac.org.
Treasure Hunt at the Beach
Create a themed treasure hunt at each beach, such as Pirates of the Caribbean, and cut out large jigsaw puzzle pieces out of a painted picture on plywood and bury the puzzle pieces in the sand for the treasure hunt teams to find, dig, and return to assist in putting the puzzle together. Clues can be given, or participants can use geocaching to assist in the location of the puzzle pieces. The puzzle can also be a message or coupon for refreshments at the snack bar.

Obstacle Course at the Beach
A currently themed and timed obstacle course can be constructed with low cost materials such as PVC pipe, plywood, etc. Popular video game-themed music (such as Mario Brothers), decorations, and costumes will add to the excitement for kids wanting to pay $1 to see if they can beat the fastest posted time on the chalk board.

Ecotourism Activities
Many possibilities identified throughout this planning effort include various activities that are dependent on the enhancement or re-purposing of existing infrastructure, or the development of future park sites and amenities within the undeveloped lands.
- Bird watching and other environmental, interpretive, or naturalist experiences
- Natural water access (sailing, kayaking, SUP, rowing or canoeing, etc.)
- Adventure or alternative sports (extreme or outdoor recreation, ATV or off-road programming, urban camping, etc.)
- Package existing offerings, with accommodations or other services

Special Events
Haunted Trails or Drive
This Halloween event can be operated like the Festival of Lights as a drive through Haunted Drive or can be a guided group Haunted Trail on the loop trails in the park. Instead of the lighted exhibits, live haunted exhibits can be constructed and volunteer cast members to scare the groups that are timed so everyone gets the best affects.

The times can be rated similar to movies (G, PG-13, PG-17), so parents with younger children can bring them to the less scary version of the tour. Each scary scene and volunteer cast member would tone down the scary to a wave with a smile for the G rated version, then crank up the scariness with each successive time period. Each scene can be taken on by a civic group, non-profit group, etc. to build, cast, and perform that scene during October weekend nights. The annual event becomes easier to run each year as props, groups, costumes, etc. can be re-used and shared. This event can be a revenue producer just as the Festival of Lights.

Scavenger Hunt
A Scavenger Hunt can be developed with local media, such as a popular radio station, that will help with sponsors and air clues each week that will direct listeners to different county parks for additional clues until all of the items are collected. The winner can be determined through a drawing or on a first come-first served basis.
H. Operational Recommendations

Whirlin’ Waters Adventure Waterpark
- Request wayfinding signage from SCDOT to be added on Highways 52 and 26 (like the ice rink in North Charleston)
- Implement the plan to add a fourth slide to the existing tower
- Implement the plan to add an additional “family raft ride” beyond of lazy river

Splash Zone Family Waterpark
- Request wayfinding signage from SCDOT to be added on Highways 700 and 171
- Parking lots need to be expanded or more added

Splash Island Family Waterpark
- Request wayfinding signage from SCDOT to be added on Highways 526 and 17

Additional Opportunities
- Dog Park concessions kiosk at peak hours – drinks, dog toys, dog treats, unique dog collars, doggy t-shirts, doggy birthday invitations, etc.
- Design and develop East Artic parcels to supplement Folly Beach access
- Expand Rental/Wedding Reception facility capacity
- Develop new Disc Golf Courses in appropriate park locations
- Add state of the art fitness stations along loop trails in day parks
- Add state of the art electronic interactive play areas such as light up walls in day parks.
- Add Community Gardens at school locations in rural areas as a curriculum and/or after school program
- Add themed destination/adventure playgrounds and/or natural playscapes in new day parks

I. New Programmatic Recommendations

Several ideas for product development have come from the extensive public involvement process the County undertook as part of the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Planning process. Program ideas were presented in focus groups, stakeholder, and public meetings, as well as through the survey. Many of these suggestions, along with ideas presented by the consultant team, coincide with the recommended capital park improvement and development projects outlined in previous chapters. In addition to the programmatic considerations previously described for Aquatics and Beach operations, Ecotourism Activities, and Special Events, many regional opportunities were identified, including:
- 2,000 meter water course for regattas, drop-in use, other events, camps, instruction, etc.
- Adventure park for ATV, zip lines, etc.
- Regional indoor sports venue for volleyball, indoor field house, etc.
- Outdoor event/tournament venue with an amphitheater/meadow/rectangular field
- Premiere regional multi-sport rectangle field tournament venue
- Birding/wildlife and ecotourism venue
- Blueways trails and camping
- Themed day camps (bug camp, bird camp, survivor camp, edible plant camps, etc.)
- Glamping (high end pampering and urban glamour camping)
• Catered Camping (chefs prepare “foodie” camping experiences)
• Outdoor cooking (grilling, campfire cooking, primitive/historical cooking)
• Re-enactment camping
• Boot camp camping
• Dog training and agility courses
• Dog shows
• Radio controlled planes, boars, or vehicle competitions
• QRC hikes
• QRC fitness programs using trail or park fitness stations
• Triathlon training
• Canopy tree touring with interpretive services
• Fishing to cooking programs
• Primitive fishing and fly tying
• Pump track, single track, BMX training programs and action park
• Edible gardens
• Water sports training and skill development programs
  ▪ Stand Up Paddleboard (SUP) lessons
  ▪ Kayak lessons
  ▪ Canoe lessons
  ▪ Boating Safety
  ▪ Wake Board lessons
  ▪ Fishing clinics and workshops
• Tours and guided adventures – river and primitive wilderness camping
• Wee Explorers ABC’s program
Chapter 8. How CCPRC Manages Operations and Oversight

- Administration, Management, and Organizational Development
- Industry and Administrative Trends
- Park and Recreation as Local Economic Engines
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis
- Information Management and Technology Opportunities – Future Considerations for Aquatics Operations
- Marketing and Communications Operational Recommendations
- Resource Management and Maintenance Standards
- Partnerships and Funding Opportunities
- Key Findings from Operations and Oversight
- Management and Operational Recommendations and Priorities
A. Administration, Management and Organizational Development

CCPRC is one of the premiere agencies in the nation and provides a sustainable operation with its many entrepreneurial endeavors. Identifying and anticipating industry trends helps the CCPRC refine its service portfolio and be responsive to opportunist endeavors as they present themselves.

B. Industry and Administrative Trends

The following key industry and administrative trends are reflective of Charleston County. An in-depth trends analysis is provided in Appendix G. These will be important to evaluate for future planning efforts and include the following:

A national trend in the delivery of parks and recreation systems reflects more partnerships and contractual agreements reaching out to the community to support specialized services.

More agencies are partnering with private, public, and non-profit groups.

Parks and recreation administration trends include increased collaborations, agency accreditation, and enterprising budgets.

Information technology allows for better tracking and reporting.

Web-based niche marketing tools are more popular for agencies to use as a means of marketing programs and services.

By March 15, 2012 an ADA transition plan must be in place with organizations to demonstrate compliance to the amended regulations.

Level of subsidy for programs is lessening and more “enterprise” activities are being developed, thereby allowing subsidy to be used where deemed appropriate.

Pricing is often determined by peak, off-peak, and off-season rates.

Partnerships and Delivery System Trends

Municipal parks and recreation structures and delivery systems have changed, and more alternative methods of delivering services are emerging. Certain services are being contracted out, and cooperative agreements with non-profit groups and other public institutions are being developed. Newer partners include the health system, social services, the justice system, education, the corporate sector, and community service agencies. These partnerships reflect both a broader interpretation of the mandate of parks and recreation agencies and the increased willingness of other sectors to work together to address community issues. The relationship with health agencies is vital in promoting wellness.
The traditional relationship with education and the sharing of facilities through joint-use agreements is evolving into cooperative planning and programming aimed at addressing youth inactivity levels and community needs. In addition, land leased to organizations or private entities can provide facility improvements that serve the public.

**Agency Accreditation**

Parks and Recreation agencies are affirming their competencies and value through accreditation. This is achieved by an agency’s commitment to 150 standards.

There are currently 102 agencies around the nation that have received the Commission for Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) accreditation. **In South Carolina, only Richland County in Columbia holds this distinction.** CCPRC should consider pursuing accreditation in the future, which would allow them to capitalize on the public relations opportunity that compliance with 150 national standards provides.

Additional benefits of CAPRA accreditation include:
- Boosts staff morale
- Encourages collaboration
- Improves program outcomes
- Identifies agency and cost efficiencies
- Builds high level of trust with the public
- Demonstrates promise of quality
- Identifies best management practices

The PROST Master Plan fulfills some of the requirements for CAPRA accreditation. In **Section G** of this chapter, the consultant team suggested a design/decision criterion for CCRPC to establish a process and set of criteria useful for future park development, vocational, and capital projects decision-making. In addition, the following documents and resources were provided separately to CCPRC as staff level documents to aid their policy development, provide design guidelines, and will further their efforts toward accreditation should CCPRC desire to pursue this trend:
- Trails Design Guidelines
- Sample Partnership Policy
- Sample Sponsorship Policy

Accreditation is a distinguished mark of excellence that affords external recognition of an organization’s commitment to quality and improvement.

Accreditation has two fundamental purposes; to ensure quality and to ensure improvement.

The National Recreation and Parks Association administratively sponsors two distinct accreditation programs. The Council on Accreditation of Parks, Recreation, Tourism, and Related Professions (COAPRT) approves Academic institutions and **Commission for Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA)** approves agencies. It is the only national accreditation of parks and recreation agencies, and is a valuable measure of an agency’s overall quality of operation, management, and service to the community.
Additional policies to consider updating include:

- Scholarship or Family Assistance
- Cost Recovery and Fees

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) - Compliance**

On September 14, 2010 the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) issued an amended regulation implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA 2010 Standards). On March 15, 2011 the amended Act became effective, and for the first time in history, it includes recreation environment design requirements. Compliance of the regulations were to be effective March 15, 2012. This includes design and construction requirements and the development of three-year transition plan. By March 15, 2015 implementation of the three-year transition plan must be complete.

**C. Parks and Recreation as Local Economic Engines**

**Jobs, Jobs, Jobs**

Parks and recreation agencies provide a community with hundreds of seasonal and part-time jobs in the form of summer lifeguards, grounds and maintenance crews, out of school camp counselors, etc. As a grassroots employer, often providing the entry level employment opportunities, as well as serving as a local consumer, tremendous real economic impact is generated as a result of local government services.

**Property Values**

Dr. John L. Crompton, Texas A&M University Department of Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Services, shares that property values increase in proximity to parks as evidenced by the fact that people are willing to pay more for homes the closer they are to a park\(^3\). Those properties that are adjacent to parks can command as much as 20 percent more.

The notion that investment in conservation and open space boosts both residential and commercial land values and property taxes has been around for some time. In a Trust for Public Land white paper\(^4\), the author cited case studies identifying that the value of land near parks is passed on to cities in the form of higher property taxes. In turn, these additional taxes can be used to pay for building and maintaining park and recreation infrastructure.

---

\(^3\) Crompton, John L. (October 2005). The impact of parks on property values: the empirical evidence from the past two decades in the United States, Managing Leisure 10, 203-218

Parks and Recreation Role in Tourism

A city benefits from both increased property tax from the increase in property value because of proximity to parks and increased sales tax on spending by tourists who visit primarily because of the city’s parks. According to a 2009 Trust for Public Land study, “Beyond the tax receipts, these factors also bolster the collective wealth of residents through property appreciation and tourism revenue.”

In his research, Dr. Crompton discusses the economic impacts of parks and recreation:
“Tourism depends on attractions. Rarely do people travel because they enjoy the car or airplane ride or because they want to stay in a particular hotel or dine at a restaurant in a different city. The desire to go to another place is stimulated by attractions. In most communities, primary attractions are sports tournaments, festivals, parks, and major recreation facilities operated by park and recreation departments. However, most stakeholders remain unaware of park and recreation departments’ role in tourism.”

Dr. Crompton says that one can calculate the value of the visitor spending to indicate the economic impact by using this formula:
“number of visitors x average spending per visitor x multiplier”

This formula indicates there are four steps involved:
(1) Define who qualifies as a visitor;
(2) Estimate the number of visitors attracted to the community by the park and recreation event or facility;
(3) Estimate the average level of spending by visitors in the local area; and
(4) Determine the ripple effects of this new money through the community by applying appropriate multipliers.

In addition, most are concerned with identifying the true economic benefit, subtracting from the revenues all of the costs for these tourism experiences. This is the net economic benefit. Dr. Crompton identifies four types of costs that must be captured: direct event costs, infrastructure costs, displacement costs, and opportunity costs.

D. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis

One reason that CCPRC continues to excel is its continual self-examination and forward thinking. To that end, CCPRC conducted a SWOT analysis with the staff and leadership team. A SWOT analysis is a process of appreciative inquiry and self-analysis of internal strengths and weaknesses, and external opportunities and threats (Figure 41). The complete results can be found in Appendix I.

5 Harnik, Peter, and Ben Welle. (2009). Measuring the Economic Value of a City Park System. The Trust for Public Land
**Internal Strengths**: This refers to major strengths of the Park and Recreation Commission that should be capitalized upon. Strengths may include competencies in various areas. Examples might include marketing efforts, financial management, programmatic portfolio and/or diversity, organizational structure, etc.

**Internal Weaknesses**: This refers to major weaknesses of the Park and Recreation Commission that the agency has control over positively impacting, addressing, or changing. Weaknesses are harmful, detrimental, and cause a negative impact. Examples might include marketing efforts, negativity/complaining, morale, etc.

**External Opportunities**: This refers to an opportunity to take action that is an attractive arena in which the Park and Recreation Commission would enjoy a competitive advantage, would further the agency in meeting its vision or fulfilling its mission, or enhance the development of its services. CCPRC should watch and plan for these if there is a high probability of occurrence.

**External Threats**: This refers to a challenge posed by an unfavorable trend, event, or development in the environment. In the absence of purposeful action, this threat might lead to the erosion of the Park and Recreation Commission’s quality service provision, financial and service sustainability, or the agency’s position or credibility. In some instances, this could also be detrimental to the parks and recreation industry. Examples might include not being guaranteed future funding or budget cuts. These are threats; but not identifying, pursuing, or using alternative funding is a weakness. CCPRC should identify and prepare to mitigate all foreseeable threats.

**Figure 41: SWOT Analysis**

Through a series of meetings, CCPRC staff brainstormed their lists of strengths and weaknesses, and then they ranked the performance and importance of each concept using the following rating scale.

**Performance**: Staff members rated their lists as a major strength, minor strength, or neutral (neither major nor minor), a minor weakness, or a major weakness.
**Importance:** Staff members rated the importance of each item to success of the Commission. Rating was high, medium, or low.

Once each strength or weakness was rated for performance and importance, a *Performance-Importance Matrix* was developed.

Finally, the staff brainstormed ways to mitigate weakness.

For each opportunity, CCPRC specified a rating for attractiveness (high or low) and the probability of success (high or low).

- **Attractiveness** refers to how attractive the opportunity is to the CCPRC in furthering its mission; fulfilling its vision; improving its revenue generation and/or cost recovery; or decreasing expenses. This rating was either high or low.

- **Success probability** relates to whether the CCPRC’s strengths will enable it to be successful in this area. This rating was either high or low.

Once each opportunity was rated for attractiveness and success probability, an *Opportunity Matrix* was developed.

For each threat, CCPRC specified the likelihood that it will happen (probability of occurrence) and the seriousness of the threat as either high or low.

Once each threat was rated for probability of occurrence and seriousness, a *Threat Matrix* was developed.

Major CCPRC strengths that are very important include:

- High degree of governmental autonomy
- Positive employee culture – good employee morale
- Logo/branding/image/marketing/reputation
- High standards
- Quality and well maintained facilities and programs
- Diverse facilities and programs
- Commission understands role and doesn’t micromanage
- Relationship with media
- Financial management and enterprise approach
- Relationships/partnerships with agencies and the public
- Leadership/commitment to core values
- Problem solving empowerment culture
- Staff experience/talent/knowledge/certifications
- Employee buy-in
- CCPRC is a staff-driven organization; staff empowerment
- Customer service/accommodating needs
- Family oriented
- Land resources; diversity
- Planning/agency vision/sustainability/innovative
- Safety
- Affordable
- Staff retention
- Number of first responders on staff
Major weaknesses and potential mitigating solutions include:

**Communication:**
- Accountability
- Required use of Outlook
- Use tools provided
- Written procedures
- Standardization of outlets
- One message from top
- Disseminating responsible party
- Willingness to listen

**Bureaucratic, too much red tape, inefficient processes:**
- Consistency
- Streamline
- Trust
- Standardization
- Eliminate redundancy
- Going electronic
- Raise the $2,500 purchasing cap

**Do “more with less” mentality:**
- Hire more people

**Technology:**
- Software upgrades; CLASS registration system
- Bandwidth
- Buy what works
- Financial software; point of sale
- Vision/technology plan
- TRC Ap

**Self-promotion/marketing:**
- Consistency
- Target audiences
- Track success
- Data collection
- Technology
- Utilize market data
- Analysis
Existing Conditions

According to the internal and external input received, the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission has not upgraded much of their technology for quite some time. Technology becomes outdated and sometimes obsolete very soon after purchased and installed. The registration software system currently utilized received the most critical comments and suggestions that it should be replaced as a priority to the agency. There were also many comments about improving the point of sale software throughout the system and linking it to the financial tracking system.

Key IT Issues

There was a consistent message throughout the internal and external input process that the CCPRC needed to upgrade its registration and rental software. The possibility of linking it to an upgraded point of sale software as well as linking both to the financial tracking software system were also suggested.

IT Opportunities – Future Considerations

As one of the top priorities, the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission needs to research and purchase new registration and rental software system to provide better tracking of participation and revenues per program area as well as per location.

CCPRC should also research and purchase a new Point-Of-Sale software system that can be monitored off-site at any time. It will be advantageous to pursue the point of sale software at the same time as the registration and rental software to make sure both systems are compatible and can be linked together as well as with the financial tracking system.

If necessary, CCPRC should research and purchase new budgeting and finance software that links to the point of sale and registration software programs via current time revenues that all can be monitored off-site at any time.

Existing Conditions

The Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission currently markets through many means of communication including seasonal brochures, flyers, webpage, mail, newspapers, radio, social media, etc. Throughout the public input process, many participants commented on not knowing the about some of the different facilities and activities the CCPRC had going on year round. It is not unusual to have public input asking for more marketing or that they did not know about some of the facilities and activities the CCPRC operates.

Key Marketing Issues

There was a consistent message throughout the public input process that improved marketing efforts to inform the public of facilities, activities, services, and updates was desirable.
Internal staff focus groups pointed out that procedures to get marketing materials approved and created could be more efficient.

**Marketing Opportunities – Future Considerations**

CCPRC needs to develop an agency-wide Marketing Plan which takes all facilities, activities, target audiences, collateral, media, tourism materials, and budgets into account. The Marketing Plan will create a consistent seasonal road map for each facility, activity, and service to make sure the entire CCPRC staff are operating from the same agreed upon plan.

From a tourism marketing perspective, Whirlin’ Waters Adventure Waterpark is the only CCPRC waterpark that should be advertised regionally and nationally through CVB, brochures at hotels and other avenues to tourists and visitors. Whirlin’ Waters Adventure Waterpark is the only CCPRC waterpark large enough to invite the traveling public to attend without infringing on the waterpark experience for the local residents.

A local waterpark brochure, seasonal brochure, local newspapers, neighborhood associations, etc. should be utilized to market all three waterparks to local residents, as they are all suited and sized to accommodate local residents.

Internal procedures for marketing and promotion should be analyzed and streamlined to make sure all CCPRC programming staff has the opportunity to receive promotional materials and advertising within a reasonable time frame and with minimal unnecessary process steps. A new marketing and promotional process needs to be established through a well-rounded committee that includes programming staff, marketing staff, and financial staff so the process works for the entire agency. Once established, the process needs to be understood by all pertinent staff through training. This marketing and promotion process should be a significant section of the Marketing Plan.

**G. Resource Management and Maintenance Standards**

**Existing Conditions**

CCPRC already has a well-developed outline of resource and maintenance standards as evidenced by the following documents:
- Maintaining a Healthy Park System
- Design Guidelines
- Wildlife Encounters

A Natural Resource Management Plan and a Cultural Resource Management Plan, both currently in draft form, should be finalized and used for guidance.
Sustainable Service Provision

CCPRC should continue to seek the sustainable balance between available resources and needs, revenues and expenses, passive and active recreation opportunities, development and preservation, etc.

Design/Decision Criteria

CCRPC needs to establish a process and set of criteria useful for future park development, vocational, and capital projects decision-making. A future process might include the following:

- Identify and rank/prioritize most critical needs related to level of service (LOS) shortfalls and existing CCPRC facility needs.
  - Use survey results
  - Internal feedback within CCPRC/Capital improvement needs

- Once the need is established, identify/rank those properties with the highest potential to meet the need.
  - Reference CCPRC Future Parks Suitable Uses chart
  - Coordination with CCPRC staff
  - Identify political and community considerations

- Upon identifying the properties conduct a more in-depth analysis to determine the best property to address the need.
  - Reference CCPRC Future Parks Analysis chart
  - Conduct additional site specific analysis of physical conditions, and natural and cultural resources
  - Develop Land Use Plan identifying land stewardship zones
  - Community and political considerations
  - Coordination with CCPRC staff
  - Develop conceptual master plans
  - Identify conceptual development costs for addressing LOS needs at park sites and resultant programming
  - Identify long term operational/maintenance costs associated with each site
  - Which site offers the most revenue/expense balance

H. Partnerships and Funding Opportunities

Existing Conditions

The Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission has utilized and capitalized on many funding and partnership opportunities to double its park acreage while sustaining the operations of existing facilities and activities. They have leveraged every type of funding and partnership resource available while adhering to their mission, vision, and values to compliment and not duplicate the recreational activities of the municipalities within Charleston County. Through the public input process, most participants agree that the CCPRC has done wonderful things with the last bond money received, and it appears that they would support or somewhat support a new bond referendum to continue developing the land purchased with the last bond money received.
Key Partnership and Funding Issues

The Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission should continue to let the public know how it leveraged the half-cent sales tax bond money to get approximately twice the amount of public land for parks.

The Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission should package the costs of priority items identified in the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan and develop a strategy to educate the public to vote for another bond referendum that will finance the development of recommended improvements.

The Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission needs to partner with private entities with common goals to be able to accomplish many of the facility and operational goals within the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan.

Partnership and Funding Opportunities – Future Considerations

The CCPRC should consider operating park admission booths with volunteers (can offer volunteer incentives such as passes for facilities and/or programs) during peak times rather than paid employees. CCPRC should develop a more robust volunteer program and utilize volunteers in other opportunities including docents, land management (invasive species, etc.), trail building, etc.

CCPRC should consider land lease to organizations, non-profits, or private entities to provide facility improvements or developments that serve the public.

CCPRC should develop “Friends of ______” groups to help with specific trails or sites.

An extensive expansion of the existing Scholarship Program should be explored through the CCPRC Foundation by creating new criteria. Open advertising of the Scholarship Program to the public as well as the business community can be a great public relations tool and may encourage use by those in need.

CCPRC can research into the possibility of a partnership with local public transportation agency for bus rides to/from local recreational and tourism facilities including stops at CCPRC parks. The program can become a great public relations tool for the public transit system, which typically receives criticism for having empty buses on their routes. A CCPRC token system can be created and used in a “Rec Rider” program where all complimentary bus rides are tracked via the tokens and CCPRC will recognize the public transit system publicly at the end of each year as to the amount of money equal to the complimentary rides they have given through CCPRC. The public transit system gains many more riders, and it helps with their public image.

CCPRC should research the efficiencies of potentially contracting out fleet repairs on an “as needed” basis with rates, locations, length of contracts, escape clause, etc. for each type of typical repair other than the typical fleet maintenance tasks. These services can be established via an RFP process, and the routine fleet can be retained for preventative maintenance tasks in-house. This type of set up should be much more efficient with a large county-wide park system, in which it can be tough to stay current with breakdowns at all of the different locations when operating out of one maintenance facility. The quality of mechanics necessary for many repairs is much better in the private sector and less expensive than trying to stay competitive with the going rates of top mechanics who can repair in less time than those without the knowledge, skills, and/or experience of those in the private sector.
Based on the geographic location and military history of Charleston County, CCPRC may want to include a Military Discount Rate for admissions to CCPRC facilities and programs. This could be a great public relations tool, as well as serving as a reward for military personnel for their commitment to the country.

A Park Ambassador Program could be created for those small CCPRC parks and facilities. The program is established with volunteers that are close neighbors and/or daily users of the park. They become the eyes and ears of the CCPRC which trains leadership in what to watch for and inspect daily, weekly, and monthly. The park ambassadors fill out, date, and return forms to CCPRC, and in return, may receive some free passes for CCPRC facilities and activities.

Seek sponsorships, possibly through the Foundation, to assist with capital campaigns.

I. Key Findings from Operations and Oversight

Several opportunities to enhance the CCPRC operations and oversight exist, including continued emphasis on communications, marketing, streamlining processes, and investing in technology. While the name “Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission” may confuse some and not others, consideration should be given to expansive identities like “Regional Park Authority” because of the tri-county cooperative impact and service area, as well as independency from the county department misconception.

J. Management and Operational Recommendations and Priorities

Identity

- Consider an agency name change reflective of the magnitude and breadth of services provided and area served.

Marketing and Communications

- Develop an agency-wide Marketing Plan
- Whirlin’ Waters Adventure Waterpark is the only CCPRC waterpark that should be advertised regionally and nationally through CVB, brochures at hotels, and other avenues to tourists and visitors.
- Develop a local waterpark brochure and a seasonal brochure and use local newspapers, neighborhood associations, etc. to market all three waterparks to local residents.
- The marketing and promotion internal procedures should be analyzed and streamlined.
- Improve website to provide more information about park natural and cultural resources and improved offerings for volunteers.

Information Management and Technology

- Research and purchase a new registration and rental software system.
- Research and purchase a new Point-Of-Sale software system that can be monitored off-site at any time.
• If necessary, CCPRC should research and purchase new budgeting and finance software that links to the point of sale and registration software programs via current time revenues that all can be monitored off-site at any time.

Partnerships and Funding

• CCPRC should be proud of the expenditure of the last bond money and continue to let the public know how they leveraged the bond money to get approximately twice the amount of public land for parks.
• Package the costs of the priority items identified in the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan and educate the public to vote for another bond referendum to finance the development of land, which has recently doubled its size.
• Partner with private entities with common goals to be able to accomplish many of the facility and operation goals within the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan.
• Consider expanding the volunteer program through “Friends of ~~~~” groups, fundraising activities, Park Ambassadors, etc.
• Expand the existing Scholarship Program through the CCPRC Foundation by creating new criteria.
• Research the possibility of a partnership with local public transportation agency for bus rides to/from local recreational and tourism facilities including stops at CCPRC parks.
• Research the efficiencies of potentially contracting out fleet repairs on an “as needed” basis.
• Include a Military Discount Rate for admissions to CCPRC facilities and programs.
• Institute a Park Ambassador Program for those small CCPRC parks and facilities.

General Operations, Management and Planning

• Consider CAPRA Accreditation
• Review, update, and adopt policies and procedures
  ▪ Trails Design Guidelines
  ▪ Future Park Development, Vocational, and Capital Projects Decision-Making Criterion
  ▪ Partnership Policy
  ▪ Sponsorship Policy
  ▪ Scholarship or Family Assistance
  ▪ Cost Recovery and Fees
• Develop ADA Transitional Plan.
• Streamline procedures such as procurement, etc. to improve efficiency.
• Maintain an internal environment that allows staff members at all levels to make decisions that they are capable of making and not always having to go to upper management.
• Develop Maintenance Standards for all maintenance tasks on park properties.
• Conduct a feasibility study for a Multi-purpose Sports Field Complex (soccer, football, lacrosse, concerts, etc.) and Fieldhouse (basketball, volleyball, futsal, indoor walking track, etc.) focusing on tournament opportunities, large events, and rental opportunities.
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Chapter 9. Key Focus Areas and Findings

- Key Findings Priority Matrix
A. Key Findings Priority Matrix

As a result of all the massive amounts of data and in-depth analysis, a key issues matrix was developed to identify key issues, summarize the data sources, and capture best practices to help prioritize the consultant team’s recommendations. Tables 24-26 illustrate the results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue - Rating Scale</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Consultant Team</th>
<th>Staff Input</th>
<th>SWOT</th>
<th>Core Values Committees</th>
<th>Public Meetings</th>
<th>Focus Groups / Stakeholders</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Statistically Valid Survey</th>
<th>Open Link Survey</th>
<th>Registration / Reservation System</th>
<th>Capacity Analysis</th>
<th>GRASP LOS</th>
<th>Best Practice or Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Data Source</td>
<td>Quantitative Data</td>
<td>Qualitative Data</td>
<td>Quantitative Data</td>
<td>Consultant’s Analysis and Professional Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Management and Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness of what is available</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Focus on targeted strategic marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining what we have - quality over quantity</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>See list of components scoring 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name is confusing - “county” reference implies a department of the county and CCPRC is a regional provider, serving the tri-county area</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Survey results opposite from qualitative data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update policies and procedures; streamline processes</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>This would help with efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update technology</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update scholarship program</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred maintenance, CIP, aging infrastructure, new amenities/freshen up</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>See list of components scoring 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Will impact LOS scores if not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access, barriers, rural service, ability to pay</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Gap analysis shows a lack in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards for design concepts, recycling, sustainable practices, etc.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Classification system recommendations help functions drive design; sustainability is a priority; rural areas lacking in service should be part of the development priorities; LOS threshold will help determine the current deficiencies in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced and sustainable approach with something for everyone including population, geography, revenue &amp; expenses, etc.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural areas are under-served</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage / wayfinding</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative approach / partnerships</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Multi-modal trails and a regional trail system can contribute to alternative transportation; coordinate with public transportation system for regional and rural sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve historic and cultural significant sites / amenities</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (public)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop urban first, preserve rural</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Opportunities must be weighed in decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development bond or tax referendum to fund new development, renovations, repairs, upgrades, additional amenities, re-purposing, etc.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>81% of the survey responses indicate a willingness to pay $10 in additional property taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to Add, Expand or Improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotourism</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Add programming locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for wedding and event destinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding and event destination</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active adults and senior programs</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-generational programs</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts and events (large)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 25: Key Issues Analysis Matrix – 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue - Rating Scale</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Consultant Team</th>
<th>SWOT</th>
<th>Core Values Committees</th>
<th>Public Meetings</th>
<th>Focus Groups / Surveys</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Statistically Valid Survey</th>
<th>Registration / Reservation System</th>
<th>Capacity Analysis</th>
<th>GRASP LOS</th>
<th>Best Practice or Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a - priority - immediate/short-term</td>
<td>b - opportunity to improve/expand - mid/longer-term</td>
<td>c - minor or future issue</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>means the issue didn’t come up or wasn’t addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike share / bike library</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative sports (extreme, non-team, adventure, etc.)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing / kayaking / rowing / canoeing</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree climbing</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day camps</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing / paddle boarding, or other sea-access</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature / interpretive / environmental programming</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and crafts</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting / hunting</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural diversity programs</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birding</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural programming (learn to swim, youth-focused, fitness / weights)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury prevention</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand or Improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldhouse (track, gymnastics, basketball/volleyball tournament/event venue)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event pool</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding venue</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated multi-purpose / day camp space</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpark</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand or Improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis was done to show current level of service and areas where service is lacking.

Add programming locationally where it makes sense.

Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for wedding and event destinations.

Add if location makes sense.
### Table 26: Key Issues Analysis Matrix – 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue - Rating Scale</th>
<th>Consultant Team</th>
<th>Staff Input</th>
<th>SWATOT</th>
<th>Core Values Committees</th>
<th>Focus Groups / Stakeholders</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Statistically Valid Survey</th>
<th>Open Link Survey</th>
<th>Registration / Reservation System</th>
<th>Capacity Analysis</th>
<th>GRASP LDS</th>
<th>Best Practice or Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheater/event venue</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail connections / greenways / blueways</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>See trails master plan recommendations; linkages are needed for regional trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water access; sand / beach restoration</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Analysis was done to show current level of service and areas where service is lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pools (in rural areas)</td>
<td>c b a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Regional day-use parks in areas currently underserved would increase level of service in those areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional day-use parks with playgrounds, shelters, trails, open space, campgrounds, adventure recreation, waterparks, etc.</td>
<td>b a a b b b b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban camping (tent, primitive group, recreational vehicle), cottages</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>b a a a a a b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>East County seems to be lacking from the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding venue</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for wedding and event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>b b b b b b b b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting range</td>
<td>b b b b b b b b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative / Adventure sports (BMX, Zip line, ATV, paintball, skate parks, ultimate Frisbee, ROPE’s course, etc.)</td>
<td>b a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park (dedicated off-leash areas)</td>
<td>b b b b b b b b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>North area seems to be lacking from the survey; Palmetto Island Dog Park scored a 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day parks</td>
<td>b b b b b b b b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>North Area seems to be lacking from the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory garden</td>
<td>a a c a a c a</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>c a b c b c b</td>
<td>North Area seems to be lacking from the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields or improvements in rural areas (lights, skinned infield, etc.)</td>
<td>b b a b b b b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>North Area seems to be lacking from the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament venue</td>
<td>a b b a b a b</td>
<td>b b b b b b b b</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low access dock for canoes/kayaks, etc.</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>a a a a a a a a</td>
<td>Add destination venues locationally where it makes sense; enterprise opportunities for event destinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety

- Park Ranger Program - enforcement issues
- Feral animals

Safety was a more prominent issue in the open link survey, and in the North Area and West County.
Chapter 10. Recommendations, Phasing, and Costs

- Sub-Area Description
- Comparative Analysis
- Capital Improvement Project Chart
In addition to the programmatic and operational recommendations, opportunities, considerations, and key issues identified in Chapters 4. Existing Developed Lands, 5. Undeveloped Lands, 6. Trail System, 7. Programs and Services, 8. Operations and Oversight, and 9. Key Issues, each sub-area has a variety of capital improvement projects (CIP) and development recommendations that would require some kind of a taxation question to fund.

Priorities and strategies for acquiring land going forward should identify key opportunities such as acquiring parcels adjacent to existing facilities, as well as any water access such as boat landings and beach access, historic sites, and trail easements.

A. Sub-Area Description

A brief overview of each sub-area follows.

**West County**

The West County sub-area represents 15,289 households with an average household size of 2.46 persons. The five-year growth rate percentage for the West County sub-area is 4.2 percent. CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Baptist Hill Rural Recreation Site
- Caw Caw Interpretive Center
- Edisto Island (future park site)
- Haut Gap Rural Recreation Site
- Johns Island (future park site)
- Kiawah Beachwalker Park
- Limehouse Pointe (future park site)
- Meggett (future park site)
- Charleston Center

A. Sub-Area Description

The Charleston Center sub-area is 128.65 square miles and represents 61,538 households with an average household size of 2.2 persons. The five-year growth rate percentage for the Charleston Center sub-area is 5.2 percent. CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Bulow (future park site)
- East Arctic (future park site)
- Folly Beach County
- Folly Beach Edwin
- James Island County
- Lighthouse Inlet (future park site)
- Limehouse Pointe (future park site)
- McLeod Plantation (future park site)
- Old Town Creek (future park site)
- Secessionville (future park site)
- Skate Park
- Charleston Center

A. Sub-Area Description

The Charleston Center sub-area is 128.65 square miles and represents 61,538 households with an average household size of 2.2 persons. The five-year growth rate percentage for the Charleston Center sub-area is 5.2 percent. CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Bulow (future park site)
- East Arctic (future park site)
- Folly Beach County
- Folly Beach Edwin
- James Island County
- Lighthouse Inlet (future park site)
- Limehouse Pointe (future park site)
**North Area**

The North Area sub-area represents 57,457 households with an average household size of 2.59 persons. The five-year growth rate percentage for the North Area sub-area is 8.2 percent. CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Ashley River (future park site)
- Cooper River Marina
- Wannamaker Park and Wannamaker North (future park site)
- Boat Landing: W O Thomas Jr.

**East County**

The East County sub-area represents 35,964 households with an average household size of 2.44 persons. The five-year growth rate percentage for the East County sub-area is 8.6 percent. CCPRC facilities and undeveloped parklands within this sub-area include:

- Awendaw (future park site)
- Isle of Palms County
- Laurel Hill (future park site)
- McClellanville (future park site)
- Mt. Pleasant Waterfront
- Palmetto Islands
- Rifle Range (future park site)
- St. James Santee Rural Recreation Site
- Thompson Hill Rural Recreation Site
- Boat Landings: Gadsonville, Paradise, Remleys Point, Shem Creek

The following population projections based on 2011 figures (Figure 42) show that the North Area has the largest population now and will continue to have the largest concentration in the future. This is followed closely by the Charleston Center sub-area. The East County has the greatest growth percentage rate at 8.6 percent over the five year projected period. The West County currently has the smallest concentration of population and will experience the smallest growth over the projected period.

**Figure 42: 2011-2016 Population Projections by Sub-Area**

![Sub-area Population Comparison](image)

*Source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2011 Market Profile*

For these reasons, consideration could be given to prioritizing both CIP and development recommendations, as well as land acquisitions to the North Area and Charleston Center sub-areas. However, this strategy should be balanced with increasing LOS in the rural East and West County sub-areas where there is little or no service.
Additionally, input from the community engagement process showed needs for new or additional service from all areas of the county.

B. Comparative Analysis

As part of the recommendation development process, a comparative study of recreation facilities and programs of six peer agencies was used. The six agencies reviewed included two districts in Illinois, two parks and open space agencies in the Midwest, and two on either coast. Information was collected through forms completed by agency staff, interviews with staff, and agency websites.

- Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission (CCPRC), South Carolina
- Cleveland MetroParks, Ohio
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, Illinois (FPDDC)
- Forest Preserve District of Will County, Illinois (FPDWC)
- Riverside County Parks and Open Space District, California
- Three Rivers Park District, Minnesota

Each peer agency’s mission includes some focus on land protection/conservation and outdoor recreation/education. All agencies serve county boundaries, except for the Three Rivers Park District, which serves a broader, three-county area. Table 27 provides a brief overview of the population size, land acreage, miles of trails, and land policies of peer agencies.

While each agency is unique, all of the agencies share some common areas of focus. A comparative analysis can help illuminate trends and opportunities for potential expansion of services for CCPRC.

Table 27: Peer Agency Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cook County FPD, IL</th>
<th>Riverside County, P &amp; OS District, CA</th>
<th>Cleveland MetroParks, OH</th>
<th>Three Rivers Park District, MN</th>
<th>DuPage County FPD, IL</th>
<th>Will County FPD, IL</th>
<th>Charleston County PRC, SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Area Population</td>
<td>5,195,000</td>
<td>2,190,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>923,222</td>
<td>678,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage of Parkland</td>
<td>68,441</td>
<td>71,356</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>25,081</td>
<td>21,475</td>
<td>9,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Acreage/Thousand</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of Trails</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of Trails/Thousand</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Policy: Conservation/Developed Land</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>90/10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Peer agency staff
The Forest Preserve District of Cook County (FPDCC) is the oldest of the seven peer agencies (1914), with the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (1915) and Cleveland MetroParks (1917) following closely after. CCPRC is the most recently established peer agency (1972).

The Illinois County and District agencies’ mission each specifically seek to protect and preserve land and to provide educational and recreational opportunities to the public. Cleveland MetroParks (OH) and Three Rivers Park District (MN) highly value the conservation of significant natural resources and environmental stewardship, as well as providing educational and recreational opportunities.

Four of the seven agencies have land policies regarding the amount of total agency land that must remain as natural areas. FPDCC and Cleveland MetroParks have 80/20 policies, where 80 percent of the land should remain natural and 20 percent can be developed. FPDDC has a higher percentage of undeveloped/natural areas at 90 percent. The Three Rivers Park District’s 80/20 policy only applies to “park reserves” that are a minimum of 1,000 acres. (The Park District has seven park reserves totaling 19,484 acres.)

In California, the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District seeks to acquire, protect, develop, manage, and interpret outstanding scenic, recreational, and historic “park related places” for the inspiration, use, and enjoyment of all people.

CCPRC’s primary responsibility is to develop a county-wide park system with an emphasis on passive activities, outdoor recreation, environmental education, and public beach access. The Commission’s mission includes acquisition and stewardship of parkland and open space.

CCPRC and Three Rivers District offer the most adventure type opportunities of the peer agencies with ropes courses, zip lines, and climbing walls/bouldering caves.

Across the nation, no two agencies are exactly alike, and that is why benchmarking (or peer comparisons) is the least effective analysis tool. From the comparative information, we can see that the benchmarked agencies are not similar in their vision and primary service areas, their organizational structure, their funding mechanisms and available resources, or in their policies. The most effective benchmarking CCPRC can do is to track its performance metrics over time against itself.

**C. Capital Improvement Project Chart**

The following Capital Improvement Project (CIP) chart provides capital investments, phasing, and cost estimates recommended as a result of this Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails master planning process, needs assessment, gap analysis, community engagement, key issue identification, and consultant expertise. The recommendations are provided for years 1-3, 4-7, and 8-10, and are not in priority order. Priorities should be driven by population, Level of Service (LOS), and balancing revenue and expenses.

Flexibility with this plan is strongly warranted, because unique opportunistic enterprises for entrepreneurial ventures or other partnerships may arise as CCPRC moves forward. It is realistic to assume that unique circumstances will arise that offer opportunities for CCPRC to participate in recreation options that are not currently quantifiable. Whether through property acquisition or by partnering with other entities in the design, construction, and/or management of recreation facilities or programs, CCPRC should remain open to opportunities that would further its mission.
Funding of the CIP could include a taxation measure specifically for the trails plan and/or an independent trails authority to generate development funding. Revenue bonds could be considered for revenue producing facilities.

The CCPRC should continue to seek the sustainable balance between available resources and needs, revenues and expenses, passive and active recreation opportunities, development and preservation, etc. as it provides services into the future.

Recommendations are provided for:
- Existing Developed Lands
- Undeveloped Lands
- Trails
- Opportunity Enterprises including acquisition
- Additional programmatic suggestions and recommendations can be found in other chapters in this document and are not included here, because most do not have financial implications.

The entire capital campaign totals $160,078,100 not including acquisition and other costs to be determined.
- Years 1-3 $61,795,700
- Years 4-7 $49,167,200
- Years 8-10 $49,115,200

Capital recommendations for exiting developed lands, undeveloped lands, and trails by Sub-Area:
- West Sub-Area $29,635,000
- Charleston Central Sub-Area $28,442,000
- North Sub-Area $45,596,000
- East Sub-Area $20,256,500
- All $16,213,600
- Location TBD $19,935,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Wide/Program/Operations</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>DISK (Self-Location(s)) to be determined</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>OTHER Niche user opportunities: uses to be determined</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>QR Code Interpretation: sites to be determined</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Enterprises</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 4, 5 &amp; 7</td>
<td>EXPANSION of internal park trails</td>
<td>$71,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 4, 5 &amp; 7</td>
<td>TRAIL based fitness stations (5 Locations)</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 4, 5 &amp; 7</td>
<td>TRAIL markers exiting along internal park trails</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Wide - External Trails</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>TRAIL from Buckhorn Road to Cow Caw Interpretive Center</td>
<td>$14,646,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>TRAIL from Toogooda Road to Chucks Flat Road</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>TRAIL from James Island County Park to George L. Griffith Boulevard</td>
<td>$2,562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>TRAIL from Maybank Highway to Horry Road</td>
<td>$2,562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>TRAIL from Bear Swamp Road to the existing shared-use path at West Bridge Road</td>
<td>$2,562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>Proposed Low Country Low Line (Beneath the elevated Interstate 26) from King Street Extension to Highway 17</td>
<td>$2,562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>TRAIL from Highway 78 to Interstate 526 near Dorchester Road</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Capital Improvement Plan - Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Capital Improvement Plan - Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>mile utility easement from Saint James Avenue (Highway 176) to Highway 78 at Charleston Southern University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,348,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>mile utility easement from Devon Forest Elementary to proposed trail at the Power Line Easement due north of Charleston Southern University to Lincolnville Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,348,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>mile utility easement from Ashley Phosphate Road near the proposed trail (west of Peppermill Parkway) to Stewart Avenue (near Reward Avenue)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,394,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>mile utility easement and railroad from the proposed trail near Highway 78 (west of Interstate 26) to Lincolnville Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,394,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>mile utility easement and railroad from Ashley Phosphate Road near the proposed trail (west of Peppermill Parkway) to Stewart Avenue (near Reward Avenue)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>mile railroad corridor from Brandywine Boulevard (at Highway 52) to Interstate 526</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,956,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>mile railroad corridor from Wadley Lane (Spruit Avenue) to Interstate 526</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,688,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>mile railroad corridor from proposed trail near Interstate 526 and Dutton Avenue to Aviation Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$684,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>mile utility easement from the southern end of the Palmetto Islands County Park property to Mathis Ferry Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,578,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>mile utility easement from Door Road to Tibwin Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGENCY WIDE WATER ACCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Capital Improvement Plan - Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Water access acquisition and development</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$27,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional water access development within existing parks: 12 sites</td>
<td>$12,950,000</td>
<td>$27,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E-F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paddle Trail Camping and Restroom Infrastructure: 2 sites</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$27,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing and Crabbing access at selected existing boat landings: 10 sites</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$27,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Improvement Plan - Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,512,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,667,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$33,545,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,724,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHLEY ADJUSTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Island Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiawah Beachwalker County Park (LEASED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiawah Point Future Park Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGGETT FUTURE PARK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL RECREATION SITES-WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLO FUTURE PARK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLY BEACH - EAST ARCTIC FUTURE PARK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLY BEACH COUNTY PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES ISLAND PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTHOUSE INLET HERITAGE PRESERVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD TOWNE CREEK FUTURE PARK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECESSIONVILLE FUTURE PARK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper River Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Park Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVENDEW FUTURE PARK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLE OF PALM COUNTY PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shade Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Completion of Master Plan Elements (elevated rentable shelter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUREL MALL FUTURE PARK SITE (LEASED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHELLEVILLE FUTURE PARK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMETTO ISLANDS COUNTY PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Master Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overlook Tower Assessment and improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dog Park Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water Park Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Central Activity Pod and Concessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Repurpose Existing Concessions to Day Camp Center, assess condition of existing structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Refurbish Existing Shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expansion of trails, boardwalk and access to additional islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overnight camping at Peninsula Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL RECREATION SITES-EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- East Sub-area satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thompson Hill improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New East Sub-area satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At times Sanare improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Future Hubs and Satellites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALL AREAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB-AREA KEY:** All = All of Charleston County, Center = Charleston Center, East = East County, North = North Area, TBD = To Be Determined, West = West County

**PROJECT TYPE KEY**
- ADD - Added Amenities
- FEASIBILITY STUDY
- TBD - TO BE DETERMINED
- LAND ACQUISITION
- MP - GENERAL
- TRAIL - TRAIL PROJECT
- CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN
- MAJOR RESTORATION
- VARIOUS - SEE PLAN
- MASTER PLAN
- EXPLORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR WATER ACCESS
- MASTER PLAN UPDATE
- WATER PARK IMPROVEMENTS
- PRELIMINARY ACCESS PLAN
- IMPROVE 11 SITES (ADD 8 SITES)
- STUDIES OTHER
- WANNAMAKER NORTH TRACT
Appendix

• A. Existing Plans Review Summary
• B. Market Segmentation in Charleston County and the BCD Tri-County Region
• C. Summary Minutes from Stakeholder Meetings and Interviews
• D. Survey Summary Report
• E. Detailed GRASP® Perspectives
• F. Future Park Analysis Working Definitions
• G. Parks, Recreation and Administrative Trends
• H. Land Acquisition Strategies
• I. SWOT Analysis

Note: The following documents and resources were provided separately as staff level documents:
• Complete Survey Results including cross tabulated data, survey instrument and comments
• A searchable inventory database of parks and facilities
• Atlas of current and future parks
• Trails Design Guidelines
• Sample Partnership Policy
• Sample Sponsorship Policy
A. Plans Relevant to the Overall Master Plan

The critical components of these seven planning documents are described below, along with relevant recommendations considered in this plan. In addition, the status of the plan or recommendation and consultant analysis is included when warranted.

Charleston County Comprehensive Plan

Year: 2010

Chapter 3.1 Land Use Element – contains specific recommendations on the location, type, form, and intensity of growth which should occur in the County and coordinates these recommendations with the use of an Urban Growth Boundary that delineates the Urban/Suburban Area and the Rural Area of the County.

Chapter 3.2 Economic Development Element – Includes strategies to balance business and employment growth with population growth. Two of the three primary departmental goals of the Economic Development Department, in which CCPRC has influence, is to attract new business/industry and to retain and expand existing businesses.

Chapter 3.3 Natural Resources Element and 3.4 Cultural Resources Element – focuses on strategies to preserve, protect, and enhance the County’s significant natural and cultural resources that contribute to the quality of life of its residents.

Chapter 3.8 Community Facilities Element – focuses on strategies to balance land use planning with the availability of public facilities and services.

Chapter 3.9 Priority Investment, Implementation, and Coordination Element – focuses on better coordination for the funding of necessary public facilities with available resources and adjacent jurisdictions through implementation strategies. The significant challenge is the multi-jurisdictional nature of planning and public service provision in the County.

Description: The County’s Comprehensive Plan details CCPRC’s area of responsibility as encompassing the entire County, with the exception of Francis Marion National Forest, Capers Island, and Dewees Island. In 1995, County Council increased the responsibilities of CCPRC by turning over responsibility for improving and managing the County’s public boat landings. CCPRC’s orientation is toward resource based passive recreation with income-producing activities. Charleston County has established public policy that its mission with respect to parks is to provide special purpose facilities (such as beach and water access), and large regional parks, typically greater than 300 acres in size, within reasonable accessibility of all County residents.
According to the Comprehensive Plan, it is a goal of the CCPRC to provide at least one County park within reasonable access of each population center in the County. The abundant waterways create physical barriers that in many cases greatly increase travel time from one area to another. It is therefore important that all areas are provided with recreation facilities. It is also a goal to acquire undeveloped lands while they are still available, in order to preserve and protect the land for future generations.

**Recommendations:**

Relevant recommendations for the Land Use Element include:

- LU 1. Protect and enhance the environmental quality of creek, marsh and river front lands, beaches, and access to beaches and waterways.**
- LU 2. Implement design character that enhances the quality of development along commercial corridors and establish areas of environmental and cultural significance.**
- LU 8. Establish programs and policies which ensure new growth contributes its fair share to the costs associated with growth.

** “Language carried forward from previous plan. Modified for tone but not intent.”

Relevant recommendations from the Economic Development Element include:

- ED 6. Focus Rural Area economic development efforts on agri-tourism and other employment opportunities that provide jobs for the local population and promote community sustainability.
- ED 9. Support tourism by continuing to protect valuable historic, natural, and cultural resources through adequate land development regulations.
- ED 10. Continue to highlight the natural and agricultural heritage of the Lowcountry in promotional materials for economic development.**
- ED 11. Continue to promote the development and maintenance of all infrastructure including: services, amenities, and transportation networks that support economic development activities. This would include capital improvement plans and coordinated priority investment.
- ED 12. Utilize Intergovernmental Agreements with other municipalities, agencies, and jurisdictions to strategically focus regional resources on prime economic development sites within the County.

** “Language carried forward from previous plan. Modified for tone but not intent.”

Relevant recommendations from the Natural Resources Element include:

- NR 1. Maintain or adopt additional amendments to the Zoning and Land Development Regulations Ordinance to ensure that sensitive and important natural resources are protected during and after development activities.
- NR 2. Continue protecting critical and natural resource areas by designating them for very low intensity uses in the future land use recommendations and the Zoning and Land Development Regulations Ordinance.
- NR 3. Promote sustainable development practices including, but not limited to, stormwater management, maintenance of vegetative cover and agricultural uses, maintenance of non-disturbance zones in critical areas, conservation set-asides in development plans, and others through special area plans and land development regulations.**
- NR 4. Promote sustainable development patterns by concentrating high intensity development in areas with existing public facilities where transportation and related services are available (the Urban/Suburban Area) and protecting sensitive or unique natural resources, permitting only limited low intensity uses in the Rural Area.**
- NR 5. Work with the Charleston County Greenbelt Plan and participating non-profit agencies to provide incentives for protection of natural resources using methods such as conservation easements to place land into permanent protection and provide development incentives such as density bonuses for land set-asides through land development regulations.
• NR 8. Continue to promote best management practices in timber harvesting and agricultural production.
• NR 10. Continue protecting water quality through implementation of the NPDES Phase II Stormwater Management Program.
• NR 12. Encourage sustainable landscaping including attractive environments that are in balance with the local climate and require minimal use of fertilizers and pesticides, at the same time conserving water.
  ** “Language carried forward from previous plan. Modified for tone but not intent.”

Relevant recommendations from the Cultural Resources Element include:
• CR 2. Continue completion of existing historic preservation and archaeological resource area surveys for the portions of the County not included in these or other similar surveys.**
• CR 3. Maintain a database of archaeological resources, heritage corridors, and historic properties roads and landscapes.
• CR 5. Monitor inventories and studies conducted by other agencies which identify new or recently discovered historic or cultural resources.**
• CR 6. Protect rural historic landscapes from development that be out of character with their inherent rural attributes.**
• CR 7. Periodically review scenic and historic roadways and vistas to make sure they are consistent with adopted ordinances.**
• CR 10. Encourage adaptive reuse and rehabilitation of older buildings that complement historic development patterns.**
• CR 11. Continue to promote historic preservation in Charleston County.
  ** “Language carried forward from previous plan. Modified for tone but not intent.”

Relevant recommendations from the Community Facilities Element include:
• CF 1. Develop alternatives to ensure that new development contributes its fair share to the costs associated with growth with regard to community facilities and services.
• CF 2. Create a stronger link between capital improvements programming and land use planning.
• CF 3. Take the lead in establishing intergovernmental agreements for the provision of services to the residents of the County consistent with the land use and growth management strategies of this Plan.
• CF 14. Explore opportunities for sharing/consolidating government facilities and services to lower the cost to all residents.
• CF 16. Continue efforts to provide parks and recreational facilities and services in coordination with the Charleston County Greenbelt Plan and the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission.
• CF 20. Encourage public-private partnerships in infrastructure planning.

Relevant recommendations from the Priority Investment, Implementation, and Coordination Element include:
• PI 6. Work with municipalities to develop agreement on the Urban Growth Boundary in support of the regional land use pattern adopted in the Charleston County Comprehensive Plan.
• PI 7. Develop a Council directed prioritized annual work program for all County operations and agencies that includes allocation of appropriate resources. This annual work program should be completed as part of the budget process.
• PI 8. Continue to coordinate with municipalities in the County to achieve consensus on regional issues and strategies to address regional issues in an effort to ensure long-term consistency and compatibility between County and municipal plans.
• PI 10. Advocate coordinated public facilities and services necessary to support the regional land use pattern adopted in Charleston County.
• PI 13. Coordinate land use planning with the Charleston County School District.
• PI 14. Continue efforts to develop a regional database sharing Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data among municipalities, counties, the BCDCOG, and state and federal resource management agencies.
• PI 16. Encourage long-term public-private partnerships in land use and infrastructure planning.

**East Edisto Plan**

**Year:** 2010

**Description:** The purpose of the East Edisto Plan is to establish a 50-year vision for development of the more than 78,000 acres of land known as East Edisto and owned by MeadWestvaco. The area is positioned southwest of Summerville and northwest of Charleston. It abuts the ACE Basin natural area, one of the largest undeveloped estuaries along the East Coast, and borders the Edisto River. The four cornerstones of the planning process were: Rural Character, Environmental Responsibility, Sustainable Towns and Villages, and Education and Employment Opportunities. Key component of the rural character are:

- To keep three-quarters of East Edisto green; through a combination of conserved land, parks, lakes, and density restricted rural areas. Towns and villages will also have a distinctly Lowcountry look and feel, created by parks, greenways, and open spaces.
- Preserve natural habitats, use sustainable building practices and materials, minimize impacts on infrastructure, and wisely manage natural resources.
- Create towns and villages that will thrive; lively places where people can live, work, learn, and shop all in close proximity. That means that families can spend less time driving and more time being together. In East Edisto, that also means more time to explore nature.
- Provide opportunities for good jobs and lifelong learning.

In addition, a network of trials and alternative transportation is discussed in **Chapter 7. The Trails System Today** and in **Section B** of this Appendix.

**Recommendations:**

- Phase 1 (by 2025-2030) – In Charleston County, development will include Good Hope and Greenwood neighborhoods at Highways 17 and 165 and the Spring Grove Commerce Park just south of Highway 17 (http://www.eastedisto.com/maps/phase-1/)
- Phase 2 (roughly between 2025-2050) – In Charleston County, development will include the Spring Grove Village at Highway 17, the Golden Grove neighborhood, and the Fair Spring neighborhood, in addition to continued development of Phase 1 areas (http://www.eastedisto.com/maps/phase-2/)
- Phase 3 (by 2060) – In Charleston County, growth of Phase 1 and 2 neighborhoods and commercial parks will continue, along with establishment of an additional village and a town (http://www.eastedisto.com/maps/phase-3/)

**Status of Plan:** In October 2012, Charleston County Council held a public hearing regarding the creation of a formed-based-code zoning district for the East Edisto land area.
NRPA Park and Open Space Standards and Guidelines

Year: 1990

**Description:** Traditional Level of Service analysis, often called the “NRPA (National Recreation and Park Association) Standards method,” was typically based on providing X number of facilities or acres per 1,000 population (or “capacity”). This methodology was developed in the 1970s and 80s. The methodology is not completely accurate for the majority of today’s public agency usage and are neither transferable nor applicable as a benchmark across all systems. Even NRPA officials are now calling this standards methodology “obsolete.”

**Consultant Analysis:** The parks and recreation industry has realized that the capacity standards (x/1,000) alone do not work for most communities and create challenges when trying to evaluate special assets such as open space, sensitive lands, trails, and indoor\amenities, as well as historic and cultural assets.

GreenPlay and the GRASP® (Geo-Referenced Amenities Standards Process) planning team have been integral in transforming the use of standards for planning parks, trails, recreation, and open space for agencies throughout the United States. GreenPlay has worked with and presented to the NRPA, state associations, the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), and other organizations to clarify accepted methods for standards analysis.

The team has created a way to standardize this variable information that is accurate, community-specific, and can be benchmarked and implemented based on the unique assets of the CCPRC. It is currently being utilized by more than 80 communities nationwide. This methodology is called composite-values methodology (CVM), and the branded version being used in this document is known as “GRASP®.” This CVM also helps with setting standards and ordinances for equitable growth and development in the future. In addition, this analysis can help the to measure aspects of the Recreation system that can influence public health, such as walkability and trail access.

Needs Assessment Report for Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission | Management Learning Laboratories (MLL) – a survey firm

Year: 2000

**Description:** Focus group meetings and questionnaires mailed out and analyzed by MLL to the community as part of the 2000 Needs Assessment work.

**Recommendations:**
- Improve publicity efforts including use of television and newspapers
- Emphasize ongoing maintenance
- Provide ample passive recreation opportunities
- Acquire land
- Keep existing park development at current levels
- Ensure that there are adequate trails, grasslands, and wooded areas, as well as areas for preservation
- Develop wildlife observation areas, cottages, cabins, and bikeways
- Offer more festivals and special events
Consultant Analysis: The 2000 Needs Assessment Report is 12 years old, and many of the recommendations are now complete. Some are still relevant, and the Needs Assessment has been updated with the statistically-valid community survey conducted as part of this master plan process.

Needs Assessment Study for Water Based Recreation Programs and Facilities (LS3P)

Year: 1997

Description: The purpose of the Needs Assessment study is to assist CCPRC in the formation of goals and policies, and for the future development of water-based recreation programs and facilities through a county-wide survey of residents in the Charleston County.

Recommendations: In general, there is interest in passive water-based recreation opportunities like walking or relaxing near water. Second, and to a lesser degree, there is special interest in boating and fishing. Lastly, to a much smaller segment, there is interest in jet skiing. Priority recommendations include:

- Pay particular attention to the power boat owners
- Consider the increasing number of older adults and their specific water-based recreation needs
- Provide passive recreation opportunities like walking or relaxing by the water
- Offer concession stands at water-based sites
- Provide indoor and outdoor swimming pools; water park expansion and amenities
- Avoid providing services which the private sector engages
- Generate interest in already popular activities
- Better inform the public that they operate Cooper River Marina
- Improve the effectiveness of The Quarterly program schedule publication and increase the CCPRC’s visibility
- Make water-based programs and facilities more affordable
- Explore transportation for people to water-based facilities and services to improve accessibility
- Offer instructional programs in boater safety and sailing
- Address the needs of those with disabilities
- Add picnic areas and restrooms by the water and at boat ramps
- Add identified improvements at specific facilities in the future:
  - Morris Island Lighthouse Preservation
  - Build a walkway along Charleston Harbor
  - Build a family waterpark in North Charleston
  - Purchase Barrier Island
- Consider a 25 percent higher non-resident fee

Consultant Analysis: The 1997 water-based recreation needs assessment report is 15 years old, and many of the recommendations are now complete. Some are still relevant, and the needs assessment has been updated with the statistically-valid community survey conducted as part of this master plan process.
South Carolina Five Coastal County Boat Ramp Study (JGT)

Year: 2007

Description: This is the most current and comprehensive boat ramp study of the South Carolina Coastal Counties. It includes factual information, economic reports, and recommendations for management and site improvements. Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Georgetown, and Horry Counties formed a coalition of coastal counties with the administrative and technical assistance of the Office of Coastal Resource Management (OCRM). Their purpose was to jointly manage and administer a study to assess existing use, issues, and condition of the 100-plus public boat ramps under SCDNR or coastal county management.

Coastal South Carolina boat ramp users include local boaters, intrastate boaters and out-of-state boaters. The boat ramps are being used primarily by recreational boaters, with local resident boating parties making up 79 percent of the total boat landing user population in the Five County Study Area. Visiting boating parties (users who live in South Carolina counties outside the study area or outside South Carolina altogether) make up the other 21 percent. Boaters do not follow county lines but instead follow the resources that appeal to their boating interest.

- Charleston County boat ramps receive the most use from boaters from all the combined counties in the study area.
- Charleston has 23 County public boat ramps to serve the entire county.
- The most popular boat ramps by county include Charleston County-Remley’s Point.

The total boat landing user population in the Five Coastal County Study Area includes the 87,983 boats registered in the study area in 2006 plus an estimated 23,388 “visiting” boats. Other users include personal Water Craft (PWC’s), canoes, kayaks, nature tours, pole fishermen, and recreational crabbers who are all developing uses of boat ramps and docks that were never intended during boat ramp funding, planning, and design.

- Charleston County has only approximately 30,500 registered boaters.
- With a projected population of 332,000 in 2006, Charleston County has 1 registered boater for each 11 residents and 1 public County boat ramp for every 14,400 residents (based on 23 total public county boat ramps).

Based on information collected, the overall user satisfaction rating was 7 out of a possible 10.

The most commonly suggested improvement was for more parking (53%), followed by restroom facilities and trash receptacles. Other problems cited were vandalism, thievery, obnoxious activities, drug issues, drinking parties, parking, and other crude, rude, and not very entertaining activities at boat ramps in all coastal counties.

The majority of users (67%) indicated that they would be willing to pay a fee for the use of the boat ramp, provided the monies collected were used exclusively for boat ramp improvement. Many, however, were frustrated that funds and taxes already collected in the name of boating are not being used to fund boat ramp projects.
Boat ramps contribute to the economy through tourism and commercial sales. This study calculated an annual economic impact of public boat landings in the Five Coastal Counties Study Area of more than $507 million. A total of 5,950 jobs (direct and indirect) and more than $147 million in personal income are created or sustained in the coastal South Carolina region by the existence and usage of these public boat landings by both residents and visitors.

- Of the total 5,950 total jobs sustained by this Five County Coastal Region’s boat landings, 2,228 are located in Charleston County alone.
- Of the total $507 million economic impact of the region’s boat ramps, $200 million flows to Charleston County.
- Of the region’s total $73 million in annual net revenues to the state and $4.7 million in annual net revenue to local governments within the coastal study region, Charleston County Boat Ramps contribute $25.5 million in annual net state revenue and $1.8 million in annual net revenue to local governments.
- These figures do not include any fees for boat registrations or taxes paid to the state, county or local government.

From the above, it is evident that the Charleston County Boat Ramps make a substantial contribution to the local businesses and the economy.

The cost of the new 40 trailer/vehicle space boat ramp has now increased to $550,000 and is highly dependent on land values. It is obvious that the lack of availability of new suitable boat ramp sites will inhibit boat ramp construction.

**Recommendations:**

**Primary Charleston County Boat Ramp “management issues” include:**

1. **There are serious traffic control issues at the boat ramps—especially the busier ramps during holidays and on weekends in the summer.**
   - **Recommendation:** It is an absolute necessity for there to be traffic control at these boat ramps to control traffic backing up into the highways and onto private property (Moultrie Shopping Center towed vehicles and boat trailers off in a recent cleanup of the abuse of parking areas). Mount Pleasant (Shem Creek and Remleys Point) could assist in this matter, as they are deriving tremendous benefits from these ramps. Likewise the City of Charleston could assist at Wappoo Cut boat ramp.

2. **There are some conflicts between boaters and dock fishermen/crabbers, etc. A County policy on who has use of the areas around a boat ramp would be useful in establishing priority of use. Steamboat Landing particularly has a reputation for this problem.**
   - **Recommendation:** Fishing off floating service docks while boat launching and retrieval is ongoing is an invitation for problems and hot tempers. Signs should be posted to guide the use of the floating service docks (boaters should take preference) and to delineate parking for non-boating vehicles – if provided at all.

3. **There is competition for parking for boat/trailer spaces and passenger vehicle spaces.**
   - **Recommendation:** Vehicles are using boat/trailer spaces, and there are not enough spaces for the boaters. This is especially true at busy ramps like Wappoo Cut and Shem Creek where passenger vehicles come to join up with boaters. During busy periods, the County may need to have a police presence at busy boat ramps to control traffic and enforce County parking regulations (an ordinance to allow the Police to issue citations would be beneficial to the effort to curb parking abuse).
d. **Trash disposal at boat ramp sites is a problem.**  
**Recommendation:** This is a real balancing, act as this can become abused with outsiders dumping trash.

The other alternative of more trash left by boaters and others is not good either. The County, in conjunction with SCDNR, should institute a Pack it in-Pack it out program for boaters who bring trash to the boat ramp site. Accommodations Tax money could be used for trash removal, as this is definitely related to tourism. Cities such as Charleston and Mount Pleasant who enjoy revenue from boat ramps could be proactive about sharing the cost and responsibility for trash control and removal.

e. **There are continuing issues that need to be reported and addressed.**  
**Recommendation:** The County should consider an “Adopt a Ramp” program whereby citizen volunteers monitor issues at boat ramps and periodically report them back to the County. Boaters are very particular about the use of the boat ramp facilities, and many of them have volunteered to participate. This would also raise the level of pride and general interest in the public eye about boat ramps.

f. **The lack of suitable restroom facilities at boat ramps during heavy use times causes hardship and embarrassing times for children, seniors, and others.**  
**Recommendation:** The County should consider having portable restrooms at major boat ramps (e.g. Remley’s Point, Shem Creek, Wappoo Cut, Limehouse, County Farm, etc.) during peak use times.

g. **The County and/or SCDNR should develop an initiative to promote boat ramp courtesy and education of boat ramp launching and retrieval procedures.**  
**Recommendation:** If adopted, this could be featured in the newspaper as the boating season approaches. There may be an opportunity through boating groups to have programs on boat ramp courtesy, loading and unloading the boats at ramps and other issues.

**Facility/Site issues include:**

a. **There is inadequate parking at boat ramps – each lane should support 25 boat/trailer combinations.** At Shem Creek there are two launching lanes. That many lanes call for 50 parking spaces for boaters only. There are currently about 30 car/trailer parking spaces. High use periods cause boaters to park along roadsides and on private property. Wappoo Cut and Remleys Point experience such heavy use that car/trailer combinations are parking on the embankment and anywhere they can find a spot along the road right of way. It is getting so crowded that boaters are not even enjoying the boating experience after having a parking hassle and worrying about their vehicle and trailer at the ramp while they are on the water. A loss of boaters means loss of revenue. This issue is especially acute for boat ramps that provide easy access to Charleston Harbor (Shem Creek, Wappoo Cut, Riverland Terrace, and Remley’s Point.)  
**Recommendation:** The County and the cities must get involved in acquiring more space for parking adjacent to boat ramps or in off site (but nearby [1/4 mile]) parking. There could be funding developed through the state to assist in this effort.

b. **There is too much vandalism and mischief at rural boat ramps in Charleston County.** Drug paraphernalia and spent ammunition shells are a real indication that there is too little attention being paid to these boat ramps.
**Recommendation:** More lighting and periodic police presence at the boat ramps would help abate some of these problems. SCDNR needs to make periodic visits to boat ramps.

c. **Charleston County needs more large boat ramps—especially on the Cooper, Ashley and Wando Rivers.**  
   **Recommendation:** An immediate search for land for new boat ramps should be made. The growing area around Daniel Island and along I-26 is producing more boaters (taxpayers) in Berkeley and Charleston Counties. These newcomers flock to the coast for the warm weather, water access, and amenities. Charleston County receives more out of county boater use than any other county in the Five Coastal County Area. There needs to be a holistic approach to Charleston Harbor boating access points. Let the political lines melt away for the better good of all boaters including local, tourists, and others. Boaters couldn’t care less about the political problems; they just want access to the water resources.

From the results of this report, it is obvious that there are tremendous economic and job benefits to continuing to maintain and grow boater access. Mount Pleasant, Charleston, Folly Beach, North Charleston, Berkeley County, Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission, and others should coordinate their efforts in finding grants, funding, planning, designing, building, and operating boat ramps with access to Charleston Harbor. There is an immediate need for large boat ramps on Daniel Island (in Berkeley County but in the City of Charleston) and in North Charleston (in the vicinity of the Naval Base) and on the Ashley River between Highway 17 and Interstate 526 (in the vicinity of Charlestowne Landing in the City of Charleston). The landing at Charleston City Marina has not received any attention for years and serves little purpose.

d. **Boat ramp parking areas need paving.**  
   **Recommendation:** Paving is expensive and brings up additional issues with drainage. While it is nice to see and use paved boat ramps, it is possible to stabilize parking areas in smaller, less used boat ramps until paving becomes necessary. Some of the money that might be used for paving could be used for the purchase of new land, dredging, and other higher priority issues.

e. **Boat Ramp needs repair.**  
   **Recommendation:** There are some issues for repair that border on safety and liability, and they should be addressed very soon. The County has access to a list of the comments from this study. Perhaps the County should set up a web page presence to continue dialogue with boaters about boat ramp issues. This could be done through the www.sccoastalboatramps.com web page.

f. **Boat Ramp needs upgrade.**  
   **Recommendation:** This study has addressed the need for upgrades as one of the subjects in the individual boat ramp sheets.

g. **Inadequate depth in boating channel.**  
   **Recommendation:** Dredging has been recommended at Garris Landing (formerly Moore’s Landing). This boat landing is under the control of the USFWS and needs dredging now.
h. **Lack of service/floating docks.**
   **Recommendation:** Boaters expect floating service docks at major boat ramps as they assist in loading and unloading passengers and contribute to safety. They are especially helpful to seniors, children, ladies, and the physically challenged. However, there are some small boat ramps that are located on small tidal and freshwater creeks that do not have room, nor does their intensity of use demand floating docks (Pierpont, Penny Creek, Stills, etc.). Adding a floating dock to a small, crowded boat ramp brings on other issues of safety as well as greater attraction to new boaters that can overload the total facility and intensify the challenge to the environment around the boat ramp. Of course, when funds are available and permits are obtained, the floating docks can be added. A potential source of docks for these locations may be saltwater docks that are being cycled out of the busier ramps. Ground out docks may not be possible because of the length required.

i. **Fast current during loading.**
   **Recommendation:** Boaters need to get real on some issues at boat ramps. Boat ramp permits are very difficult to obtain, and coastal boat ramps are expensive to construct. If the current is too strong, go to another boat ramp. There are a number of them on lakes and quiet streams. The use of service docks may help some boaters in faster current circumstances. This report has recommended adding service docks at some of the boat ramps that do not currently have them.

j. **Kayakers and canoe enthusiasts feel that they should have accommodations for their use.**
   **Recommendation:** Kayakers are a vocal special use group that think that because they do not pollute (although they still arrive via vehicles) and do not have trailers that take up parking (eight can arrive on a trailer followed by eight vehicles), they should get special treatment. It was never intended that they be launched at boat ramps, and they bring no funds from their use that directly produce revenue for boat ramp construction or operation. They are not registered with SCDNR, and thus, there is no Water Recreation Fund allocation for them. They should be restricted from using the busier boat ramps, as they do not mix well with motorized boats (too slow and do not like boat wakes). If the county wants to provide a place for these non-motorized, non-registered, non-funds contributing vessels it should encourage the use of the less desirable landings (Santee Gun Club, Penny Creek, Stills, etc.) on an “as available basis.” Beaufort County has turned a very minimal landing on Hilton Head over to the Kayakers and they (the Kayakers) maintain the facility themselves. This has worked very well: the Kayakers are happy with it, and the County does not have to spend much money on it.

k. **Unauthorized commercial use of the boat ramps**
   **Recommendation:** Fishing guides, tour guides, and their customers utilize space at the boat ramps. Usually this is not a burden, but they should either ask their patrons to car pool to the boat ramp and/or, if parking is available, park in the space provided, not in car/boat trailer spaces. The boat ramps and the parking were not designed for commercial use that conflicts with boaters’ use.
l. **Marine Contractor use of boat ramps**

*Recommendation:* Some Marine Contractors consider boat landings their point of access to projects. They use heavy equipment over the ramps while loading, tie up the facility to the exclusion of boaters, tie up to the docks, and occupy space that deprives boaters of parking. The boat ramps were never designed to accommodate these enormous loads, and the continued use of them for this purpose creates cracks (usually not obvious until later) which let salt water seep in to create corrosion to the slab reinforcing. Ultimately, the slab and the sub grade will fail. Securing floating barges and work boats to the floating docks and piles is a recipe for serious damage. This must be stopped or controlled through a license or special use permit.

m. **Use areas around SCDOT bridge projects to build boat ramps.**

*Recommendation:* Some success in working with SCDOT, especially during the permitting process, has been realized on selected projects (Limehouse Landing and Wappoo Cut); however, it should be noted that just because there is frontage on a body of water, it still does not mean that it is a good boat ramp site. The new Arthur Ravenel Jr. Bridge does not necessarily present a good opportunity for a boat ramp (wide marsh area and mud flat) from the Mount Pleasant side, but it could have presented a better opportunity from the Charleston side. Also, there are traffic access issues that are not always amenable to turning lanes. The best way to seize the opportunity is to be a player in the bridge permitting process. The new proposed bridge on Highway 41 over the Wando River may be the best opportunity to obtain a new boat ramp site on the Wando River. Even if the bridge right-of-way does not have a good boat ramp site, there is usually mitigation to compensate for unavoidable impacts (similar to the fishing pier being built under the Arthur Ravenel Jr. Bridge for Mount Pleasant). The purchase of a boat ramp site could be used for mitigation. This would be better mitigation for the boating public than purchasing credits in a mitigation bank in the middle of a swamp. One note of caution: do not let the contractor for the bridge build the boat ramp under the SCDOT contract unless they have past experience in this type of construction. This was done in Beaufort County and was a disaster because the contractor built the boat ramp improperly.

**Consultant Analysis:** The Consultant team observed many of the same issues that are listed there, and from their observations, these are all still relevant issues. The study brought up many issues that have been confirmed through this process.

**South Carolina SCORP**

*Year:* 2008

*Description:* The purpose of the SCORP is to analyze the current status of outdoor recreation trends, demand, and supply in the state every five years and to meet the requirements of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant Manual. Trail relevant components are discussed in detail in *Chapter 7. The Trails System Today.*

*Recommendations:* As a result of the SCORP, individual agencies and organizations will develop detailed plans for the identified strategies based on their respective missions, priorities, and available resources to address the 15 priority implementation issues.

*Issue 1:* Increase funding for outdoor recreation facilities and programs, to include increased grant opportunities, exploring privatization and/or leveraging public-private partnerships for appropriate activities and facilities, seeking private sponsorships, and fostering increased volunteer involvement to augment staff and reduce operational costs.
**Issue 2:** Increase funding for locally-based recreation facilities and programs, particularly in rural communities, to reduce the need for travel, relieve crowding at major facilities, and enhance recreational access for persons with mobility or financial limitations.

**Issue 3:** Create an expanded network of trails that are well-designed and well-managed, are available to many, and provide appropriate facilities for:
- Equestrians
- Boating, including canoeing, kayaking, and rowing
- Walkers, hikers, backpackers, and bikers in both urban and rural settings
- Historic trails (Revolutionary War, railroad, etc.)
- General use trails

**Issue 4:** Provide adequate support facilities for all trails including:
- Trailheads, including signage, parking, and restrooms
- Potable water for people and livestock
- Parking for longer campers and horse trailers where appropriate
- Water and electrical hookups at non-primitive camp sites
- Additional secluded primitive campsites
- Bathhouses, where appropriate
- Trash collection
- Safety improvements (scheduled water releases, warning devices, call boxes, parking improvements, etc.)

**Issue 5:** Provide additional education, outreach, and promotion of available outdoor recreation opportunities statewide – including recreational facilities, educational programs, trails for all types of uses, and camping facilities – with a particular emphasis on reaching minorities, K-12 students and educators, lower income residents, and persons with disabilities.

**Issue 6:** Promote increased collaboration between recreational facility managers and teachers on formal and informal outdoor education opportunities.

**Issue 7:** Provide or improve outdoor recreation facilities to enable greater accessibility and use by multiple age groups and persons with disabilities.

**Issue 8:** Minimize conflicts between outdoor recreational activities that are not compatible through education, regulation, and careful planning of new or expanded facilities and programs.

**Issue 9:** Provide and properly maintain adequate facilities for, and access to, a diverse range of outdoor recreation activities, from traditionally popular activities such as boating and hunting, to emerging activities such as rowing, rock climbing, disc golf, and dog parks.

**Issue 10:** Require and/or encourage the provision of connectivity between trails, outdoor recreation facilities, open space, and residential development on all levels – local, regional, and statewide.

**Issue 11:** Create and encourage partnerships among government and non-profit agencies at all levels to ensure coordination, reduce redundancies, provide training and technical assistance, and leverage resources to enable additional outdoor recreation opportunities.
Issue 12: Encourage small business and eco-tourism opportunities to enhance local economic development and to fill unmet outdoor recreational needs.

Issue 13: Protect and acquire significant lands for natural and cultural resources and identify opportunities for allowing public outdoor recreational use.

Issue 14: Protect shorelines (rivers, lakes, and beaches) and dedicate more waterfront lands for public recreational use and access.

Issue 15: Promote green technologies and energy conservation techniques in the planning, design, construction, and operation of outdoor recreation facilities to reduce costs and conserve natural resources.

B. Plans Relevant to the Trails Element

The critical components of these nine trail related planning documents are described below along with relevant recommendations considered in this trails section. In addition, the status of the plan or recommendations is included when warranted.

East Edisto Plan

Year: 2010

Description: In addition to the details described in Chapter 2. CCPRC Today – Perspective and Context, a substantial network of primary and secondary trails, plus established trailheads, is proposed within the acreage. Recommended development is sustainable and facilitates biking and walking for transportation.

CHATS Long Range Transportation Plan

Year: 2010

Description: The CHATS Long Range Transportation Plan describes the Berkeley Charleston Dorchester metropolitan region’s existing and projected conditions for transportation, recommends specific improvement projects, and establishes criteria for prioritizing projects. If a project is not included in the scope of the Long Range Plan, it is not eligible for federal funding through CHATS. The Plan recommends that “complete streets” are developed as new streets are constructed and existing streets are extended or interconnected. Recommendations are organized as policies, programs, retrofit projects, new construction, and funding and priorities, though no specific on-street or off-street projects are identified.

Recommendations:
- Chapter 5 Bicycle & Pedestrian Element, pages 5-9 to 5-17

Status of Plan: The Plan guides MPO funding of capital transportation improvement projects and is updated every three to five years.
Charleston County Comprehensive Plan

Year: 2008

Description: Charleston County Comprehensive Plan is an expression of the County’s intent for where and how future growth and development should occur. The plan also identifies parts of the County that may or may not be appropriate for certain types of growth, given the Lowcountry’s unique character and natural conditions. Charleston County Council adopted the 10-year update of the County’s Comprehensive Plan on November 18, 2008. The Comprehensive Plan Update is the result of the state mandated 10-year update cycle, the need for the County to conform to new state statutes (The Priority Investment Act) that require additional elements in the Comprehensive Plan, and a response to changing economic and growth trends. Several elements of the Comprehensive Plan are relevant to this Plan.

Recommendations:

Chapter 3.7 Transportation Element

- RoadWise Project Locations are identified by district on pages 85-87 with the “Allocation Category” of “Bike & Pedestrian Path Enhancement Project.”
- T4. Identify planned right-of-way to be set aside for future roadways, sidewalks, and bicycle paths.
- T6. Adopt “Complete Streets” policies
- T11. Promote increased traffic safety along roadways including, but not limited to, separation of pedestrian and bicycle traffic from motorized traffic, intersections improvements, access management plans such as curb cuts, and lower speed limits.

Chapter 3.9. Priority Investment, Implementation, and Coordination Element

- PI 9. Continue coordination with Berkeley County, Dorchester County, and Colleton County to plan concurrently and compatibly, with particular attention to the regional implications of decisions regarding transportation system improvements.
- PI 11. Continue coordinating with SCDOT and BCDCOG to enhance transportation planning in Charleston County, focused upon the following:
  - Identification of roadway improvements in future updates of the CHATS Plan and the Five-Year Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) that support the development pattern in the Charleston County Comprehensive Plan.
  - Long-term planning for state highways that supports the goals of the Charleston County Comprehensive Plan.
  - Design of state highways that supports the goals of the Charleston County Comprehensive Plan.
  - Funding implementation of the adopted CHATS Plan Actions to enhance transit use and funding implementation of the CHATS Long-Range Public Transportation Plan.

Chapter 3.10 Energy

- ES.10. Provide support facilities at County buildings to promote walking and cycling to work. Support facilities may include, but are not limited to, bike racks, lockers, changing areas, and showers.

Status of Plan: Charleston County adopted the 10-year comprehensive plan update on November 18, 2008. The document guides countywide planning and policy.
South Carolina Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)

Year: 2008

Description: The purpose of the SCORP is to analyze the current status of outdoor recreation trends, demand, and supply in the state every five years and to meet the requirements of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant Manual.

Recommendations: As a result of the SCORP, individual agencies and organizations will develop detailed plans for the identified strategies based on their respective missions, priorities, and available resources to address the 15 priority implementation issues. In addition to recommendations for increasing funding and improving access for persons with mobility limitations, the following issues are relevant to trails planning:

Issue 3: Create an expanded network of trails that are well-designed and well-managed, are available to many, and provide appropriate facilities for:
- Equestrians
- Boating, including canoeing, kayaking, and rowing
- Walkers, hikers, backpackers, and bikers in both urban and rural settings
- Historic trails (Revolutionary War, railroad, etc.)
- General use trails

Issue 4: Provide adequate support facilities for all trails including:
- Trailheads, including signage, parking, and restrooms
- Potable water for people and livestock
- Parking for longer campers and horse trailers where appropriate
- Water and electrical hookups at non-primitive camp sites
- Additional secluded primitive campsites
- Bathhouses, where appropriate
- Trash collection
- Safety improvements (scheduled water releases, warning devices, call boxes, parking improvements, etc.)

Issue 5: Provide additional education, outreach, and promotion of available outdoor recreation opportunities statewide – including recreational facilities, educational programs, trails for all types of uses, and camping facilities – with a particular emphasis on reaching minorities, K-12 students and educators, lower income residents, and persons with disabilities.

Issue 10: Require and/or encourage the provision of connectivity between trails, outdoor recreation facilities, open space, and residential development on all levels – local, regional, and statewide.

Issue 13: Protect and acquire significant lands for natural and cultural resources and identify opportunities for allowing public outdoor recreational use.

Issue 14: Protect shorelines (rivers, lakes, and beaches) and dedicate more waterfront lands for public recreational use and access.

Status of Plan: South Carolina Department Parks Recreation and Tourism staff are guided by the goals of the Plan and work to implement the recommendations of the Plan through department initiatives, capital improvement projects, and programs.
Charleston Bicycle Master Plan

Year: 2007

Description: The purpose of the Plan is to increase the number of bicycle facilities, encourage bicycling by visitors and residents, and provide educational opportunities for community members. The Plan outlines 100 miles of proposed network improvements, 5,000 proposed bicycle parking spaces, and recommendations for encouragement and marketing and education and training.

Recommendations:
- Network Improvements, pages 23 to 36
- Bicycle Parking, pages 31-50
- Programs and Policies, pages 51-67

Status of Plan: The City of Charleston did not formally adopt this Plan; however, a number of recommendations of the Plan are incorporated into the Mobility Element of the adopted Comprehensive Plan of the City of Charleston, known as the 2010 Century V Plan. Projects recommended within the Mobility Element are considered for the City’s eight-year rolling capital improvement plan.

Charleston County Comprehensive Greenbelt Plan

Year: 2006

Description: Following a 2004 referendum for a one-half of one percent Sales and Use Tax, Charleston County and key stakeholders developed this Plan to address the major elements required by the voter-approved ordinance. The funds resulting from the Sales and Use Tax are identified as the Greenbelt Fund and are capped at just over $221 million over the 25 year maximum life span. The Plan’s vision is “to grow the economy of Charleston County while conserving and protecting the Lowcountry resources that make the County a wonderful place to live.” The Plan addresses both non-programmed natural open space (such as wetlands) and programmed open space (such as parks and trails).

Recommendations:
- Protect 30 percent of land and water resources in Charleston County as future green space (page 4-7).
- The Plan includes a 1,200-acre goal for Greenway Corridors, based on a 200-mile system of greenways with 50-foot wide corridors (page 4-22, with map on page 4-23).
- Chapter 5 Implementation identifies allocation formula for Greenbelt Funds (page 5-2) and specific next steps (pages 5-10 to 5-11).

Status of Plan: CCPRC, in cooperation with a Greenbelt Advisory Board, has actively worked to implement the recommendations of this Plan. As of September 2012, 20,569 acres of land have been protected in Charleston County, $78.4 million in funding has been awarded toward the protection of land, and $16.6 million remains for future conservation efforts. CCPRC hosts a website that tracks the continued progress of the greenbelt program and informs the public of existing and upcoming greenbelt projects (www.smallchangeforbigchange.org).
**Berkeley Charleston Dorchester Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Action Plan**

*Year:* 2005

**Description:** The purpose of this Plan is to improve walking and bicycling conditions in the BCD COG region and to encourage residents to walk and bike on a daily basis. Funded through a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, BCD COG developed this Plan in partnership with school districts, healthcare providers, and other partners. The three key concepts guiding the Plan are: 1) Safe Routes to School; 2) Complete Streets; and 3) Community Intervention. The recommendations of the plan are defined within those three categories and delineate measurable outcomes, the potential lead agency, and supporting partners.

**Recommendations:**
- Action Plan Matrix, pages 11 to 13

**Status of Plan:** This concise action plan led to the development of a local Eat Smart Move More coalition (an affiliate of the statewide Eat Smart Move More organization), which was formalized in 2010. The group, called Eat Smart Move More Charleston Tri-County, is implementing the recommendations of the Plan. More information can be found here: http://eatsmartmovemoresc.org/charleston-tri-county/who-we-are/

---

**Comprehensive CCPRC Trails Study and Recommendation**

*Year:* 2003

**Description:** The purpose of the Comprehensive CCPRC Trails Study and Recommendation is to provide a comprehensive background about existing trails in the CCPRC’s trail system, as well as to offer recommendations for improving that system by developing design consistency agency-wide and by future trail expansion and improvements. The Study provides general recommendations for agency planning, recommendations for a communications strategy, and recommendations for design/construction of trails. Recommendations specific to the trails inventoried in the report are also included.

**Recommendations:**
- General Recommendations, page 2-3

Communication Recommendations include: comprehensive trails brochure, facility trails brochure, trailhead development, and trail markings/signs.

Design/Construction Recommendations include: vary trail widths and materials, provide a shoulder for paved paths, clear first/pave later, reduce or eliminate dead ends, intersection enhancements, improve safety of user-made short cuts, capitalize on vistas and views, and increase trail amenities.

Trail Recommendations, page 8-13 are provided for:
- Caw Caw Interpretive Center
- Mount Pleasant Palmetto Islands County Park
- James Island County Park
- North Charleston Wannamaker County Park
- Folly Beach Edwin S. Taylor Fishing Pier
- Folly Beach County Park
- Isle of Palms County Park
Status of Plan: The recommendations of this trails study are incorporated into the current CCPRC Parks Recreation Open Space and Trails (PROST) planning effort. The Study’s recommendations are updated and refined as needed.

CHATS and Charleston County Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan

Year: 1995

Description: Adopted in 1995, the Charleston Area Transportation Study (CHATS) and Charleston County Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan includes an analysis of existing conditions and recommended policies and programs. The Plan includes a “Bicycle Route Master Plan,” an implementation plan, and design guidelines. The vision of the plan is: “Residents and visitors to the Charleston area will choose to bicycle and walk for transportation and recreational travel. The study area will become more bicycle-friendly and walkable over the next 20 years, offering travelers safe and convenient alternatives to driving within and between communities.”

Recommendations:
• Recommendations are incorporated into the 1998, 2005, and 2035 CHATS Long Range Plans.

Status of Plan: Numerous bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvement projects recommended within this Plan have been implemented in the last 17 years (such as the multi-use path on Lockwood Boulevard). Ten primary policies recommended in the Plan have since been adopted by the CHATS Policy Committee and the Charleston County Transportation Committee, as well as local jurisdictions and agencies, where appropriate, including the following: “All existing rail and utility corridors will be reviewed for their potential to incorporate multi-use trails. The CHATS Policy Committee recommends that area jurisdictions shall act immediately to protect and preserve abandoned railroad corridors that have the potential to become part of a regional trail network.”

C. Other Relevant Trails

The following five additional trail planning efforts are also relevant to this Master Plan.

East Coast Greenway Alliance

The East Coast Greenway is a 2,500 mile hiking and biking route that, once completed, will extend from Maine to Key West, Florida. Through funding from the S.C. Forestry Commission, the BCD COG completed a study in 2005 of the trail’s potential route within the BCD region.

The study proposed a 95 mile long trail extending through Charleston County, linking neighborhoods, communities, schools, health care centers, and shopping nodes for local users. The route also connects local, state, and national parks (including the Francis Marion National Forest, the Santee Coastal Reserve, and the Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge), and local, state, and national bicycle routes and trails (including the Palmetto Trail). This regional segment of the East Coast Greenway travels north-south along coastal Highway US 17, through the city of Mount Pleasant, across the already-designated East Coast Greenway segment on the Ravenel Bridge, into and through downtown Charleston and then along the already-designated segment on the West Ashley Greenway.
The County and its partners are working to acquire additional right-of-way and close gaps in the East Coast Greenway route throughout the County. The East Coast Greenway Alliance nonprofit organization, based in Durham, North Carolina, is a partner in the development of the route. Some of the current issues with the route include a lack of directional signage and the fact that some portions of the route are designed as mountain bike trails.

**Palmetto Trail**

The Palmetto Trail is South Carolina’s Mountains-to-the-Sea Trail and the signature project of the statewide nonprofit, the Palmetto Conservation Foundation. Once complete, the trail will extend roughly 425 miles from Awendaw, South Carolina at the Intracoastal Waterway to Oconee State Park at the trail’s northern terminus. The seven-mile Awendaw Passage is the portion of the Palmetto Trail that passes through Charleston County. The Swamp Fox Trailhead is located near US 17 and the Buck Hall Landing Trailhead is located at the coast. The trail route hugs the northern edge of Awendaw Creek.

**Battery 2 Beach Route**

The Battery 2 Beach Route is a proposed bicycling route from the Battery in historic Charleston to Folly Beach to the south and to Isle of Palms to the north. The route is approximately 33 miles and extends through Folly Beach, James Island, West Ashley, the Charleston peninsula, the Town of Mount Pleasant, Sullivan’s Island, and Isle of Palms. Proposed improvements along the route range from shared-lane markings and bicycle lanes, to sidewalks and shared-use paths. Intersection improvements and signage are also planned. An intergovernmental working group involving each municipality, Charleston County, SC DOT, and others is leading the effort. Several segments along the route already provide bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities.

**Low Country Low Line**

The Low Country Low Line is a citizen-driven effort to develop a southeastern counter to the popular High Line of New York. The concept proposes to use undevelopable space beneath the Interstate 26 (I-26) overpass as it enters the Charleston peninsula (as opposed to the High Line’s use of an elevated transportation corridor). The project extends from a northern terminus near exit 219B on I-26 to a southern terminus where the interstate becomes an at-grade facility and merges with Highway 17. The space beneath the overpass provides a wide linear corridor of open space. The Low Country Low Line effort envisions a linear park serving multiple user groups and attracting residents and visitors alike. The project is in the early stages of exploring feasibility.

**Southeast Coast Saltwater Paddling Trail**

South Carolina is one of four states included within the Southeast Coast Saltwater Paddling Trail corridor. This National Park Service initiative envisions a continuous saltwater paddling trail across Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, and connecting to Florida’s partially completed Circumnavigational Saltwater Paddling Trail. The effort is led on a state-by-state basis with the National Park Service’s Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance (RTCA) program as an advisory partner. A signature piece of South Carolina’s section of the Southeast Coast Saltwater Paddling Trail extends through Charleston County. “The South Carolina portion of this blueway route is also referred to as the South Carolina Paddling Trail.”
Appendix B: Market Segmentation in Charleston County and the BCD Tri-County Region

A. Introduction

According to ESRI, “segmentation systems operate on the theory that people with similar tastes, lifestyles, and behaviors seek others with the same tastes—“like seeks like.” These behaviors can be measured, predicted, and targeted. ESRI’s segmentation system, Community Tapestry, combines the “who” of lifestyle demography with the “where” of local neighborhood geography to create a model of various lifestyle classifications or segments of actual neighborhoods with addresses—distinct behavioral market segments.” Each segment is named as a descriptor of typical lifestyle characteristics.

Understanding the dominant market segments in Charleston County and the BCD Region can contribute to the success of the Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission, Park, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan. The 65-segment Tapestry Segmentation system classifies US neighborhoods based on their socioeconomic and demographic compositions. The possible segments include: Enterprising Professionals, Las Casas, Dorms to Diplomas, Top Rung to Social Security Set.

B. Charleston County

The top three market segments in Charleston County are “In Style, Aspiring Young Families, and Boomburbs,” as described below.

In Style

Demographic

In Style residents live in the suburbs but prefer the city lifestyle. Professional couples predominate. Household distributions by type are similar to those of the United States. Married-couple families represent 54 percent of households. Households without children (married couples without children, single-person, shared, and other family types), comprise more than two-thirds of all households. This count is increasing. The population is slightly older, with a median age of 40 years. There is little diversity in these neighborhoods.

Socioeconomic

In Style residents are prosperous, with a median household income of $70,745 and a median net worth of $182,665. Wages and salaries provide income for 84 percent of the households; 47 percent also receive some form of investment income. In Style residents are more educated when compared to the US average: 42 percent of the population aged 25 years and older hold a bachelor’s or graduate degree. Labor force participation is 68.5 percent; unemployment is 8.4 percent. Forty-six percent (46%) of employed residents have professional or management positions, with above average concentrations in the finance, insurance, health care, technical services, and education industry sectors.
Residential

*In Style* residents live in affluent neighborhoods of metropolitan areas across the country. More suburban than urban, they embrace an urban lifestyle; 14 percent prefer townhouses to traditional single-family homes chosen by 56 percent of the households. The median home value is $218,289. The 68 percent rate of home ownership is just slightly above average. More than three-quarters of the housing was built in the last 30 years.

Preferences

Computer savvy *In Style* residents go online daily to research real estate information; do their banking; track investments; trade stocks; book travel; and buy computer hardware or software, concert tickets, or tickets to sporting events. They use a financial planner and invest in stocks, bonds, money market funds, money market bank accounts, and securities. Looking toward the future, residents hold life insurance policies and contribute to IRA and 401(k) retirement accounts. To maintain their homes, they hire professional household cleaning services and contractors to remodel their kitchens.

Residents stay fit by exercising, eating a healthy diet to control their weight, buying low-fat foods, and taking vitamins. They attend live musical performances and gamble at casinos. They take domestic vacations to hike, golf, and go backpacking. They read magazines, listen to news-talk radio, and watch professional sports events and golf on TV.

Aspiring Young Families

Demographic

Most of the residents in this demographic are young, startup families, married couples with or without children, and single parents. The average family size of 3.1 people matches the US average. Approximately two-thirds of the households are families, 27 percent are single person, and 9 percent are shared. Annual population growth is 1.13 percent, higher than the US figure. The median age is 30.5 years; nearly 20 percent of these residents are in their 20s. Typical of younger populations, *Aspiring Young Families* residents are more ethnically diverse than the total US population.

Socioeconomic

The median household income is $52,487; wages provide the primary source of income. The median net worth is $36,734. Approximately 60 percent of employed residents work in professional, management, sales, or office/administrative support positions. Overall, 87 percent of residents aged 25 years and older have graduated from high school, 58 percent have attended college, and 24 percent hold a bachelor’s or graduate degree.

Residential

In large, growing southern and western metropolitan areas, the highest concentrations of these neighborhoods are found in California, Florida, and Texas. Twenty percent are located in the Midwest. Tenure is nearly even; 51 percent of the households rent and 49 percent own their homes. Residents live in moderately priced apartments, single-family houses, and startup townhouses. Most of the housing was built after 1969. The average gross rent is comparable to the US average. The median home value is $137,343.

Preferences

Focused on family and home, residents of *Aspiring Young Families* communities spend most of their discretionary income for baby and children’s products, toys, home furnishings, cameras, and video game systems. They go online to look for jobs, play games, and buy personal preference items such as music and computer equipment.
These residents would probably go to a theme park while on vacation. They play video games, watch TV, eat out, and go to the movies. They also play basketball and go bowling and biking. They listen to urban stations and professional basketball games on the radio and watch sports, news, entertainment, and courtroom shows on TV. They eat out at family restaurants such as Chili’s or IHOP and go to Jack in the Box or Sonic for fast food.

**Boomburbs**

**Demographic**
The newest additions to the suburbs, these communities are home to busy, affluent young families. Both the neighborhoods and the families are growing. *Boomburbs* is the fastest-growing market in the United States; the population has been growing at a rate of 4.51 percent annually since 2000. It is also home to one of the highest concentrations of young families with children. The median age is 33.8 years; one-fifth of *Boomburbs* residents are between 35 and 44 years of age. There is little ethnic diversity in the population; most of the residents are white.

**Socioeconomic**
The *Boomburbs* market includes one of the highest concentrations of two-income households, complemented by one of the highest rates of labor force participation, at 71 percent. Residents are well educated: more than 50 percent of the population aged 25 years and older hold a bachelor’s or graduate degree. They work primarily in management, professional, and sales occupations. The median household income is $110,681, more than double that of the US median. More than half of these households receive additional income from interest, dividends, and rental property. The median net worth is $387,651.

**Residential**
The newest developments in growing areas, *Boomburbs* neighborhoods are concentrated in the South, West, and Midwest; the highest state concentrations are found in Texas and California. Approximately three-quarters of the housing units in *Boomburbs* neighborhoods were built after 1989; most are single-family houses. These are the newest developments in growing areas. The home ownership rate is 88 percent, compared to 66 percent for the United States. The median home value of $282,689 is also high compared to the US median of $157,913. Commuting links these dual-career households with their suburban lifestyle. Many work outside their resident county; 35 percent cross county lines to work (compared to 23 percent for the United States).

**Preferences**
Residents’ product preferences reflect their suburban lifestyle. *Boomburbs* is the top segment for buying household furnishings, toys and games, men’s business and casual clothes, big-screen TVs, cars, and trees. This is also the top market to own big-screen TVs, DVD players, digital camcorders, video game systems, and scanners as well as owning or leasing full-size SUVs. Residents own laptop computers, all kinds of software, and two or more cell phones. They are well-insured, holding life insurance policies worth $500,000 or more. They go online frequently to buy flowers and tickets to sports events, trade and track their investments, do their banking, and make travel plans. Personal computer use by children younger than 18 years is the highest of all the Tapestry segments.

*Boomburbs* residents prefer homes with fireplaces and hot tubs. They tend to employ professional household cleaning services. They will do home improvement projects themselves or hire a contractor for more complicated work. For property maintenance, they hire lawn care and landscaping services, but will also do some lawn care themselves.
Family vacations are a top priority; trips to Disney World, Sea World, and other theme parks are popular destinations. For exercise, they play tennis and golf, ski, lift weights, and jog. They watch family videos on DVD, attend baseball and basketball games, and go to golf tournaments. They will readily spend more than $250 a year on high-end sports equipment and buy family DVDs for their collections. Favorite types of radio programs include alternative, soft contemporary, sports, and all-talk. They read parenting, finance, and business magazines and watch newer sitcoms and dramas on TV.

C. The Tri-County Region

The top three market segments within the Tri-County Region include one of the same segments as Charleston County, and two others.

Rural Bypasses

Demographic
The age and household composition of the Rural Bypasses market is very similar to US distributions. Half of the households consist of married-couple families, 15 percent are single-parent families, and 7 percent are other family types. One-fourth of these households consist of a single person. The median age for this segment is 38.3 years, near the US median of 37 years. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the residents are white; 35.5 percent are black.

Socioeconomic
The median household income is $28,082. Wages and salaries provide the primary sources of income; however, many depend upon Social Security, Supplemental Security Income, and public assistance for support. Because of low home values and household debt, the median net worth of $22,235 is below the median household income. Overall, two in three residents aged 25 years and older have graduated from high school; the population with a bachelor’s degree is one-third that of the US level. Employed residents work in a variety of occupations, with a slightly higher percentage in blue-collar occupations. Higher-than-average proportions of employed residents work in the agricultural, mining, manufacturing, and construction industry sectors. Compared to US levels, the labor force participation rate of 50 percent is low and the unemployment rate of 14.6 percent is high.

Residential
Open space, undeveloped land, and farmland are found in Rural Bypasses neighborhoods, located almost entirely in the South. Families live in small towns along country back roads. Residents enjoy the open air in these sparsely populated neighborhoods. Most houses are modest, single-family dwellings; 32 percent are mobile homes. Home ownership is at 76 percent; the median home value is $63,328, making it one of the three lowest of the Tapestry segments. Most housing in this market was built after 1969. The vacancy rate of 16 percent is high.
Preferences
Typical of their country lifestyle, Rural Bypasses residents prefer to drive trucks and SUVs and listen to country radio. To save money, they eat at home and maintain their homes and gardens themselves. In areas with no cable access, some residents install satellite dishes to watch TV. They frequently watch sports on TV, NASCAR and other auto races, college football games, and fishing programs. They read fishing and hunting magazines. Conservative with their long-distance calls, resident demand for cost-effective cellular services is growing. They shop at discount stores, preferably at Wal-Mart. They also order from catalogs and from their Avon representatives. They shop at home improvement stores such as Lowe’s and fill prescriptions at the local Wal-Mart Pharmacy instead of regular pharmacies. This is the top Tapestry segment to own and/or buy new motorcycles.

Aspiring Young Families (see previous section)

Midland Crowd

Demographic
Its growing population of 12 million (approximately 4 percent of the US population) makes the Midland Crowd Tapestry Segmentation’s largest segment. Since 2000, the population has grown by 2.18 percent annually. The median age of 37.2 years parallels that of the US median. Sixty-two percent (62%) of the households are married couple families; half of them have children. Twenty percent (20%) of the households are singles who live alone. Midland Crowd neighborhoods are not diverse.

Socioeconomic
Median household income is $50,096, slightly lower than the US median. Most income is earned from wages and salaries; however, self-employment ventures are slightly higher for this segment than the national average. The median net worth is $88,854. Unemployment is below average. Half of the residents who work hold white collar jobs. More than 45 percent of the residents aged 25 years and older have attended college; 16 percent have earned a bachelor’s or graduate degree.

Residential
Midland Crowd residents live in housing developments in rural villages and towns throughout the United States, mainly in the South. Three-fourths of the housing was built after 1969. The home ownership rate is 81 percent, higher than the national rate of 66 percent. The median home value is $121,782. Two-thirds of the housing is single-family houses; 28 percent are mobile homes.

Preferences
These politically active, conservative residents vote, work for their candidates, and serve on local committees. Their rural location and traditional lifestyle dictate their product preferences. A fourth of the households own three or more vehicles; they typically own or lease a truck, and many own a motorcycle. Proficient do-it-yourselfers, they work on their vehicles, homes, and gardens and keep everything in tip-top shape. They hunt, fish, and do woodworking. Dogs are their favorite pets. They patronize local stores or shop by mail order. They have recently bought radial tires. They often go to the drive-through at a fast-food restaurant.

Many households own a satellite dish so they can watch CMT, the Speed Channel, Home & Garden Television, NASCAR racing, rodeo/bull riding, truck and tractor pulls, fishing programs, and a variety of news programs. They listen to country music on the radio and read fishing and hunting magazines.
Appendix C – Summary Minutes from Stakeholder Meetings
CCPRC PROST Master Plan – Consolidated Responses – Public Meetings
June 19, 2012 – 12 Participants, press, 6 staff, 2 consultants
June 20, 2012 – 3 Participants, press, 4 staff, 3 consultants
June 21, 2012 – 10 Participants, press, 2 staff, 2 consultants
July 24, 2012 – 35 Participants, 4 staff, 2 consultants
July 25, 2012 – 34 Participants, 4 staff, 2 consultants
July 26, 2012 – 32 Participants, 3 staff, 1 consultant
3 Ancillary comments

As we’re looking at recommendations for the Master Plan:

1. What are the key strengths of the CCPRC System – what do we need to keep and celebrate?
   • Affordability *****
   • Variety of programs and facilities **
   • Convenience
   • Parks are up to date
   • Safety
   • Quantity of services and programs *
   • Playgrounds
   • Water parks
   • Demographic distribution of parks *
   • Economic development (jobs)
   • Volunteers
   • Keeping natural
   • Special events
   • Cultural diversity
   • Well maintained
   • Water access *
   • Balance between enterprise and tax support
   • Location of parks to water
   • Acquired wonderful properties *
   • Preservation from development
   • Active and accessible outdoors
   • Education
   • Facilities that cater to the needs of the public
   • Reliable funding source
   • Distribution
   • Maintain character of surroundings
   • Resident focus versus tourist
   • Public acceptance
   • Positive use of tax dollars
• Adjacencies to other providers such as the USFS
• Environmental stewardship
• Asking the community for input

2. What do we need to fix or improve? If you had a blank check, what *improvements or changes* would you make to the CCPRC System?
• Accessibility to the rural *
• Connectivity (bike/pedestrian)****
• Connection to the municipalities’ parks *
• Folly beach (washout)
• Other amenities such as playgrounds at Wappoo Boat Landing/McLeod
• Destination park (rural)
• Need more in North area *
• More community outreach to diversify existing programs
• New amenities/enhancing existing facilities (add new features to water parks - new slide at Whirling Waters, etc.)
• Better traffic management at events (distribute load/use/capacity – with limited ticket sales or controlled access timing) *
• More overnight facilities
• Lack of non-motorized connection between parks (trails)
• Tell the real story – true history; need more historical/cultural and ecological/environmental education/interpretation – interactive and self-guided
• Better and more communication/marketing of what is available *
• Urban setting opportunities in light of infill development
• Working closer with the schools to use facilities; increase outreach to schools
• Sustainable pubic beach access
• Hours of service expanded to evening and weekends for programs
• Seniors don’t have transportation to get to the parks (St. Pauls doesn’t have public transportation)
• Transportation – but the rural folks would like to see services near them
• Set aside and area for preserving tea plants
• Need signs at parks that say what’s going on in the park
• More managed timber harvest and selling
• Parks are too far away for us to use
• Have kids up here that need to learn how to swim
• Centered around the urban areas and not the rural areas
• Rural areas lack service due to not having a common voice; they don’t get attention
• Coyotes, hogs, cats, feral wildlife issues

3. Do you think there are any (geographical) *areas* of Charleston County that are underserved in terms of parks and recreation services or facilities?
• Rural areas **
• Inner city
• Johns Island
• Wadmalaw Island
• River and other barriers may cut off getting to places
• North Charleston
• Under-privileged
• Urban-inner city youth (transported)
• Peninsula
• Saint Pauls area (especially children)
• Edisto
• Seniors
• Military and families
• Little communities in the Rural West and Rural East Counties, North of Mt. Pleasant

4. What needed park and recreation facilities are currently not being provided in Charleston County?
   • Senior center (only one I know if is on Johns Island); Ashem track/Old Town Road would be a good location – City provides these kind of services **
   • Pools (teaching and leisure/aquatics center) and a true shallow end pool/up to 5’ ****
   • Pond to swim in
   • Natatorium for competitive swimming
   • Archery range
   • Outdoor sports
   • Rural equity: playground
   • Historical sites
   • Amphitheater ***
   • Outdoor classroom or small amphitheater
   • Water Access (salt and other) *
   • Small playgrounds spread throughout the system *
   • Boat landings/access on peninsula *
   • Park and ride lot
   • Free spray/play areas
   • Camping and cabins and primitive (on and off the water)***
   • RV sites
   • Event space/open grassy areas **
   • Trails *** more + bike lanes + off road
   • Poarch (big old people) swing in the shade
   • More picnic areas
     o Skate park
     o Zip lines *
     o Active sports
     o Tower with a canopy tour
   • Fitness stations/outdoor fitness park *
   • Distance markers on trails
   • Fishing/crabbing facilities ***
   • Community gardens *
   • LEED certified buildings
   • Multi-use courts for alternative sports (rollerblade, street soccer, dodge ball, bike polo)
   • Rowing and multi-water sport venue (Dorchester Rd. or man-made) with boathouse and low approach dock (for teaching, events, etc.) **
   • Skating rink
   • Another location for Holiday lights (to relieve pressure/capacity at JICP)
• More sustainable location for public beach access
• Community center with fitness in the St. Pauls area
• Horse trails
• Wildlife plots
• Bird watching stations
• Interpretive walk
• Shelters *
• Grills
• Equestrian facility
• Concessions
• Restrooms at boat landings
• Restrooms at recreation sites (Thompson Hill)
• Archeological sites
• Interpretive Intercostals waterways
• Ballfields
• A regional attraction in the rural areas
• Passive and active for all ages
• Rental facilities
• Prefer one larger amenity than several smaller ones spread around

5. What recreation programs or services should be offered that are currently not being offered by CCPRC?

• Teach learn to swim – swimming ***
• Hunter safety
• Historical/Cultural (heritage/civil rights)
• Music/concerts in parks (free outdoor) – community groups can play/other types of music/at other parks **
• Sharks education and other beach/nature wildlife
• Sustainability programs
• Dancing programs/events
• Regional field day
• Seniors Day (free admission)
• Movies in the park
• New festivals
• Park after dark (late night adult programs) *
• Farmers Market
• Gay Days
• Interactive and self-guided (true) historical interpretation
• Guided fishing and hunting
• Health and wellness programs and events *
• Learn to row (paddle, etc.) camp/classes
• Competitive sports leagues – although the Cities offer this
• Learn to bike, bike safety, and other cycling maintenance courses, etc.
• Adult road safety courses
• Be a clearinghouse for information on programs and services
• Summer Camps at Caw Caw
• Bird watching
- Master Naturalists classes at other locations than Caw Caw *
- Camps *
- Gardening
- Environmental biology
- Survivalist, CPR, First Aid
- Geocaching
- Self defense classes
- Summer activities/camps/classes
- Residential (week-long) camps
- Archery

6. What improvements to parks, recreation, open space and trails do you think should be the highest priority for Charleston County?
   - Sustainability *
   - Maintenance *
   - Quality (of the condition)
   - Accessibility (also to less privileged populations)*
   - Water access
   - Non-motorized access (adjacent neighborhoods first, and then to other parks) – connectivity, safety and awareness
   - Diversity
   - Self sustaining financially
   - Affordability
   - New park in North area
   - Keep it fun and exciting
   - Rowing center – low access dock
   - Preliminary basic access (trails, dock, signage, restroom, trailhead, etc.) to the undeveloped properties in harmony with the development process
   - Quiet enjoyment at Ashem (set up as an equestrian area, and would welcome canoes)
   - Pursue enterprise ventures to balance tax supported
   - Invest in areas where we already have infrastructure
   - Work harder to get us access with other government entities – public facilities should be accessible – agencies should work together
   - Pool
   - Communication and marketing to get the word out about what is available
   - ADA accessibility to camping, facilities and programming
   - Facilities in rural areas (East County)
   - East Coast Greenway master plan emphasis creating connections
   - Partnerships – public owners
   - Architectural site opportunity
   - Multi-use facilities to stretch the dollars further

7. When new parks and park facilities are constructed, how should priority be determined? (Example: geography and population).
   - Both geography and population **
   - Develop the opportunities of the purchased undeveloped properties
   - Improve what’s there, especially if in the rural areas
- Strategically acquire smaller tracks with schools for rural areas
- County parks should benefit everyone in the county so use a weighted average between geography and population
- Characteristics of properties and geographies may also dictate the development
- Draw people from one part of the county into other parts of the county
- Take advantage of opportunities
- Accessibility
- Capacity and service gaps
- Unmet needs – or growth in users (and people with go where it is)
- Needs of highest number of people
- Put similar facilities in the rural area as needed because they don’t exist there
- Balance of need/geography and population
- Lack of facilities

8. Does the name Charleston County Park and Recreation Commission adequately describe CCPRC’s role in Charleston County?
   - Hard to get used to who all is doing us
   - Confusing – not sure if a department of the county **
   - Commission – may mean it is part of something else; what does this mean? Perhaps commission means a broader mission; this doesn’t mean anything to me *
   - Ambiguity – the historical mission isn’t captured in “recreation”
   - Incorporate the word “leisure”
   - Confusion between City and County
   - Yes
   - Yes but a mascot
   - It’s the most bureaucratic name you can come up with
   - Take “commission” off the name
   - Thought county meant they were part of county
   - Also “Charleston” is confusing with the City
   - Commission should have representation from every area
   - Recognized logo – keep that
   - Sure

9. It is mandated that CCPRC NOT compete with Municipal Recreation Agencies. There is a clear shortage of athletic facilities in the area. Should CCPRC provide these facilities to fill that void?
   - Where there is a void, or where the municipalities aren’t keeping up with demand, CCPRC should step in (especially in urban areas) **
   - Don’t think there should be competition, there should be cooperation
   - Yes they should
   - You could do anything as long as the municipalities would agree
   - It’s a money issue – may be easier to offer passive parks in rural areas
   - Rural recreation areas may really need you to step in
   - Municipalities may try to shift their responsibilities to the county – need guidelines to avoid this from happening
   - Most people don’t distinguish who is doing what
   - CCPRC could partner with the Cities by building facilities for the cities to operate
   - CCPRC should be providing input into the Cities
• CCPRC should be able to use schools after hours (like in the rural areas)
• Don’t duplicate services
• Yes, fill the void

10. Do you currently use other non-CCPRC recreation facilities/programs? If yes, which ones and why?
• City parks and pools – location is desirable/close/convenience
• Private gyms for workout
• MLK lap pool downtown (only Olympic pool in the area) – only swim teams are local/neighborhood or JCC provided
• Elementary school playgrounds
• Beaches
• Bike lanes
• Private and city tennis
• State parks
• Wildlife management areas
• National monument
• Charleston and Bees landing
• Boat landings
• National forest
• Seewee Environment Center
• Caper Main Wildlife Refuge
• Santee Coastal Preserve
• Mt Pleasant Recreation Center
• Hampton Plantation State Park

It’s all about access and location in the rural areas; and interest in the urban areas

11. Would you be supportive of a tax increase or bond issue, if it is found that there are insufficient funds to build and/or properly maintain parks, facilities and programs to the standards desired by the community? What other ways should be explored to fund our vision?
• Would support a bond referendum (sunsets) versus a tax, although about half supported
• No – 1; bond support for passive projects
• 3 no or don’t know; 5 yes
• Depends on what is in the package
• Touch every single interests where you can
• Yes if it was for a specific purpose for a specific timeframe
• Don’t roll it into another bigger thing
• If we know it’s going to benefit us, the rural areas
• You might get a completely different answer if you spell out property tax versus sales tax or other implied taxation funding

12. Are you aware of any potential partnerships that CCPRC should explore?
• City/County – Many cities and Charleston County (and/or Tri-County area) *
• Community Foundation
• Gullah Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor (Federal initiative)
• Education system – school district, charter schools
• Community groups (local bands)
• Higher Education/Universities, etc. (College of Charleston, TTC, Citadel, Chas Southern, Clemson extension)
• Boeing
• Black Baud
• MUSC and other hospitals
• Symphony Orchestra and other musical groups
• Naval Weapons Station (Marrington Plantation) - part in County
• Museums
• SC Arts Commission
• Culturally based festival partners
• Mead Westvaco/Copstone
• Private developers
• SCDHEC
• Oprah
• Local non-profits
• CARTA
• Local businesses
• Charleston Restaurant Association
• Charleston Moves
• SCDOT
• SPA
• Intertech
• National organizations (topic specific)
• National Park Service
• State Parks
• Parkland Foundation
• Historic preservation groups
• United Way
• Wal-mart
• SCPRT
• RTA
• SCG+E/Berkley Electric
• CPW
• Westraco (their master plan is encompassing a lot of similar things)
• Verizon Foundation
• District 1 unincorporated areas (non-profit)
• United States Fish and Wildlife
• USFS
• DNR
• Volunteers, in-kind donations

13. Is there anything else we should keep in mind as we move forward?
• When will we start on the projects – “it’s going to take time”
• What are the funding sources CCPRC has investigated – TBD
• How about a logo change?
“I did mean to add something else to the idea of PRC taking advantage of our natural resources. Charleston County has an abundance of history and historical sites. Many of these sites are relatively unknown. I think that PRC should take advantage of this and offer appropriate programming.”

“The SC Trails Committee of the SC PRT met yesterday. There was only one grant for the motorized trail funds so we had carryover for next year of approximately $465,000 in that category (pending passage of the transportation bill). The Palmetto Conservation Foundation (natalie@palmettoconservation.org) are doing a series of workshops in the fall on the Blueways in Spartanburg, Columbia and Beaufort. We included the PCF’s Palmetto Trail in the data provided to [the consultants] but you may want to talk with [them] about the PCF’s plans for Charleston County.”

“As a local resident, I would like to offer my opinion for the use of the Harmony Hall property. I would like to see this property retained as an unimproved hiking, walking, and wildlife viewing area. I do not want to add structures or development that would change the natural beauty of the property and increase local traffic. In addition, please keep in mind that for all of the residents who live past Harmony Hall (of which I am one) Ethel Post Office Road has only one way out for emergencies.”
# Table of Contents

**METHODOLOGY** .................................................................................................................. 1

**RESPONDENT PROFILE** .................................................................................................. 3

**CURRENT FUNCTIONS: VALUES AND VISION** ................................................................. 5
  Open Ended Comments - Functions .................................................................................... 7

**CURRENT FACILITIES, AMENITIES AND SERVICES** .................................................... 8
  Usage Frequency .................................................................................................................. 8
  Importance of Current Parks & Recreation Facilities ......................................................... 10
  Degree to which Current Facilities are Meeting Household Needs .................................. 13
  Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix – Current Facilities ....................................................... 16

**CURRENT FACILITIES TO EXPAND OR IMPROVE** .................................................... 19
  Top Priorities for Facilities to be Expanded or Improved .................................................. 19
  Sub-County Analysis for Improvements and Expansions of Facilities ......................... 21

**PROGRAMS, ACTIVITIES, AND SPECIAL EVENTS** ........................................................ 23
  Usage Frequency ................................................................................................................ 23
  Importance Current Parks & Recreation Programs ............................................................ 25
  Degree to which Programs are Meeting Household Needs .............................................. 27
  Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix – Current Programs/Events ......................................... 29

**CURRENT PROGRAMS TO EXPAND OR IMPROVE** .................................................... 32
  Top Priorities for Programs to be Expanded or Improved .................................................. 32
  Sub-County Analysis for Improvements and Expansion of Programs ......................... 34
  Open Ended Comments: Programs/Facility Improvements ............................................ 36

**FUTURE FACILITIES, AMENITIES, AND SERVICES** .................................................... 37
  Top Priorities for Programs or Facilities Not Currently Being Provided to be Added ........ 39
  Open Ended Comments - Future Facilities, Amenities and Services ............................... 41

**IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED/REASONS FOR NOT USING CHARLESTON COUNTY RECREATION PROGRAMS OR FACILITIES** ................................................................. 43
  Open Ended Comments: Reason Do Not Use/Needs Improvements ............................. 44

**WILLINGNESS TO TRAVEL AND IMPORTANCE OF ACCESSIBILITY TO UNDEVELOPED PARKS** .................................................................................................................. 45
GREENWAYS AND TRAILS ................................................. 47
   Top Priorities for Greenway and Trail Improvement .............................. 48
   Sub-County Analysis of Aspects of Greenways and Trails .................... 49
   Open Ended Comments - Greenways and Trails .................................. 50

COMMUNICATION ................................................................ 52
   Adequate Description of the Name “Charleston County Parks and Recreation
      Commission” .................................................................................. 52
   How Residents Currently Receive Information ................................. 52
   Other Methods of Communication .................................................... 53

FINANCIAL CHOICES/FEES ................................................ 54
   Perception of Current Program and Facility Fees Charged .................... 54
   Willingness to Increase Property Taxes ............................................ 54
   Position on Bond Referendum .......................................................... 54

SUGGESTIONS/OPEN ENDED COMMENTS ...................... 56
Table of Figures

Figure 1 Household Characteristics ........................................................................................................ 3
Figure 2 Respondent Characteristics ..................................................................................................... 4
Figure 3 Race, Ethnicity .......................................................................................................................... 4
Figure 4 Current Functions – Importance to Household - Percentage Very Important vs. Not at all Important ............................................................................................................................ 5
Figure 5 Charleston County Parks & Recreation - Level of Importance per Function – Average Rating 6
Figure 6 Current Facilities - Frequency of Use of Past 12 Months ........................................................... 8
Figure 7 Percent of Population Who Used a Facility at Least Once Within the Past 12 Months .......... 9
Figure 8 Current Facilities – Importance to Household - Percentage Very Important vs. Not at all Important ................................................................................................................................. 11
Figure 9 Current Facilities – Importance to Household - Average Rating of Random Sample vs. Open Link Survey ........................................................................................................................... 12
Figure 10 Current Facilities – Degree to Which Needs are Being Met – Percentage Completely Meets Needs vs. Not at all Meets Needs .............................................................................................. 14
Figure 11 Current Facilities – Degree to Which Needs are Being Met - Average Ratings of Random Sample vs. Open Link Survey ............................................................................................................ 15
Figure 12 Current Facilities – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Random Sample Overall ............... 17
Figure 13 Current Facilities – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Open Link ........................................ 18
Figure 14 Most Important Facilities to be Expanded or Improved ....................................................... 20
Figure 15 Three Most Important Facilities to be Expanded or Improved - By Sub-County Area .......... 22
Figure 16 Current Programs and Events - Frequency of Use ................................................................. 23
Figure 17 Percent of Population Who Used a Program at Least Once - Random Sample ...................... 24
Figure 18 Current Programs – Importance to Household - Percentage Very Important vs. Not at all Important ............................................................................................................................................ 26
Figure 19 Current Programs – Degree to Which Needs are Being Met - Percentage Needs Completely Met vs. Needs Not at all Met ....................................................................................................... 28
Figure 20 Current Programs – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Random Sample Overall .............. 30
Figure 21 Current Programs – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Open Link ..................................... 31
Figure 22 Most Important Programs to be Added, Expanded, or Improved ......................................... 33
Figure 23 Three Most Important Programs to be Added, Expanded, or Improved - By Sub-County Area 35
Figure 24 Future Facilities, Amenities and Services Most Important Over Next 5 – 10 Years – Very Important vs. Not at all Important ........................................................................................................... 37
Figure 25 Specific Programs or Facilities Desired for the Future – Very Important vs. Not at all Important .......................................................................................................................... 38
Figure 26 Most Important/Highest Priority of Programs or Facilities Desired for the Future .............. 40
Figure 27 Charleston County Programs and Facilities - Improvements Needed/Reasons Do Not Use ...... 43
Figure 28 Time Willing to Spend Traveling to a CCPRC Facility ......................................................... 45
Figure 29 Importance for Access to Undeveloped Future Park Sites .................................................... 46
Figure 30 Most Important Aspects of Greenways and Trails to be Added – Very Important vs. Not at all Important .......................................................................................................................... 47
Figure 31 Three Most Important Aspects of Greenways and Trails to be Added .................................. 48
Figure 32 Three Most Important Aspects of Greenways and Trails to be Added - By Sub-County Area ... 49
Figure 33 “Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission” as an Adequate Name for Their Role 52
Figure 34 How Residents Currently Receive Information and How Best to Reach Residents .......... 53
Figure 35 Preferred Payment Method for County Parks and Rec. Facilities, Amenities and Services ....... 55
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to gather public feedback on Charleston County parks, natural areas, programs, facilities, services and other community investments. This feedback and subsequent analysis was designed to assist the Charleston County Park & Recreation Commission in the creation of a *Parks for Tomorrow Master Plan* for existing and possibly future enhancements, facilities, and services.

The survey was conducted using three methods: 1) a mail-back survey, 2) an online invitation only survey, and 3) an open link online survey for members of the public who did not receive a randomly selected survey in the mail. Unless stated otherwise, the analysis herein focuses primarily on surveys received via the first two methods.

The primary list source used for the mailing was a third party list purchased from Melissa Data Corp., a leading provider of data quality solutions with emphasis on U.S., Canadian, and international address and phone verification and postal software. Use of the Melissa Data list also includes renters in the sample who are frequently missed in other list sources such as utility billing lists.

A total of 12,000 surveys were mailed to a random sample of Charleston County residents in August 2012, with approximately 11,400 being delivered after subtracting undeliverable mail. To help encourage and boost response, pre-notification postcards alerting residents to the coming survey were also sent to the 12,000 included in the randomly selected sample of households. The final sample size for this statistically valid survey was 821, resulting in a margin of error of approximately +/- 3.4 percentage points calculated for questions at 50% response¹. Results from the open link survey generated an additional 2,201 responses.

The underlying data for the random sample responses were weighted by age, ethnicity, and by geographic sub-county planning area to ensure appropriate representation of Charleston County residents across different demographic cohorts in the sample. Based on current 2011 ESRI data for Charleston County, the age, race and ethnicity profile of residents is distributed as follows: Under 35 (33 percent), Age 35 - 44 (16 percent), Age 45 - 54 (18 percent), Age 55 - 64 (16 percent), Age 65 - 74 (9 percent), 75 and older (7 percent); Race: White (64 percent), African American (30 percent), Asian (1 percent), Other (5 percent); and Ethnicity: Hispanic Ethnicity (5 percent). By geographic sub-county area, Charleston Center represents approximately 36 percent of households, North County 34 percent, East County 21 percent, and West County 9 percent. These proportions were the basis for weighting of the survey data so that the resulting analysis reflects the conclusions and opinions of the underlying population.

¹ For the total sample size of 821, margin of error is +/- 3.4 percent calculated for questions at 50% response (if the response for a particular question is “50%”—the standard way to generalize margin of error is to state the larger margin, which occurs for responses at 50%). Note that the margin of error is different for every single question response on the survey depending on the resultant sample sizes, proportion of responses, and number of answer categories for each question. Comparison of differences in the data between various segments, therefore, should take into consideration these factors. As a general comment, it is sometimes more appropriate to focus attention on the general trends and patterns in the data rather than on the individual percentages.
As responses to the open-link version of the questionnaire are “self-selected” and not a part of the randomly selected sample of residents, results from the open-link questionnaire are kept separate from the mail and invitation web versions of the survey for the overall analysis. The majority of the discussion that follows focuses primarily on results from the randomly selected sample of residents. However, the summary and analysis of responses at the sub-county level, included in some analyses of the report, combines the open-link responses with the randomly selected responses in order to increase sample sizes and informational content at this level of analysis.
RESPONDENT PROFILE

Household Characteristics

- The majority of respondents (56%) have an annual household income between $25,000 and $74,999
- 25 percent of households earn annual incomes of $100,000 or greater
- 11 percent earn between $75,000 and $99,999
- 9 percent earn $24,999 or less
- 80 percent of respondents own their home; 15 percent rent.
- Almost 50 percent of the respondents are in households with children living at home
- 22 percent are in households with children no longer at home (empty nesters)
- 29 percent are in households with no children at all
- Average number of people per household for the county overall: 2.8
- The Center sub-county area holds the least number of people per household at 2.6, being in character by a greater proportion of couples and singles without kids
- North Area and East County has the highest number per household at 2.9 each, characterized by a greater proportion of families

![Figure 1: Household Characteristics](image-url)
Age, Gender, and Student Status

- Average age of respondents was 47.2 years
- Center and North Area has a younger population in general than East and West County
- 69 percent of respondents were female; 31 percent were male
- 10 percent of respondents were students

**Figure 2**

**Respondent Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 34</td>
<td>County Overall: 47.2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center: 47.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Area: 47.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East County: 50.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West County: 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or older</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

- Male: 31%
- Female: 69%

**Student?**

- Yes: 10%
- No: 90%

Race/Ethnicity

- 5 percent of respondents were of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin
- 64 percent identified themselves as White; 30 percent Black or African American; 1 percent Asian, Asian Indian, or Pacific Islander and 5 percent as Other, mixed race or more than one race.

**Figure 3**

**Race, Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>County Overall: 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian Indian, or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>County Overall: 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I am not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I am of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT FUNCTIONS: VALUES AND VISION

By rating a 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale where 5 means “very important” ninety four percent of residents overall indicated that the “Operation and maintenance of existing park facilities” in the county was the most important aspect of current CCPRC functions. This function had an average rating of 4.7. Other highly important CCPRC functions include “Promote healthy, active lifestyles” (4.5 average rating; 89% rating a 4 or 5); “Acquire, manage and protect open space” (4.5 average rating; 89% rating a 4 or 5); “Manage, protect historically or culturally significant areas” (4.5 average rating; 88% rating a 4 or 5); “Provide recreation programs and services for all age groups” (4.4 average rating; 86% rating a 4 or 5); “Connect people with nature” (4.4 average rating; 85% rating a 4 or 5); and “Provide water access facilities” (4.3 average rating; 84% rating a 4 or 5).

**Figure 4**

*Current Functions – Importance to Household - Percentage Very Important vs. Not at all Important*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percentage Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operate and maintain existing park facilities</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote healthy active lifestyles</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage and protect historically or culturally significant areas</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire, manage and protect open space</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide recreation programs and services for all age groups</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect people with nature</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide water access facilities (beach, boat, etc)</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with local non-profits to serve special needs populations</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide environmental or natural history programs</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a county-wide trail system</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities for sports and special events</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide passive nature parks with passive recreation opportunities</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide large regional park facilities</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide cultural arts programs</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct major special events</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very important (4-5) | Not at all important (1-2)
Figure 5

Charleston County Parks & Recreation - Level of Importance per Function – Average Rating

- Operate and maintain existing park facilities
- Acquire, manage and protect open space
- Promote healthy active lifestyles
- Manage and protect historically or culturally significant areas
- Connect people with nature
- Provide recreation programs and services for all age groups
- Provide water access facilities (beach, boat, etc.)
- Partner with local non-profits to serve special needs populations
- Provide a county-wide trail system
- Provide environmental or natural history programs
- Provide passive nature parks with passive recreation opportunities
- Provide facilities for sports and special events
- Provide large regional park facilities
- Conduct major special events
- Provide cultural arts programs

Average Rating

3 3.2 3.4 3.6 3.8 4 4.2 4.4 4.6 4.8 5

- County Overall/ Random Sample
- Center
- North Area
- East County
- West County
Open Ended Comments - Functions

Respondents were given the opportunity to state/comment on other CCPRC functions that are important to provide. Though comments varied considerably, some major themes were present. Many respondents advocated for better fiscal management and discounts for certain populations, an increase in dog parks/dog off-leash areas, connectivity and development of hiking/biking trails, more beach access and natural resource/green space protection.

The programs commonly mentioned as important to develop included aquatic programs for youth and senior citizens, outdoor recreation and adventure programming for youths, and more music/dance/art programs.

There also were frequent and passionately written comments regarding fiscal and social responsibility. Managing resources, both financial and natural, was very important to respondents.

Example Comments:
- Dog parks
- Dog parks with little dog areas
- Areas to accommodate dogs off leash
- Dog-friendly park
- Reduce cost to use parks for seniors
- Develop revenue-generating components to support the above
- Offer discounts to less fortunate
- The above programs should be free to the public.
- When building new parks, save as much green space and trees as possible.
- Provide bike and run/walk trails
- Bicycle trails around Charleston County
- Running trails (unpaved)
- Trails and bicycle paths
- Trail system would be huge
- More beach access at Folly Beach and Kiawah Beach
- Reopen Folly Beach Park! With showers and food. I would pay an additional fee over and above my annual membership to use this park.
- Open beach earlier 7:00 AM till dark
CURRENT FACILITIES, AMENITIES AND SERVICES

Usage Frequency
Residents of Charleston County used “Beach access” and “Trails” most frequently over the past year (at least 9 times over the past 12 months).

The following facilities were used most frequently over the past year by residents of Charleston County:

- Beach access (9.8 times on average over the previous 12 months, with 59% of the county overall visiting at least once per year)
- Trails (9.5 times with 52% visiting)
- Children’s playgrounds (8.3 times with 52% visiting)
- Picnic area (3 times with 55% visiting)

Second tier of usage:
- Spray play splash pool (3.2 times with 28% visiting)
- Dog off-leash areas (5.5 times with 19% visiting)
- Boat access at boat launches (5 times with 24% visiting)
- Fishing piers (4.8 times with 31% visiting)
- Water parks (3.5 times with 48% visiting)

Figure 6
Current Facilities - Frequency of Use of Past 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Average Number of Times Used in the Last 12 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach access</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s playgrounds</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog off-leash areas</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat access at boat landings</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water parks</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray play splash pool</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing docks at parks</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use fields</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/kayak/SUP access</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge course</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian center</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting space rental</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter rental</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing wall</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Overall/Random Sample
Figure 7

Percent of Population Who Used a Facility at Least Once Within the Past 12 Months

- Beach access: 59%
- Picnic areas: 55%
- Trails: 52%
- Children's playgrounds: 52%
- Water parks: 48%
- Fishing piers: 31%
- Spray play splash pool: 28%
- Multi-use fields: 24%
- Boat access at boat landings: 24%
- Fishing docks at parks: 19%
- Dog off-leash areas: 19%
- Marina: 16%
- Nature center: 13%
- Canoe/kayak/SUP access: 13%
- Shelter rental: 11%
- Meeting space rental: 9%
- Climbing wall: 9%
- Campground: 9%
- Challenge course: 5%
- Equestrian center: 5%
- Disc golf: 4%

County Overall/Random Sample
Importance of Current Parks & Recreation Facilities

Respondents were asked to indicate how important each of the current facilities owned and/or operated by CCPRC are to their household.

The following were the most frequently rated important facilities:

- Beach access (81 percent of respondents rated this a 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale or “very important”)
- Children’s playgrounds (76 percent)
- Trails (70 percent)
- Water parks (70 percent)
- Picnic areas (68 percent)

Second tier of important facilities include:

- Spray play splash pool (61 percent)
- Fishing piers (58 percent)
- Boat access at boat landings (56 percent)
- Fishing docks at parks (54 percent)
Figure 8
Current Facilities – Importance to Household - Percentage Very Important vs. Not at all Important

- Beach access: 81% Very important, 10% Not at all important
- Children’s playgrounds: 76% Very important, 11% Not at all important
- Trails: 70% Very important, 11% Not at all important
- Water parks: 70% Very important, 13% Not at all important
- Picnic areas: 68% Very important, 7% Not at all important
- Spray play splash pool: 61% Very important, 18% Not at all important
- Fishing piers: 58% Very important, 18% Not at all important
- Boat access at boat landings: 56% Very important, 25% Not at all important
- Fishing docks at parks: 54% Very important, 20% Not at all important
- Multi-use fields: 50% Very important, 22% Not at all important
- Nature center: 49% Very important, 21% Not at all important
- Canoe/kayak/SUP access: 48% Very important, 23% Not at all important
- Campground: 47% Very important, 25% Not at all important
- Dog off-leash areas: 47% Very important, 33% Not at all important
- Marina: 46% Very important, 28% Not at all important
- Shelter rental: 45% Very important, 28% Not at all important
- Meeting space rental: 34% Very important, 29% Not at all important
- Challenge course: 31% Very important, 30% Not at all important
- Climbing wall: 33% Very important, 28% Not at all important
- Equestrian center: 43% Very important, 26% Not at all important
- Disc golf: 42% Very important, 25% Not at all important
Figure 9

Current Facilities – Importance to Household - Average Rating of Random Sample vs. Open Link Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>RANDOM SAMPLE</th>
<th>OPEN LINK WEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach access</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's playgrounds</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water parks</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray play splash pool</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat access at boat landings</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing docks at parks</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use fields</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/kayak/SUP access</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog off-leash areas</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter rental</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting space rental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing wall</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge course</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian center</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degree to which Current Facilities are Meeting Household Needs

Respondents were then asked to rate the same list of current facilities according to how well they are meeting the needs of their household.

Facilities with the highest degree of needs being met include:

- Children's playgrounds (82% rated this a 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale where 5 means “completely met”; with an average rating of 4.2)
- Water parks (76%; average rating of 4.0)
- Picnic areas (74%; average rating of 4.0)
- Beach access (72%; average rating of 4.0)
- Spray play splash pool (71%; average rating of 3.9)

For most facilities, the proportion of the community that indicated their needs were being met was larger than the proportion whose needs were not being met. The same facilities that were least important also received the lowest ratings for the degree to which household needs are being met.

Facilities with the lowest degree of needs being met include:

- Disc Golf (45% rated this a 1 or 2 on a 5 point scale or “Not at all meeting needs”; with an average rating of 2.8)
- Equestrian center (39%; average rating of 3.0)
- Dog off-leash areas (37%; average rating of 3.1)
- Challenge course (34%; average rating of 3.0)
- Climbing wall (34%; average rating of 3.1)
Figure 10

Current Facilities – Degree to Which Needs are Being Met – Percentage Completely Meets Needs vs. Not at all Meets Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Percentage Completely Meets Needs</th>
<th>Percentage Not at all Meets Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's playgrounds</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water parks</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach access</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray play splash pool</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing docks at parks</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter rental</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat access at boat landings</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use fields</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/kayak/SUP access</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting space rental</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog off-leash areas</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian center</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing wall</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge course</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Responding

- Completely meeting needs
- Not at all meeting needs
Figure 11
Current Facilities – Degree to Which Needs are Being Met - Average Ratings of Random Sample vs. Open Link Survey
Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix – Current Facilities

It is instructive to compare and plot the importance scores against the needs met scores in an “importance vs. needs-met” matrix. As illustrated below, performance scores are displayed in matrices using the mid-point rating of both questions to divide the quadrants (ex. for the Overall County of the Random Sample results, importance scale midpoint was 3.4; needs-met midpoint was, coincidentally, also 3.4). This allows us to determine a detailed positioning of each location in comparison to each other.

Many of the top facilities listed previously as meeting household needs are also considered the most important. Maintaining these important assets is an indispensable CCPRC function. The following are facilities that are highly important and meet the household needs of the County.

- Beach access
- Children’s playgrounds
- Trails
- Picnic areas
- Water parks
- Spray play Splash pool
- Fishing piers

Facilities located to the left of the needs-met midpoint and relatively closer to the importance midpoint or even above, indicate facilities with the potential for making improvements of relatively high importance and that could have a strong impact on the degree to which needs are being met. These include:

- Boat access at boat landings
- Multi-use fields
- Nature center
- Fishing docks at parks
- Canoe/Kayak/SUP access
- Campground
- Dog off-leash areas
- Marina

Further below the importance midpoint and left of the needs-met midpoint, are facilities not meeting needs well, however, they are important to fewer members of the community. These “niche facilities” may receive a small but passionate following; therefore, there is merit to measuring participation and planning for potential future enhancements accordingly.

- Disc golf
- Equestrian center
- Challenge course
- Climbing wall
- Meeting space rental
- Shelter rental
Figure 12

Current Facilities – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Random Sample Overall
Figure 13
Current Facilities – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Open Link
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CURRENT FACILITIES TO EXPAND OR IMPROVE

Top Priorities for Facilities to be Expanded or Improved
Respondents were then asked to rank their most, second most, and third most important facilities for expansion or improvement in Charleston County. Some facilities stood out as being very important to members of the community while others were clearly not important to as many respondents.

The facilities mentioned the most as one of the combined top three most important to be expanded or improved:
- Beach access (47% of respondents ranked “Beach access” as one of the three most important facilities to be expanded or improved)
- Trails (40%)
- Children’s playgrounds (35%)
- Water parks (30%)
- Picnic areas (29%)

Second tier of top priorities:
- Dog off-leash areas (17%)
- Boat access (15%)
- Fishing piers (14%)
- Spray play splash pool (13%)
Figure 14

Most Important Facilities to Be Expanded or Improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>Second most important</th>
<th>Third most important</th>
<th>Combined Top 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach access</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's playgrounds</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water parks</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog off-leash areas</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat access</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray play splash pool</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/kayak/SUP access</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use fields</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing docks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter rental</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge course</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting space rental</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing wall</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian center</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-County Analysis for Improvements and Expansions of Facilities

When comparing the responses by sub-county, Center sub-county residents indicated a greater importance than other sub-county areas for a number of facilities including “Beach access”, “Trails”, “Dog off-leash areas”, “Disc golf” and “Nature center”.

North Area residents ranked “Children’s playgrounds”, “Water parks”, “Shelter rental”, “Spray play splash pool” and “Picnic areas” much higher than the other sub-county areas.

East County showed greater importance towards “Trails”, “Boat access”, “Fishing piers”, “Canoe/kayak/SUP access” and “Multi-use fields”.

Despite a lower priority overall for the “Equestrian center”, it was much more favored within West County than in any other sub-county area. West County also showed a greater priority for “Boat access”, “Dog off-leash areas”, “Canoe/kayak/SUP access”, and “Campgrounds”.
Figure 15

*Three Most Important Facilities to be Expanded or Improved - By Sub-County Area*

- Beach access
- Trails
- Children's playgrounds
- Water parks
- Picnic areas
- Dog off-leash areas
- Boat access
- Fishing piers
- Spray play splash pool
- Canoe/kayak/SUP access
- Multi-use fields
- Nature center
- Fishing docks
- Shelter rental
- Campground
- Marina
- Meeting space rental
- Challenge course
- Disc golf
- Climbing wall
- Equestrian center

Percent Responding:
- Center
- North Area
- East County
- West County
PROGRAMS, ACTIVITIES, AND SPECIAL EVENTS

Usage Frequency
Charleston County residents attended the “Holiday Festival of Lights” and other festivals such as “Cajun,” “Latin American,” etc. more than any other program or event. The following programs and events were used most frequently over the past year by residents of Charleston County:

- Holiday Festival of Lights (1.7 times on average over the past 12 months with 61% of the county overall attending at least once per year)
- Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.) (0.9 times at 30% attending)
- Evening concerts (0.6 times at 25% attending)
- Youth programs (0.7 times at 15% attending)
- Self-guided interpretive tours (0.5 times at 15% attending)

Second tier of usage:
- Summer, winter/spring break camps (0.6 times at 13% attending)
- Historical/Cultural programs (0.4 times at 11% attending)

---

**Figure 16**
*Current Programs and Events - Frequency of Use*

Average Number of Times Used in the Last 12 Months

- Holiday Festival of Lights: 1.7
- Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.): 0.9
- Youth programs: 0.7
- Evening concerts: 0.6
- Kaleidoscope after school: 0.6
- Challenge course: 0.6
- Self-guided interpretive tours: 0.5
- Historical/Cultural programs: 0.4
- Dances on the pier: 0.3
- Environmental education: 0.3
- Triathlon, 5K, 10K races: 0.3
- Pet events: 0.3
- Special needs/Adaptive: 0.2
- Fishing tournaments: 0.1
- Paddling programs: 0.1
- Community education classes: 0.1
- Equestrian events: 0.1
- Climbing programs: 0.0
Figure 17

Percent of Population Who Used a Program at Least Once - Random Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percentage Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Festival of Lights</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening concerts</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth programs</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided interpretive tours</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, winter/spring break camps</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Cultural programs</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dances on the pier</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental education programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleidoscope after school programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon, 5K, 10K races</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet events</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education classes</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge course</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing tournaments</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs/Adaptive recreation programs</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing programs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling programs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian events</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of Current Parks & Recreation Programs

Respondents were asked to indicate how important each of the current recreation programs and events operated by Charleston County Parks & Recreation are to their households.

The following were the most frequently rated very important programs:
- Climbing programs (79% of respondents rated this a 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale or “very important”), although only 2% of the total population have used climbing programs (see Figure 17 above)
- Holiday Festival of Lights (59%)
- Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.) (58%)
- Summer, winter/spring break camps (54%)
- Youth programs (52%)

The following programs and events received the highest proportion of “Not at all important” ratings or indicated the least important to the community:
- Pet events (52% rated this a 1 or 2 on a 5 point scale or “not at all important”)
- Community education classes (43%)
- Triathlon, 5K, 10K races (40%)
- Paddling programs (38%)
Figure 18
Current Programs – Importance to Household - Percentage Very Important vs. Not at all Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Very Important (4 or 5)</th>
<th>Not at all Important (1 or 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climbing programs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Festival of Lights</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, winter/spring break camps</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Cultural programs</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing tournaments</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening concerts</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided interpretive tours</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge course</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dances on the pier</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental education programs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleidoscope after school programs</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs/ Adaptive rec. programs</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian events</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling programs</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon, 5K, 10K races</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education classes</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet events</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degree to which Programs are Meeting Household Needs
As with the facilities, respondents were then asked to rate the same list of programs according to how well they are meeting household needs.

Programs with the highest degree of needs being met include:
  • Holiday Festival of Lights (87% rated this a 4 or 5 or on a 5 point scale or “Needs completely met”)
  • Youth programs (66 percent)
  • Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.) (63%)
  • Environmental education programs (61%)

For most programs and facilities, the proportion of the community that indicated their needs were being met was larger than the proportion whose needs were not being met. However there were several programs in which more respondents indicated their needs were “Not at all being met” (1 or 2 on a 5 point scale). Reflective of the small but passionate following, these programs include:
  • Equestrian events (51% rated this a 1 or 2 or on a 5 point scale or “Needs not at all being met”)
  • Paddling programs (47%)
  • Climbing programs (44%)
  • Challenge course (43%)
Figure 19
*Current Programs – Degree to Which Needs are Being Met - Percentage Needs Completely Met vs. Needs Not at all Met*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Needs completely met (4 or 5)</th>
<th>Needs not at all met (1 or 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Festival of Lights</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth programs</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental education programs</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Cultural programs</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleidoscope after school programs</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening concerts</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dances on the pier</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs/ Adaptive rec. programs</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, winter/spring break camps</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet events</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon, 5K, 10K races</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education classes</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided interpretive tours</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing tournaments</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing programs</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian events</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge course</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding

![Graph showing the percentage of needs completely met (4 or 5) and needs not at all met (1 or 2) for various programs.](image-url)
Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix – Current Programs/Events

As with facilities, it is informative to plot and compare the program/event scores for importance and needs being met using “importance vs. needs-met” matrices. In Figure 20, performance scores are displayed in a matrix using the ratings mid-point for both questions to divide the quadrants (ex. for the Random Sample results, the importance scale midpoint was 3.1; needs-met midpoint was 3.3). A positioning of each location in comparison to each other is detailed.

Many of the top programs listed previously as meeting household needs are also considered the most important. The following are programs that are highly important and meet the household needs of the County.

- Holiday Festival of Lights
- Youth programs
- Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.)
- Environmental education programs
- Historical and cultural programs
- Evening concerts
- Special needs/Adaptive rec. programs
- Dances on the pier

Programs located left of the needs-met midpoint and relatively closer to the importance midpoint or above, indicate programs with relatively high importance that could be improved. Improving these programs would have a strong impact on the degree to which needs are being met. These programs include:

- Community education classes
- Self guided interpretive tours
- Triathlon, 5K, 10K races
- Summer, winter/spring break camps
- Pet events
- Paddling programs

Further below the importance midpoint and left of the needs-met midpoint, are programs not meeting needs well, however, they are important to fewer members of the community. These “niche programs” may receive a small but passionate following; therefore, there is merit to measuring participation and planning for potential future enhancements accordingly.

- Fishing tournaments
- Challenge course
- Climbing walls
- Equestrian events
Figure 20
Current Programs – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Random Sample Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of each facility to your household (average rating)</th>
<th>How well needs are currently being met (average rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Importance/ Lower level of needs being met</td>
<td>Higher Importance/ Higher level of needs being met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education Classes</td>
<td>Holiday Festival of Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Guided Interpretive Tours</td>
<td>Environmental Ed Class &amp; Historical/ Cultural Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon, 5K, 10k Races &amp; Summer, Winter/Spring Break Camps</td>
<td>Youth Programs &amp; Festivals (Cajun, Latin America, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling Prog.</td>
<td>Special Needs/ Adaptive Rec. Prog. &amp; Dances on the Pier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Course</td>
<td>Kaleidoscope After School Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing Walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Tournaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Concerts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Tournaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDPOINT OF RATINGS SCORES (3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Importance/ Lower level of needs being met</td>
<td>Lower Importance/ Higher level of needs being met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 3 4 4.5 5

Importance of each facility to your household (average rating)
How well needs are currently being met (average rating)
Figure 21

*Current Programs – Importance vs. Needs-met Matrix - Open Link*

- **Higher Importance/Higher level of needs being met**
- **Higher Importance/Lower level of needs being met**
- **Lower Importance/Lower level of needs being met**
- **Lower Importance/Higher level of needs being met**

Importance of each facility to your household (average rating)

How well needs are currently being met (average rating)

- **Midpoint of ratings scores (3.1)**
- **Midpoint of ratings scores (3.3)**

Facilities:
- Kaleidoscope After School
- Special Needs/Adaptive Rec.
- Dances on the Pier
- Pet Events
- Environmental Edu.
- Equestrian Activities
- Festivals
- Fishing Tournaments
- Self-Guided Interpretive Tours
- Other
- Youth Prog.
- Triathlon/5K/10K
- Historical/Cultural
- Community Edu.
- Evening Concerts
- Other
- Paddling Prog.
- Other
CURRENT PROGRAMS TO EXPAND OR IMPROVE

Top Priorities for Programs to be Expanded or Improved

Respondents were asked to rank their most, second most, and third most important programs for future expansion or improvement in Charleston County. Some programs stood out as being very important to members of the community while others were not as important to respondents.

The program(s) mentioned the most as one of the combined 3 most important to be added, expanded or improved:

- Holiday Festival of Lights (57% of respondents ranked “Holiday Festival of Lights” as one of the three most important programs to be added, expanded or improved)

Second tier of top priorities:

- Festivals (Cajun, Latin American etc.) (32%)
- Evening concerts (29%)
- Youth programs (22%)
Figure 22
Most Important Programs to be Added, Expanded, or Improved

![Bar chart showing the most important programs with respective percentages for each category.]

- Holiday Festival of Lights: 36% (Most important), 10% (Second most important), 11% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 57%
- Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.): 6% (Most important), 16% (Second most important), 10% (Third most important)
- Evening concerts: 9% (Most important), 9% (Second most important), 11% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 29%
- Youth programs: 9% (Most important), 9% (Second most important), 4% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 22%
- Kaleidoscope after school programs: 5% (Most important), 6% (Second most important), 4% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 15%
- Historical/Cultural programs: 3% (Most important), 6% (Second most important), 6% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 15%
- Summer, winter/spring break camps: 7% (Most important), 3% (Second most important), 4% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 14%
- Environmental education programs: 4% (Most important), 5% (Second most important), 5% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 14%
- Pet events: 3% (Most important), 4% (Second most important), 6% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 13%
- Community education classes: 6% (Most important), 4% (Second most important), Combined Top 3 12%
- Triathlon, 5K, 10K races: 3% (Most important), 5% (Second most important), 3% (Third most important), Combined Top 3 11%
- Challenge course: 3% (Most important), 4% (Second most important), Combined Top 3 8%
- Self-guided interpretive tours: 2% (Most important), 4% (Second most important), Combined Top 3 8%
- Special needs/Adaptive recreation programs: 5% (Most important), 5% (Second most important), Combined Top 3 8%
- Dances on the Pier: 4% (Most important), 3% (Second most important), Combined Top 3 8%
- Fishing tournaments: 3% (Most important), 6% (Second most important)
- Paddling programs: 4% (Most important)
- Climbing programs: 4% (Most important)
- Equestrian events: 2% (Most important)
Sub-County Analysis for Improvements and Expansion of Programs

Analyzing specifically by location, some programs were ranked higher for improvement and expansion more often. For example, the Center sub-county area rated “Historical/Cultural programs” as more important than any other sub-county area.

The North Area ranked improvements to “Youth programs”, “Dances on the Pier” and “Kaleidoscope after school programs” higher than the other sub-county areas.

Corresponding to the “Equestrian center” facility improvements, West County also favored improvements to “Equestrian programs” more than other sub-county areas. West County also differed by being more in favor of improving “Environmental education programs”, “Self-guided interpretive tours” and “Climbing programs”.

East County rated improvements to “Pet events”, “Challenge course” and “Summer, winter/spring break camps” more than Center, North Area or West County.
**Figure 23**

*Three Most Important Programs to be Added, Expanded, or Improved - By Sub-County Area*

- Holiday Festival of Lights: 53% Center, 56% North Area, 60% East County, 71% West County
- Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.): 28% Center, 31% North Area, 26% East County, 22% West County
- Evening concerts: 18% Center, 19% North Area, 18% East County, 13% West County
- Youth programs: 15% Center, 18% North Area, 27% East County, 12% West County
- Historical/Cultural programs: 12% Center, 18% North Area, 18% East County, 17% West County
- Kaleidoscope after school programs: 16% Center, 14% North Area, 17% East County, 16% West County
- Environmental education programs: 12% Center, 15% North Area, 12% East County, 17% West County
- Pet events: 13% Center, 14% North Area, 13% East County, 19% West County
- Summer, winter/spring break camps: 7% Center, 11% North Area, 12% East County, 14% West County
- Triathlon, 5K, 10K races: 7% Center, 12% North Area, 13% East County, 14% West County
- Community education classes: 12% Center, 10% North Area, 12% East County, 9% West County
- Self-guided interpretive tours: 9% Center, 12% North Area, 9% East County, 17% West County
- Challenge course: 8% Center, 9% North Area, 9% East County, 13% West County
- Dances on the Pier: 6% Center, 12% North Area, 10% East County, 12% West County
- Special needs/Adaptive recreation programs: 5% Center, 6% North Area, 6% East County, 8% West County
- Fishing tournaments: 4% Center, 6% North Area, 7% East County, 5% West County
- Paddling programs: 3% Center, 7% North Area, 6% East County, 6% West County
- Climbing programs: 5% Center, 3% North Area, 4% East County, 6% West County
- Equestrian events: 2% Center, 3% North Area, 6% East County, 3% West County
Open Ended Comments: Programs/Facility Improvements

Using question #7 on the survey, respondents were then given the opportunity to illustrate what they feel CCPRC can improve upon regarding programs and facilities. With the variety of ideas respondents had concerning improvements to their top three most important programs and facilities several themes were repeated.

Lots of people were unaware of many CCPRC programs and requested better publicity and advertising. Other common themes within the comments included improving/adding to festivals and concerts; better parking/traffic management; more youth programs; and improvement to trails and trail/path system.

Example Comments:

- I would like to see more advertising. I'm often unaware of events I would like to attend.
- More advertisement
- Did not know about races, more communication
- Better advertising - cheaper access for county residents
- I was not aware such programs existed in most instances.
- Your youth programs do not meet my children's needs. I have very capable children who look for more demanding activities.
- Need to focus programs as much as possible on children
- Need summer camps for kids w/serious health conditions (cancer, diabetes), need equestrian center east of Cooper
- More bike paths on James Island
- Need more kayak boat launches on Johns Island; need long bike trails through the city/county that you can actually get from one place to another, not just ride in a circle.
- Bigger, better concerts and more variety of music
- More concerts, ex: live music at Joe Riley Stadium
- Make sure festivals don't fall on the same weekend as others in the area
- Traffic congestion - bus people in for festivals from remote locations
- More parking
FUTURE FACILITIES, AMENITIES, AND SERVICES

Respondents were given the following background information: CCPRC funds parks, recreation, and trail operations and maintenance with user fees and property tax dollars. As you answer the following questions, please keep in mind that additional funds would be required to acquire, build, operate, and maintain new parks, recreation, natural areas and trails.

Based on this information, respondents indicated “Develop new walking/biking trails and greenways” (73%), “Improve or expand existing park facilities” (72%), “Develop new parks on recently acquired land” (71%), “improve maintenance at existing parks” (64%), and Purchase and preserve historic sites” (63%) as the most important needs over the next 5 – 10 years. “Purchase land for trails and open space” (59%), “Provide more recreation programs” (56%), and “Purchase land for beach and boat access” (55%) were considered very important despite being ranked slightly lower overall.

Figure 24
Future Facilities, Amenities and Services Most Important Over Next 5 – 10 Years – Very Important vs. Not at all Important
Asked about specific programs and facilities that are currently not being provided, respondents indicated they would desire in the future more “Water access” (67%), “Nature areas/preserves” (66%), “Greenways/trails system” (63%), “Outdoor concerts/festival venue (amphitheatre or open space)” (61%), “Day use park facilities” (61%), “Water safety programs” (60%), and “Water trails system” (58%) as the most important needs to Charleston County households.

**Figure 25**

*Specific Programs or Facilities Desired for the Future – Very Important vs. Not at all Important*
Top Priorities for Programs or Facilities Not Currently Being Provided to be Added

Respondents were asked to rank their most, second most, and third most important programs or facilities for future additions, expansions, or improvements in Charleston County. Respondents indicated several programs/facilities as much more important than others.

The program(s)/facility(s) mentioned the most as one of the combined three most important to be added, expanded or improved:

- Greenways/trail system (37% of respondents ranked “Greenways/trail system” as the top three most important program to be added, expanded or improved)

Second tier of top priorities:

- Water access (29%)
- Outdoor Concert/festival venue (amphitheater or open space) (29%)
- Nature areas/preserves (25%)

Third tier of top priorities:

- Water trails system (23%)
- Overnight accommodations (campgrounds/cabins) (22%)
- Multi-sport complex (21%)
- Day use park facilities (20%)
**Figure 26**

*Most Important/Highest Priority of Programs or Facilities Desired for the Future*

- **Greenways/trail system**: 37% Most Important, 11% Second Most Important, 8% Third Most Important
- **Water access**: 29% Most Important, 13% Second Most Important, 8% Third Most Important
- **Outdoor concert/festival venue (amphitheater or open space)**: 29% Most Important, 13% Second Most Important, 11% Third Most Important
- **Nature areas/preserves**: 25% Most Important, 10% Second Most Important, 7% Third Most Important
- **Water trails system**: 23% Most Important, 11% Second Most Important, 8% Third Most Important
- **Overnight accommodations (campground/ cabins)**: 22% Most Important, 10% Second Most Important, 6% Third Most Important
- **Multi-sport complex**: 21% Most Important, 7% Second Most Important, 5% Third Most Important
- **Day use park facilities**: 20% Most Important, 7% Second Most Important, 6% Third Most Important
- **Water safety programs**: 15% Most Important, 6% Second Most Important, 4% Third Most Important
- **New festivals**: 13% Most Important, 4% Second Most Important, 4% Third Most Important
- **Adventure sports (climbing wall, zip line)**: 13% Most Important, 4% Second Most Important, 4% Third Most Important
- **Un-programmed fields, courts and open turf**: 11% Most Important, 4% Second Most Important, 4% Third Most Important
- **Hunter safety programs & facilities (archery, skeet, etc.)**: 8% Most Important, 4% Second Most Important
- **New nature programs**: 8% Most Important, 4% Second Most Important
- **Agriculture-based programs and facilities**: 6% Most Important, 4% Second Most Important
- **New community enrichment programs**: 5% Most Important, 4% Second Most Important
- **New cultural and history programs**: 6% Most Important, 3% Second Most Important
Open Ended Comments - Future Facilities, Amenities and Services
Respondents were given the opportunity to describe and comment on what they feel CCPRC needs to do over the next 5 – 10 years to meet their household’s needs for both facilities and programs. The most frequent themes referred to building/improving facilities and services for the senior community and providing more access to beaches. Other common themes included being more fiscally responsible and improving/expanding bicycle/trail infrastructure and system.

Example Comments for “Other” Category:
- Senior center in West Ashley
- Retired - more activities for senior citizens
- Senior center
- More activities for senior citizens!
- Low impact activities for seniors
- Add John Island Park with water access or water park
- Just swimming only area
- Folly Beach needs park rework!
- Open Folly Beach Park - more parking at Kiawah Beach
- Be reasonable stewards of my tax money
- Maintain what you have
- Provide trails with minimal impact on the land
- Run-walk-bike paths
- Bike paths that are safe along roads, connecting to parks
Respondents were also able to write in additional information in regards to the importance of specific programs and facilities not currently being provided. Examples of responses are given below:

New nature programs, specifically...

New cultural and history programs, such as...

New community enrichment classes, specifically...

New Festivals, such as...

Other (please specify):
- Senior programs - More nature programs, native Indian - Need swimming pool other than MLK - Beach programs, Indian culture, gospel festival - Raptor center, food fests/BBQ challenge, mini golf, batting cages, bike safety classes, Marsh/sea life, dance, food truck festival - Butterfly garden, jazz festival - Festivals for seniors - Butterfly park - Disabled/elderly - can't be out in the heat, more indoor choices - Outdoor art classes, outdoor yoga - Natatorium - Aquatic center - Boat access of west side of Cooper River in N. Chas. - Handicap access - Beach open year-round, 7 AM till dark - Extended hours at Beach walker - Open Folly Beach Park - more parking at Kiawah Beach - More marinas - Bike paths - Bike paths - Community gardening space and programs - Equestrian center - Parking at Folly Pier enlarged - Off-leash beach access for dogs - Veggie gardens - Master gardeners.
IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED/REASONS FOR NOT USING CHARLESTON COUNTY RECREATION PROGRAMS OR FACILITIES

Respondents were then asked why they do not use Charleston County recreation programs or facilities and where they feel improvements can be made. Based on responses to this and other questions in the survey, opportunity exists for improving the awareness of programs with promotions and additional information.

The main reasons for not using programs and facilities were:
- Not aware of programs or facilities (67%)
- No time/other personal issues (61%)

Second tier of reasons for not using programs or facilities:
- Programs not offered at times I want (28%)
- Price/user fees (24%)
- Don’t have programs I want (21%)
- Hours of Operation (21%)

The greatest need for improvement was an awareness of programs and facilities while the price/user fees followed closely behind.

Figure 27
Charleston County Programs and Facilities - Improvements Needed/Reasons Do Not Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Needs improvement</th>
<th>Reason do not use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of programs or facilities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time/other personal issues</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs not offered at the times I want</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price/user fees</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have programs I want</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer other recreation</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities and amenities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition/maintenance or safety</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/class was full</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service/staff knowledge</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of personnel</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding

RRC Associates, Inc. 43
Open Ended Comments: Reason Do Not Use/Needs Improvements

Respondents were given the opportunity to write in additional information for the “reasons not use/needs improvement” question. Examples of responses are given below:

Don’t have the Programs I want, such as...
- Disc golf leagues - Art classes - Gardening/plant ID - Historical/cultural programs - Fitness classes - Horseback riding lessons - Line dancing - Senior oriented programs – Rowing.

Lack of facilities and amenities, such as...
- Bathrooms – Boathouse - Bike/hike trails - Camping facilities - Disc golf - Folly Beach - Mt Pleasant facilities - Dog parks - Aquatic/fitness center – Parking - Tennis courts - Wheel chair accessibility.

Programs not offered at the times I want (specify program/time you want):
- 5am to 9pm - After 5pm - After 6 pm - After work Nov-Feb - After work/weekends – Evenings – Early - Non-working hours - Saturday or Sunday - Year round.

Condition/maintenance or safety of facilities (specify):
- Bathrooms at water parks - Dog park - More benches - Folly Beach Park - Folly Beach County Park - Mosquitoes at Palmetto are a hindrance - Need more showers & restrooms at beach access - Trim trees - Playground Rd./A lot of trash - Dog park could be cleaner.

Accessibility, explain...
- Distance to parks - Not enough hours of operation - Earlier park opening for walking/running - Handicap access - I live pretty far from most facilities - need more in Mt. Pleasant - No large print/blind accessible – Parking - Open all days - Wheelchair access - More handicap spaces - Maybe a golf cart for use by handicapped (wheelchair).

Program/class was full (specify):
- Beg. kayak/sup - Argentine tango class - Kaleidoscope is often over full - Summer camps - Swimming class - Youth sports and summer camps - SUP-bad info – Geocaching.

Prefer other recreation providers/clubs (such as):

Other (please specify):
- Age – Handicapped - Cost prohibitive - Classes were cancelled - Children are grown - Better publicity - Distance from home - Don’t live close enough - Hours of operation are too short during the summer - Just moved to area - Just too busy to look and take what is being offered - Live too far away - No companionship - Can’t go alone - Not interested - Pool needs to open earlier - Restrictive hours: Caw Caw, Folly Beach (before storm damage at Folly) - The disc golf course is not worth traveling to James Island from Mt Pleasant to play - Trash everywhere - Work on weekends.
WILLINGNESS TO TRAVEL AND IMPORTANCE OF ACCESSIBILITY TO UNDEVELOPED PARKS

In response to how much time respondents are willing to spend traveling to a CCPRC park facility roughly ¼ stated they were willing to travel 15 minutes or less, ½ were willing to travel 30 minutes or less, and ¼ were willing to travel up to one hour.

The North Area sub-county residents reported (at 33 percent) the highest willingness to drive up to one hour, while Center sub-county residents were the least willing to drive up to one hour.

![Figure 28: Time Willing to Spend Traveling to a CCPRC Facility](image-url)
When asked of the importance to allow access to undeveloped park sites the highest proportion of respondents (47%) indicated access as very important (either 4 of 5 on a scale of 1 – 5 where 5 = Very Important); 40% were neutral. Only 14 percent indicated access as not important.

By far the most common activity or service requested at these sites was for access to “Trails and parking” (65%).

Second tier of importance for County Overall:
- Fields for events (31%)
- Volunteer opportunities (28%)
- Programs with CCPRC staff (19%)

The North Area reported a much higher percentage of importance in regards to “Programs with CCPRC staff” than the other sub-county areas.
GREENWAYS AND TRAILS

Respondents were asked to identify the aspects of Greenways and Trails that are most important to them. Most aspects were rated as very important (4 or 5) by ¾ or more of respondents, with very few respondents reporting not very important.

The following were rated “Very Important” (4 or 5) by the highest majority of households:

- Restroom availability and maintenance (83%)
- Trailheads (with parking, access to water, restrooms) (82%)
- Signage, maps, and wayfinding on trails (78%)
- Trail maintenance (surface repair, weeds) (76%)
- Loop trails within parks (for fitness walking/jogging) (76%)
- Preservation, protection & restoration of natural resources along greenway corridors (seating, water fountains, shade) (76%)
- Signage to greenways and trails (75%)

\[Figure 30\]

Most Important Aspects of Greenways and Trails to be Added – Very Important vs. Not at all Important

- Restroom availability and maintenance
- Trailheads (with parking, access to water, restrooms)
- Signage, maps, and wayfinding on trails
- Trail maintenance (surface repair, weeds)
- Loop trails within parks (for fitness walking/jogging)
- Preservation, protection & restoration of natural resources along greenway corridors (seating, water fountains, shade)
- Signage to greenways and trails
- Amenities along trails (seating, water fountains, shade)
- Trail linkages

Very Important (4 or 5) vs. Not at all Important (1 or 2)
Top Priorities for Greenway and Trail Improvement

Respondents were asked to rank their most, second most, and third most important aspects of Greenways and Trails to be provided in Charleston County.

The aspects of Greenways and Trails mentioned the most as one of the combined top three most important:

- Restroom availability and maintenance (51% of respondents ranked “Restroom availability and maintenance” as one of the 3 most important aspects of Greenways and Trails)
- Loop trails within parks (for fitness walking/jogging) (43%)
- Amenities along trails (seating, water fountains, shade) (38%)
- Trailheads (with parking, access to water, restrooms) (37%)
- Preservation/protection/restoration of natural resources (33%)
- Signage, maps, and way-finding on trails (33%)
- Trail maintenance (surface repair, weeds) (28%)

The facilities mentioned the least as one of the top three most important facilities to be provided:

- Signage to greenways and trails (18%)
- Trail linkages (11%)

Figure 31

Three Most Important Aspects of Greenways and Trails to be Added

- Restroom availability and maintenance: 51%
- Loop trails within parks (fitness walking/jogging): 43%
- Amenities along trails (seating, water fountains, shade): 38%
- Trailheads (parking, access to water, restrooms): 37%
- Preservation/protection/restoration of natural resources: 33%
- Signage, maps, and way-finding on trails: 33%
- Trail maintenance (surface repair, weeds): 28%
Sub-County Analysis of Aspects of Greenways and Trails

Several aspects of Greenways and Trails were shown to be more important in some locations than others. The North Area sub-county area had the most differences than the other sub-county areas. North Area reported “Amenities along the trail” and “Signage, maps, and way-finding on trails” more often to add than the other sub-county areas. The West County area reported a comparatively greater priority for “Trailheads (with parking, access to water, restrooms)”. 

*Figure 32*

*Three Most Important Aspects of Greenways and Trails to be Added - By Sub-County Area*
Open Ended Comments - Greenways and Trails
Respondents were asked to elaborate on trail linkages and other important aspects regarding Greenways and Trails. The most common linkages mentioned as important to pursue included downtown, West Ashley, existing trails and paths, and beaches/other parks.

Example Comments:
Trail Linkages to:
- W. Ashley/Ashley River
- Parks, beach, and downtown
- West Ashley
- James Island
- More trails
- Downtown Charleston
- Downtown
- Downtown, beaches
- Existing roads/bike paths
- North areas not pleasant
- Beaches, county parks
- One park to another

Other important aspects of Greenways and Trails referred to safety and exercise/fitness areas at parks and along trails.

Example Comments:
Other:
- Safety
- Safety along route and at parking
- Safety lighting and surveillance camera
- Viable alternatives to cars via biking, walking, etc.
- Increase security
- Periodic exercise areas
- Fitness stops along the way
- More trails
Many other important aspects of Greenways and Trails referred by respondents included trail linkages, safety, and maintenance. Although several respondents indicated that more trails should be paved for universal accessibility, even more indicated to keep trails unpaved and natural for hiking. Another theme worth noting was that many respondents did not know much information about greenways and trails and suggested better advertising/promotion.

**Example Comments:**

- Make them longer, rather than focus on paving and water. People can bring their own. Recycle and trash cans so people do not litter.
- Do not pave West Ashley Greenway!!!
- Do not pave trails
- No pavement or gravel. Keep them natural, no benches, restrooms, water, etc.
- I really felt they shouldn't have been paved. It was nice to have a "non-urban" path in an "urban."
- Greenways are best paved and provide alternative transportation into an area or place where people seem to go - like shopping, parks, library, school, etc.
- More paved trails - better maintenance/signage
- Greenways and trails need to be safe and accessible.
- Please make more trails available.
- Wish loops were longer vs. only 1.5-2 mi.; mileage indicators at a stop and start and midway through to help people pace themselves; more bathrooms at Palmetto Is. Park
- Improve traffic around parks. Increase bike trails. Have barriers between cars/bikes.
- Safety most important
- 1st that safety issues are given attention, increase lighting sources, include directed 911 alarm boxes throughout trails, provide 1st Aid Center at each facility
- It would help if they were linked together - West Ashley -> Downtown -> Mt. P
- Publicize where one can find out where they are located
- There should be signs along the path with pictures explaining what trees, flowers, shrubs I am looking at.
- I don't recall ever receiving any information regarding the facilities available or a calendar.
- Very hard to find trailheads w/map and directions. Didn’t know where to park, found it hard to locate off-road biking trails.
- It would really be great if greenways would connect to downtown, for example, find a way to connect the West Ashley Greenway to downtown.
- Paths that are disabled friendly.
- Ashley Greenway needs to be mowed more often. The grass is often knee-high - makes it hard to see snakes. I often do not use when the grass is so high.
- Maintenance
COMMUNICATION

Adequate Description of the Name “Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission”
By rating 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 – 5, where 5 is “Agree”, a majority of respondents (77%) reported that they feel “Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission” is a name that adequately describes their role within Charleston County. Only 3% of the county felt the name does not adequately reflect CCPRC’s role(s) within Charleston County. Twenty percent of respondents were neutral.

How Residents Currently Receive Information
Respondents were asked how they usually receive information on parks and recreation facilities, services and programs. Most of the respondents reported the following as to how they currently receive information.

- Word of mouth (48%)
- Internet/website (45%)
- Newspaper (40%)
- Mail (39%)
- Radio (38%)
- CCPRC Quarterly Calendar (31%)

Best Way to Reach Residents of Charleston County
After explaining there is a cost to communicating, respondents were asked how they may best be reached by CCPRC. Most of the respondents reported the following as the best method to be reached.

- E-mail (33%)
- Mail (19%)
- Internet/Website (14%)
Figure 34
How Residents Currently Receive Information and How Best to Reach Residents

Other Methods of Communication
Some respondents reported receiving information about parks and recreation facilities, services and programs through church and church events, employees, library, news programs and signage at park facilities.

Many residents indicated that signage at parks and through the library are the best methods of communicating information.
FINANCIAL CHOICES/FEES

Perception of Current Program and Facility Fees Charged
Respondents were asked how they would prefer to pay for County Parks admission fees. The preferred method among residents was “Pay per vehicle upon entrance (cyclists, pedestrians free)” (40 percent), followed by “Annual pass for entrance” (24 percent), and “Pay per person upon entrance” (22 percent).

Willingness to Increase Property Taxes
After explaining:

“Over the past 5 years, CCPRC has doubled the acreage in its park system, now totaling nearly 10,000 acres. As we dream about future improvements (keeping in mind that quality recreation facilities and programs cost money to provide and maintain), how much additional property tax would you be willing to pay annually to increase recreational opportunities in Charleston County?”

Base on this information most respondents (36%) stated they would be willing to increase property taxes by $1 to $10 annually, 28% were willing to pay an $11 to $20 annual increase, and 17% indicated more than a $20 increase to property taxes. Less than 20% of respondents indicated they would not be willing to increase property taxes.

Position on Bond Referendum
If a bond referendum was identified as a viable funding source for parkland expansion, 73% of respondents said they would support passing a vote for this option (31% “Definitely Support”; 42% “Probably Support”). Whereas 9% said they would not support passing a vote. Eighteen percent were neutral.
Figure 35
Preferred Payment Method for County Parks and Rec. Facilities, Amenities and Services

Preference on Paying Parks and Rec. Fees:

- Pay per vehicle upon entrance (cyclists/pedestrians free): 40%
- Annual pass for entrance: 24%
- Pay per person upon entrance: 22%
- None, would rather pay higher taxes so most parks are free: 10%
- Monthly pass for entrance: 2%
- None, don’t use or need parks: 2%

Amount Willing to Increase Property Taxes By:

- None: 19%
- $1 to $10: 36%
- $11 to $20: 28%
- More than $20: 17%

Position on Bond Referendum:

1=Definitely not support: 4%
2=Probably not support: 5%
3=Neutral: 18%
4=Probably support: 42%
5=Definitely support: 31%
SUGGESTIONS/OPEN ENDED COMMENTS

The survey provided respondents the opportunity to list any additional comments or suggestions regarding parks, recreation facilities, open space, trails, and programs provided in Charleston County. The resulting comments cover a wide variety of issues important to residents as well as a number of specific areas for potential improvements. The full set of comments, which can be found in the appendix, should be viewed in order to understand the extent of issues covered and the specific types and location of these issues.

Overall, there were some major themes that emerged, including fixing Folly Beach County Park, adding more water parks, linking more trails/paths together, staying and becoming even more financially sustainable and responsible, maintaining current facilities better, and providing discounts to specific users, among others.

Example Comments

- Lower the price of the annual passes for Charleston County residents.
- County residents should have first and cheaper access than out of county.
- I think facilities of any type should be paid for by those who utilize them. Senior citizens with fixed incomes should not be taxed to support facilities they do not use.
- Offer deals to college students. It’s still very expensive to go to the water parks.
- Senior discounts
- I cannot handle any more property tax!
- Take care of existing property and enforce park rules. Enforce leash laws and law to pick up after your animal and NO litter on our subdivisions.
- Develop first those facilities that will be revenue generators
- Do not pave any trails!
- There is adequate amount of park space - serve jointly with all town in county - make better use of existing facilities
- Maintain and improve existing land/parks instead of buying new land
- Bring back Folly Park
- Priority needs to be at Folly Beach. To clean up the old park before it washes into the ocean. Haul off all debris, even if park cannot be restored at this time.
- Open Folly Beach Park, more parking at Kiawah Beach Park - South Carolina
- More bike paths, connect parks with bike paths, section off roads for bikeways
- More bike paths
- I would like to see the water park in Mt. Pleasant expanded to be more suitable for teenagers/adults.
- More water parks please!
- Leave water parks open beyond Labor Day and before Memorial Day
- More boat landing or add additional parking at existing landings
Appendix E – Detailed GRASP® Perspectives
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Appendix F – Future Park
Analysis Working Definitions

CCPRC FUTURE PARKS – ANALYSIS

Working Definitions for Analysis Categories

1. **Accessibility** – Addresses ease of access to a site from a large population in reasonable proximity to property, reflects a measure of remoteness from areas of dense population.

2. **Contextual Impact** – References a site’s ability to be developed in some manner without negatively impacting adjacent properties and both the current and historic cultural context of the immediate surrounding locale.

3. **Cultural/Historic Value** – Addresses a site’s historic and archaeological value and contributions to the cultural relevance of the area and region.

4. **Deed Restrictions/Easements** – Addresses the existence of deed restrictions or easements that could impact the development program of a site.

   Note: This criteria could be ranked on a 1-5 scale based on an interpretation of the constraints that the deed restriction or easement would have on the site’s opportunity for a wide range of development.

5. **Deep Water Access** – Reflects that there is access to deep water.

   Note: This criteria could be ranked on a 1-5 scale based on an interpretation of the quality of the access and the depth of the water available to serve a wide range of water based activities.

6. **Existing Structures** – Recognizes whether the site has a structure on it and if so what is the state of the structure with respect to its ability to be utilized in future development scenarios.

7. **Existing Trail Conditions** – Reflects an evaluation of the quality and quantity of existing trails based on visual observations.

8. **Large Vistas (typically off-site)** – This category represents a site quality that recognizes impressive off-site vistas exist on the property and that these vistas will greatly contribute to the enjoyment of park users.

   Note: This category may be better served with a different name, possibly just “Off Site Vistas.”

9. **On Site Views** – Recognizes significant on site features natural or man-made that contribute to a lasting visual appreciation of the property.

10. **Proximity to Population Centers** – This category is related to the accessibility category but focuses more on a site’s potential to draw significant users due to its proximity to existing or anticipated higher density, primary residential development.
Note: I believe that while related, the categories of “accessibility” and “proximity to population centers” should be distinct due to the possibility that a property could be located within an area of relatively high density residential but still be somewhat remote and difficult to access to a broader population. An example would be the Secessionville Tract. Alternatively the Cow Cow Tract is quite accessible but somewhat remote with respect to proximity to high concentrations of users.

11. **Topographic Variety** – Recognizing that wide ranges of topographical relief are rare in the Lowcountry this category reflects the significant visual attribute that topographical variety brings to a site and its important contribution to identifying a property as a unique place.

12. **Utility Availability** – The potential for a site to be developed for a wide range of uses often is based on the availability of public water, sewer and electric power. This category addressed a respective site’s access to public water, sewer, and power.

   Note: This category could be modified to rank access on a 1-5 scale to address access to utilities.

13. **Wetland Quality** – This criteria addresses the perceived visual quality and variety of wetland habitats on a subject property based on visual observations and their potential value to a park users appreciation of the property as a unique natural area.

14. **Habitat Diversity** – Based on visual accounts of the tract this criteria reflects assumptions on the potential for diversity of wildlife founded upon observations on the variety of vegetative cover and type, wetland conditions, land forms, and the site’s proximity within a larger local wildlife context.

15. **Soils** – Reflects a site’s potential for development based on an evaluation of USDA Soils Map Data.

16. **Hydrology** – Based on observations of site conditions, review of soils maps data, and visual confirmation of existing drainage structures and features establish assumptions on the potential for a site to address a flexible development program at a reasonable cost.
Appendix G: Parks, Recreation, and Administrative Trends

A. Influencing Trends and Best Management Practices in Parks and Recreation

A challenge for today’s parks and recreation agency administrators is to continue to understand and respond to the changing characteristics of their communities. In this fast-paced society, it is important to stay on top of current trends impacting parks and recreation. The following information highlights relevant local, regional, and national parks and recreational trends from various sources that may influence Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission (CCPRC) over the next ten years.

B. Active Transportation

The current U.S. transportation infrastructure focuses on motor vehicle travel and provides limited support for other transportation options for most Americans. As a result, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) has outlined several health and safety implications of the current transportation system. Physical activity and active transportation have declined compared to previous generations. The lack of physical activity is a major contributor to the steady rise in rates of obesity, diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and other chronic health conditions in the United States.

Motor vehicle crashes continue to be the leading cause of injury-related death for many age groups. Pedestrians and bicyclists are at an even greater risk of death from crashes than those who travel by motor vehicles.

Many Americans view walking and bicycling within their communities as unsafe, because of traffic and the lack of sidewalks or multi-modal paths, crosswalks, and bicycle dedicated lanes.

Although using public transportation has historically been safer than highway travel in light duty vehicles, highway travel has grown more quickly than other modes of transportation.

A lack of efficient alternatives to automobile travel disproportionately affects vulnerable populations such as the poor, the elderly, people who have disabilities, and children by limiting access to jobs, health care, social interaction, and healthy food choices.

Although motor vehicle emissions have decreased significantly over the past three decades, air pollution from motor vehicles continues to contribute to the degradation of the environment and adversely effects respiratory and cardiovascular health.

Transportation accounts for approximately one-third of all U.S. greenhouse gas emissions thusly contributing to climate change.
As a result of these implications, communities around the country are creating programs to address and support alternative methods of transportation. Policy is being created, funding options are available, and partnerships are emerging. Initiatives like Safe Routes to Schools and Safe Routes to Play, and designing for “Complete Streets,” are emerging to create safe, walkable communities.

Charleston County has a strong Safe Routes to School program with a large percentage of schools participating in Walk to School Day, monthly school walking events, walking school buses, and student safety patrol.

**South Carolina Bicycle/Pedestrian Trails Trends**

South Carolina ranks 49th among states for bicycling safety according to a report by the Alliance for Biking & Walking. The “Bicycling and Walking in the U.S.: 2012 Benchmarking Report” shows that while 2.1 percent of work trips in South Carolina are by bicycle or on foot, bicyclists and pedestrians account for 11.9 percent of traffic fatalities in the state.

South Carolina spends just 0.6 percent of its federal transportation dollars on biking and walking, ranking 46th among states for investing in biking and walking.

Currently, South Carolina biking and walking funding works out to just $0.95 per person, compared to the national average of $2.17. Without funding, infrastructure cannot be improved to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, keeping South Carolina the second most unsafe state in which to ride a bike.

Numerous successful projects across the state have been funded in part with federal dollars through threatened programs like Transportation Enhancements, including trails in Greenville, Charleston, and Spartanburg. With continued investment, bicycling and walking can become easier and safer and can be viewed as a realistic transportation choice for South Carolina residents.

One example of statewide initiatives that support bicycling and walking is the Palmetto Conservation Foundation’s Palmetto Trail, a vision of more than 425 miles of hiking and bicycling paths exploring lakes, mountain ridges, and forests, that is two-thirds complete, with nearly 290 miles open to the public. Some sections feature urban bikeways, greenways, and rail-to-trail conversions; others feature the history, culture, and geography of the Palmetto State.

**South Carolina Department of Transportation Pedestrian & Bicycle Milestones**

According to the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT), the following milestones have been achieved relating to bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

a. In February 2003, SCDOT approved a resolution affirming that bicycling and walking accommodations should be a routine part of the Department’s planning, design, construction, and operating activities, and will be included in the everyday operations of its transportation system.

b. One of the most popular features of SCDOT’s hallmark Cooper River Bridge project is the 10-foot wide shared-use bicycle and pedestrian path. It extends nearly 2.71 miles linking Mount Pleasant and Charleston.
c. The Bikes Belong Coalition and the League of American Bicyclists (LAB) awarded a “Complete Streets” grant of $50,000 to help South Carolina implement its policy to improve conditions for bicycling and walking. The grant is supporting research, training, and evaluation programs to ease implementation of the policy. The League of American Bicyclists, in conjunction with the Palmetto Cycling Coalition, SCDOT, and other local groups are working to support the implementation of “Complete Streets.”

d. State Ranking: South Carolina was ranked 32nd in the 2012 bicycle friendly state rankings by the League of American Bicyclists, an improvement over its 2011 ranking of 39th.

e. Bicycle Friendly Communities in South Carolina: Spartanburg, Columbia, Greenville, and Charleston were chosen as “Bronze” level Bicycle Friendly Communities by the League of American Bicyclists.

League of American Bicyclists’ Top 10 Signs of Success in a Bicycle Friendly State
- People Commuting by Bike (More than 1 percent)
- Safe Passing/Vulnerable Road User Law
- Complete Streets Policy
- Dedicated State Funding
- Active State Advocacy Group
- State Bicycle Plan (Adopted 2002 or later)
- Share the Road Campaign
- Bicycle Education for Police
- Bicycle Safety Emphasis in Strategic Highway Safety Plan
- Top 10 State for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Spending
- Age-Related and Demographic National Trends

C. Adult - The Baby Boomers: Planning for the Demographic Shift

Baby boomers are defined as individuals born between 1946 and 1964, as stated in Leisure Programming for Baby Boomers. They are a generation that consists of nearly 76 million Americans. In 2011, this influential population began their transition out of the workforce. As baby boomers enter retirement, they will be looking for opportunities in fitness, sports, outdoors, arts and cultural events, and other activities that suit their lifestyles. With their varied life experiences, values, and expectations, baby boomers are predicted to redefine the meaning of recreation and leisure programming for mature adults.

In the leisure profession, this generation’s devotion to exercise and fitness is an example of their influence on society. When boomers entered elementary school, President John Kennedy initiated the President’s Council on Physical Fitness; physical education and recreation became a key component of public education. As boomers matured and moved into the workplace, they took their desire for exercise and fitness with them. Now as the oldest boomers’ are nearing 60, park and recreation professionals are faced with new approaches to provide both passive and active programming for older adults. Jeffrey Ziegler, a past president of the Arizona Parks and Recreation Association, identified “Boomer Basics” in his article, “Recreating Retirement: How Will Baby Boomers Reshape Leisure in Their 60s?”

Charleston County’s demographic profile indicates that almost 26 percent of the current population falls within the Baby Boomer age range (those approximately 45-64 years of age).
Boomer Basics:
- Boomers are known to work hard, play hard, and spend hard.
- They have always been fixated with all things youthful. Boomers typically respond that they feel 10 years younger than their chronological age.
- Their nostalgic mindset keeps boomers returning to the sights and sounds of their 1960s youth culture.
- Swimming pools have become less of a social setting and much more of an extension of boomers’ health and wellness program.
- Because in general, boomers have a high education level, they’ll likely continue to pursue education as adults and into retirement.

Boomers will look to parks and recreation professionals to give them the skills needed to enjoy many life-long interests and sports. When programming for this age group, a customized experience to cater to their need for self-fulfillment, healthy pleasure, nostalgic youthfulness, and individual escapes will be important. Recreation trends will shift away from games and activities that boomers associate with senior citizens. Ziegler suggests activities such as bingo, bridge, and shuffleboard will likely be avoided because boomers relate these activities to being old.

Boomers will reinvent what being a 65-year-old means. Parks and recreation agencies that do not plan for boomers carrying on in retirement with the same hectic pace they have lived during their years in employment will be left behind. Things to consider when planning for the demographic shift:
- Boomer characteristics
- What drives Boomers?
- Marketing to Boomers
- Arts and Entertainment
- Passive and Active Fitness Trends
- Outdoor Recreation/Adventure Programs
- Travel Programs

National trends reported by the Federal Interagency Forum on Aging Related Statistics in March of 2008 suggest that older people enjoy higher levels of prosperity than any previous generation, with an increase in higher incomes and a decrease in the proportion of older people with low incomes and in poverty. Major inequalities continue to exist for people without high school diplomas who report smaller economic gains and fewer financial resources.

Listed below are additional demographic differences in Charleston County (as of 2011) compared with the State of South Carolina and national trends:
- Households are smaller in Charleston County (2.41 persons) than in the State (2.52 persons); as well as when compared to the national average of 2.60 persons per household.
- Households are older in the West and East County sub-areas, and younger in the North area. The median age is 35.4 years in Charleston County, and the Central area mirrors the County median age.
- 7.1 percent speak a language other than English at home, compared with the State, where 6.7 percent speak other than English. However, both the County and the State are far less multilingual than the national average of 20.3 percent who speak a language other than English at home.
The 2011 National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA) Survey on sports participation found the top five athletic activities ranked by total participation included: exercise walking, exercising with equipment, swimming, camping, and aerobic exercising. Additionally, the following active, organized, or skill development activities remain popular: bicycle riding, hiking, running/jogging, basketball, golf, and soccer. Table 28 further outlines the top twenty sports ranked by total participation in 2011 and the percent change from 2010. Note that the 2011 information is the most recent year available as of the writing of this document.

Table 28: Top Twenty Sports Ranked by Total Participation 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Walking</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising with Equipment</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (vacation/overnight)</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Exercising</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Riding</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workout at Club</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Lifting</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Freshwater)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards/Pool</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Shooting</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating, Motor/Power</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting with Firearms</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent Change is from 2010

Source: NSGA 2011

The Ten-year History of Sports Participation Report published by NSGA shows national trends in team sports and individual sports. Overall participation trends indicate a general increase in 2011 for most team sports. However, softball and volleyball show a decrease in participation through 2011.

In more recent years lacrosse has become one of the country’s fastest growing team sports. Participation in high school lacrosse has almost doubled this decade. An estimated 1.2 million Americans over age seven have played lacrosse within the previous year.
Over the decade individual sports show a dramatic increase in aerobic exercising, exercise walking, exercising with equipment, hiking, kayaking, running/jogging, target shooting and target shooting with an airgun, tennis, weightlifting, and working out at a club. Table 29 illustrates a ten year change in participation for selected activities including both team sports and individual sports.

Table 29: Ten-Year History of Sports Participation (in millions) 2001-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Exercising</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery (Target)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking/Wilderness Camping</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Riding</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards/Pool</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating, Motor/Power</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dart Throwing</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Walking</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising with Equipment</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Freshwater)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Saltwater)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (tackle)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey (ice)</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting w/Bow &amp; Arrow</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting with Firearms</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Line Roller Skating</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Biking (off road)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzzleloading</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paintball Games</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (Alpine)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (Cross Country)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target Sports (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Shooting</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Shooting (Airgun)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Skiing</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Lifting</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workout at Club</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Participated more than once (in millions), seven (7) years of age and older.*

*Source: NSGA 2011*

### Youth Sports

Specific offerings for children’s fitness are slowly increasing in health and fitness facilities. Facilities are offering more youth-specific exercise equipment. Individualized youth sports training opportunities are becoming more popular as well. For youth ages 7 to 11 years, swimming and bicycle riding, followed by basketball had the highest number of participants in 2011; however, for the same age group, muzzleloading, aerobic exercising, hunting with a bow and arrow, running/jogging, and tennis saw the highest percent of increase of the sports in the survey in 2011.

It is important to note that of all the sports mentioned above, basketball is the only team sport. Additionally, in-line skating experienced the largest percentage decrease in participation.

Another noteworthy trend is the increase in “pick-up” play in team sports. In recent years, the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association (SGMA) noticed that participation in team sports has been driven by organized/sanctioned play. However, in 2008, there were seven team sports where “casual/pick-up” play exceeded organized/sanctioned play. Those sports were basketball, ice hockey, field hockey, touch football, lacrosse, grass volleyball, and beach volleyball. It is believed that this is the result of athletes and their families feeling the pinch of the economy. Many people are choosing the less expensive ways to play sports and stay active.

### Impact of the Olympics

Athletics cannot underestimate the impact that both the winter and summer Olympic Games have on sports participation in Olympic years and in the year that follows. The Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association (SMGA) recently completed a Study on Sports, Fitness, and Recreational Activity Participation. SCMA researcher Neil Schwartz reflected on the study’s finding. “While some people may not be motivated to play a particular sport because of watching the Olympic Games, many people are encouraged to start exercising and getting in better physical shape because of the Olympic Games. In some cases, an agency sees a straight line from Olympic coverage and increased sports participation, and other times, it is not so direct. The research clearly supports that analysis.”

### ATV Safety

The SC Children’s Hospital Collaborative continues to take the lead role in advocating for all-terrain vehicle (ATV) safety and children. Chandler’s Law, South Carolina’s ATV safety legislation, became effective July 1, 2011. Statewide efforts to educate the public about the law’s requirements, the need for safety equipment, and the need for hands-on training are continuing. Information about the law can be found at www.chandlersatv.org.
Aquatics
According to the National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA), swimming ranked third in terms of participation in 2011, and fourth in 2009 and 2010.

Outdoor swimming pools are not typically heated and open year round. Nationally, there is an increasing trend toward indoor leisure and therapeutic pools. Additional indoor and outdoor amenities like “spray pads” are becoming increasingly popular as well. In some cities and counties, spray pools are popular in the summer months and are converted into ice rinks in the winter months.

According to a 1997 Needs Assessment for CCPRC on Water-based Recreation Programs and Facilities, attention should be placed on:

- Meeting the needs of power boat owners
- Meeting the specific water-based recreational needs of older adults
- Providing opportunities for walking by and relaxing near the water
- Providing concession stands and waterfront restaurants (which CCPRC has successfully developed)
- Providing passive-type water-based recreation opportunities
- Providing active water-based activities and instructions like swimming opportunities (which CCPRC has continued to develop through their waterparks), boater safety and sailing, boat races and camping on the water, and look toward providing different kinds of activities (perhaps rowing, kayaking, standup paddling, etc.)

E. Beach Management

The Beachfront Management Act (S.C. Code Ann. § 48-39-250) establishes eight state policies to guide the management of ocean beaches:

a. Protect, preserve, restore, and enhance the beach/dune system
b. Create a comprehensive, long-range beach management plan and require local beach management plans for the protection, preservation, restoration, and enhancement of the beach/dune system, each promoting wise use of the state’s beachfront to include a gradual retreat from the system over a 40 year period
c. Severely restrict the use of hard erosion control devices and encourage the replacement of hard erosion control devices with soft technologies which will provide for the protection of the shoreline without long-term adverse effects
d. Encourage the use of erosion-inhibiting techniques which do not adversely impact the long-term well-being of the beach/dune system
e. Promote carefully planned nourishment as a means of beach preservation and restoration where economically feasible
f. Preserve existing public access and promote the enhancement of public access for all citizens including the handicapped and encourage the purchase of lands adjacent to the Atlantic Ocean to enhance public access

g. Involve local governments in long-range comprehensive planning and management of the beach/dune system in which they have a vested interest

h. Establish procedures and guidelines for the emergency management of the beach/dune system following a significant storm event

According to the Guidelines for the Development of Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plans established under the Beachfront Management Act (S.C. Code Ann. § 48-39-250), Charleston County is one of 18 communities required to develop local comprehensive beach management plans. As of this writing, Charleston County has not submitted its plan.

According to the Charleston County Recreation Commission website, “Due to ongoing erosion problems in addition to the heavy erosion caused by Hurricane Irene in August 2011, Folly Beach County Park will remain closed to the general public through the 2012 season. Information relating to Folly Beach County Park is still active on statewide tourism sites, however.”

7. Conservation

The top ten recommendations of the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) Conservation Task Force were published in the November 2011 issue of Parks and Recreation magazine. They are:

a. Take a leadership role in the community to promote conservation. Park and recreation agencies have a unique opportunity to bring governmental agencies, non-profit organizations, community leaders, and the public together for the cause of working together on community wide conservation objectives-clean water, wildlife habitat preservation, reducing energy use and improving environmental quality. Park and recreation agencies must lead the way in promoting conservation to diverse and underserved audiences.

b. Lead by example in employing best management conservation practices in parks. Park and recreation agencies should become the catalyst in the community for conservation by showing how best practices can be adopted – for example, not mowing what does not need to be mowed; stopping wasteful energy consumption; and reducing pesticide use for example. Show the public how conservation practices can benefit everyone.

c. Engage volunteers in conservation and stewardship. Create a sense of belonging and stewardship for parks by creating a personal sense of ownership and value. Enable people to identify with their parks and natural resources, and to care about their future. Sustain stewardship by creating meaningful public participation in implementation of conservation principles and practices.

d. Establish a strategic land acquisition strategy based on knowledge and awareness of significant natural and cultural resources (watershed protection, unique ecological characteristics, and sensitive natural areas deserving protection). As the largest owners of public land within most communities, park and recreation agencies should lead the way in developing a strategic vision for preserving open space and conserving important landscapes and natural features.

e. Engage youth in conservation. Get kids and teens outdoors and enjoying their parks. The experience of nature is inherently rewarding for youth. Set as a goal to connect kids in the community to nature and the outdoors. Children and youth will be fascinated by nature and will develop a lifelong affinity as well as a conservation ethic if they have early opportunities to enjoy nature and recreate outdoors in a safe, rewarding way.
f. Conserve energy in all ways. Park and recreation agencies must lead by example, showing the public how and why they should adopt practices that they can see demonstrated in parks and recreation facilities. Park and recreation agencies should adopt energy conservation measures that make sense and save public taxpayer funds.

g. Protect natural resources in parks and in the community. A core mission of public parks is to protect land and water resources and to be stewards of natural resources. This means committing personnel and resources to protect natural and cultural resources and creating sustainable long-term methods of funding this conservation mission. Parks and recreation agencies are entrusted with some of the most important public assets of a community, and the conservation and long-term protection of this public trust is and should be a core component of every parks and recreation agency’s mission.

h. Create sustainable landscapes that demonstrate principles of conservation. Utilize sustainable landscape practices to save taxpayer funds, to measurably improve conservation benefits and to educate the public about conservation. For example, agencies can reduce turf grass and mowing frequency; replace turf with native plants; manage floodplains for multiple uses including conservation and public recreation; enhance wetlands for water filtration and groundwater recharge; plant model landscapes of drought tolerant native plants adapted to climate and culture; and promote parks as food sources through edible landscapes and community gardens.

i. Forge partnerships that foster the mission of conservation. The greatest and most beneficial conservation successes most often occur as a result of collaboration. Park and recreation agencies should partner with non-profit and community service organizations, universities and colleges, school systems, other governmental agencies, and non-traditional partners for conservation outcomes. Promote health, education, and other goals while working toward a common mission of conservation.

j. Utilize technology to promote conservation. Park and recreation agencies need to embrace technology to promote conservation. This is not only in applications such as GIS, but in utilizing social media to engage the public, especially youth. Technology is not to be feared as something that detracts from the conservation mission of parks agencies, but rather it is to be accepted as a means of sharing knowledge and connecting people to conservation and stewardship.

G. Cycling

Bicycle friendly cities have been emerging over the last ten years. Cycling has become a popular mode of transportation as people consider the rising cost of fuel, desire for better health, and concern for the environment. Some people also use cycling as a mode of transportation just for the fun of it.

The Alliance for Biking and Walking published Bicycling and Walking in the United States 2012 Benchmark Report. This report shows that increasing bicycling and walking goals are clearly in the public interest. Where bicycling and walking levels are higher, obesity, high blood pressure, and diabetes levels are lower. Higher levels of bicycling and walking also coincide with increased bicycle and pedestrian safety and higher levels of physical activity. Increasing bicycling and walking can help solve many serious problems facing the nation.

According to the Alliance for Biking and Walking report, public health trends related to bicycling and walking include:

- Bicycling and walking levels fell 66 percent between 1960 and 2009, while obesity levels increased by 156 percent.
- Between 1966 and 2009, the number of children who bicycled or walked to school fell 75 percent, while the percentage of obese children rose 276 percent.
• In general, states with the highest levels of bicycling and walking have the lowest levels of obesity, hypertension (high blood pressure), and diabetes and have the greatest percentage of adults who meet the recommended 30-plus minutes per day of physical activity.

The economic benefits of bicycling and walking include:
• Bicycling and walking projects create 11-14 jobs per $1 million spent, compared to just seven jobs created per $1 million spent on highway projects.
• Cost benefit analyses show that up to $11.80 in benefits can be gained for every $1 invested in bicycling and walking.

National bicycling trends:
• Bike sharing and bike libraries allow people to rent bikes and tour communities using multiple pick up and drop off locations.
• Infrastructure to support biking communities is becoming more commonly funded in communities.
• The number of bike commuters in the United States rose by 64 percent from 1990 to 2009.
• Bike share communities rose from .4 percent to .6 percent.
• According to a white paper, *Analysis of Bicycling Trends and Policies in Large North American Cities: Lessons For New York*, “Case studies cities have implemented a wide range of infrastructure and programs to promote cycling and increase cycling safety: expanded and improved bike lanes and paths, traffic calming, parking, bike transit integration, training programs and promotional events.” These trends have helped improve cycling in these communities.
• Cycling participation by age almost doubled in the age group 25-64 from 23 percent in 1995 to 42 percent in 2009.
• Cycling participation by ethnicity shows that non-Hispanic whites have the highest bike mode sharing among ethnic groups; cycling rates are rising faster among African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans. Those three groups also account for an increasing share of total bike trips, rising from 16 percent to in 2001 to 21 percent in 2009. Cycling is dominated by non-Hispanic whites, who make 79 percent of all bike trips in the USA but account for only 66 percent of the population (American Community Survey, 2009).
• The League of American Bicyclists currently have 490 applicants and have designated 190 communities in 46 states, up from 84 communities in 2008. The award recognizes education, engineering, enforcement, encouragement, and an evaluation plan.

H. Facilities

According to *Recreation Management* magazine’s “2011 State of the Industry Report,” national trends show an increased user-base of recreation facilities. To meet that growing need, a majority of the 2011 State of the Industry Survey respondents (60.3 percent) reported that they have plans to build new facilities or make additions or renovations to their existing facilities over the next three years. Nearly a quarter (24.2 percent) of respondents said that they have plans to build new facilities, and just over a quarter (25.9 percent) said that they plan to add to their existing facilities. Another 43.6 percent are planning renovations.
The current national trend is toward “one-stop” indoor recreation facilities to serve all ages. Large, multi-purpose regional centers help increase cost recovery, promote retention, and encourage cross-use. Agencies across the U.S. are increasing revenue production and cost recovery. Multi-use facilities versus specialized space is a trend, offering programming opportunities as well as free-play opportunities. “One stop” facilities attract young families, teens, and adults of all ages.

Also according to the report, parks and recreation respondents said that the average amount planned for construction for parks fell by 12.7 percent from an average of $3,907,000 in last year’s survey to $3,411,000 this year. There was very little change in the types of features and amenities included in the facilities of the survey respondents from last year to this year. The most commonly found features include locker rooms (57.5 percent of respondents have locker rooms), classrooms and meeting rooms (57.4 percent), bleachers and seating (56.8 percent), outdoor sports courts for basketball, tennis, etc. (54.1 percent) and concession areas (53.9 percent).

Amenities and specialty parks that are still considered “alternative” to traditional park and recreation services but are increasing in popularity include the following:
- Climbing walls.
- Cultural art facilities.
- Adult fitness parks.
- Skate parks – the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association estimates that there are about 1,000 skateboard parks in the United States.

Green design techniques and certifications such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) are becoming more common as sustainability is on everyone’s mind. A recent Building Commissioners Association (BCA) survey indicated that 52 percent of recreation industry survey respondents indicated that they were willing to pay more for green design knowing that it would significantly reduce or eliminate the negative impact of buildings on the environment and occupants.

I. Festivals and Events

Economic Impact of Festivals

In the context of urban development, from the early 1980s, there has been a process that can be characterized as “festivalization,” which has been linked to the economic restructuring of towns and cities, and the drive to develop communities as large-scale platforms for the creation and consumption of “cultural experience.” The CCPRC offers a number of large-scale festivals and events including Holiday Lights, the Cajun Festival, Pet Fest, the East Coast Canoe and Kayak Festival, Blessing of the Fleet and Seafood Festival, the Model Yacht Club Champions Regatta, the Reggae Concert Series, the Uncle Sam Jam, and a variety of dances and triathlons, among others. Many of these can indirectly benefit the community through tourism.

According to the survey results, the most frequently attended programs, activities and special events were the Holiday Festival of Lights (1.7 times on average over the past 12 months with 61% of the county overall attending at least once per year); Festivals (Cajun, Latin American, etc.) (0.9 times at 30% attending); and evening concerts (0.6 times at 25% attending).
Research indicates the success rate for festivals tends to be evaluated simplistically on the basis of profit (sales), prestige (media profile), size (numbers of events), often translated into numbers of visitors. Research from the European Festival Research Project (EFRP) indicates there is evidence of local and county governments supporting and even instigating and managing particular festivals themselves to achieve local or regional economic objectives, often defined very narrowly (sales, jobs, tourists). There is also a growing number of smaller more local community-based festivals and events in communities, most often supported by local councils, which have been spawned partly as a reaction to larger festivals that have become prime economic-drivers. These community-based festivals often will re-claim cultural ground based on their social, educational, and participative value.

According to the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism and a study conducted for them on Tourism Product Development Concept Plan for the Charleston Region by Tourism Development International, the Charleston region enjoys a prominent tourism presence and a distinct competitive advantage on the national, even world stage. The Charleston area a destination wedding venue, top reasons for this competitive position include:

a. The excellently preserved downtown area of the Charleston peninsula.
b. The extensive and varied coastline comprising beaches, marshes, and inlets affording a wide range of recreational and wildlife study possibilities.
c. The extensive visitor infrastructure and facilities in the City of Charleston, along the coast, and at other visitor nodes along the interstate and in communities like Mount Pleasant, North Charleston, and Summerville.
d. The Ashley and Cooper Rivers running through Dorchester and Berkeley counties into the ocean at Charleston, and the plantation houses and other natural and historic sites of interest along the rivers.
e. A series of significant historic and natural sites in the (tri-county) area.

According to the Department, “the cultural and natural heritage attractions of Berkeley and Dorchester counties are not sufficiently strong in their own right to attract more than those visitors with a committed interest in the history of the area, and/or its wildlife and other natural features. Any significant increase in visitation will come through:

a. Product development in Charleston that broadens its appeal;
b. Vacationers to Charleston looking for something extra from their stay in the region; and
c. The development of both water-based and land touring routes themed around the natural and cultural heritage assets of [Charleston as well as] Berkeley and Dorchester counties.
d. Linkages and partnerships between the tri-county regional area.”

Several ideas for product development have come from the extensive public involvement process undertaken by the County as part of the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Planning process. In addition, many regional opportunities were identified including:

• 2000 meter water course for regattas, drop-in use, other events, camps, instruction, etc.
• Adventure park for ATV, zip lines, etc.
• Regional indoor sports venue for volleyball, indoor field house, etc.
• Outdoor event/tournament venue with an amphitheater/meadow/rectangular field
• Premiere regional multi-sport rectangle field tournament venue
• Birding/wildlife and ecotourism venue
• Blueways trails and camping
J. Fitness Programming

There is much to be learned about trends and expectations each year in order to make the most of each event. According to FestivalsandFairs.Net, an online festival resource, listed the following 2011 trends:

- How the Economy Affects You – No matter what, the economy is always a factor. In 2011, people are expected to be more comfortable spending their money at craft shows, fairs and festivals.
- ‘Tis the Season – For 2011, the trends are pointing toward an emphasis on holidays and specific events.
- Arts – A variety of art offerings such as music, cultural arts, scrapbooking, jewelry, digital art, etc. are trends to watch.

There have been many changes in fitness programs in the last ten years. What clients wanted in 2000 is not necessarily what they want today. Fitness programs that have increased in popularity since 2000 include outdoor exercise, boot camp, personal training, post-rehabilitation, kids-specific fitness, and sport-specific training. Declining programs since 2000 include dance, health fairs, sports clinics, aerobics, stress-management classes, and weight-management classes. (IDEA Health and Fitness Association)

The American College of Sports Medicine’s (ACSM) Health and Fitness Journal conducted a survey to determine trends that would help create a standard for health and fitness programming. Table 30 shows survey results that focus on trends in the commercial, corporate, clinical, and community health and fitness industry. The Worldwide Survey indicates the following shift in fitness trends between 2009 and 2010.

Table 30: Worldwide Fitness Trends for 2010 and for 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
<td>1. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strength training</td>
<td>2. Strength training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children and obesity</td>
<td>3. Fitness programs for older adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal training</td>
<td>4. Exercise and weight loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Core training</td>
<td>5. Children and obesity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special fitness programs for older adults</td>
<td>6. Personal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Functional fitness</td>
<td>7. Core training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sport-specific training</td>
<td>8. Group personal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Group personal training</td>
<td>10. Functional fitness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American College of Sport Medicine

K. General Programming

One of the most common concerns in the recreation industry is creating innovative programming to draw participants into facilities and services. Once in, participants recognize that the benefits are endless. According to Recreation Management magazine June 2011 “State of the Industry Report,” the most popular programs, offered by more than half of survey respondents, include holiday events and other special events (64.3 percent); fitness programs (61.1 percent); educational programs (60.4 percent); day camps and summer camps (56.3 percent); mind-body/balance programs such as yoga, tai chi, Pilates, and martial arts (51.4 percent); and youth sports teams (50.7 percent). Sports training was not in the top ten; however, golf instruction and tennis lessons are a fast paced trend.
The report also suggested slightly less than a third (31.9 percent) of respondents indicated that they are planning to add additional programs at their facilities over the next three years. The most common types of programming they are planning to add include:

- Fitness programs (planned by 26.8% of respondents planning to add programs)
- Educational programs (25%)
- Teen programming (24%)
- Mind-body/balance programs (22.5%)
- Active older adults (20.9%)
- Day camps and summer camps (20.8%)
- Environmental education (20.3%)
- Individual sports activities (18.9%)
- Holiday events and other special events (18.6%)
- Sports tournaments or races (18%)

L. Health — Statewide Statistics

In spite of the overall reports of good health given by the citizens of the Palmetto State, chronic conditions are still making an impact on the health of many South Carolinians.

Table 31 contains some of the risk factors that contribute to an increased risk of developing a chronic condition. The prevalence of these risk factors from the 2010 South Carolina Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey are listed in the table below for Charleston County.

Table 31: Risk Factors for Charleston County and South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Charleston County</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 Servings of Fruits and Vegetables per Day (2009)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary lifestyle</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight or Obese</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. Health and Obesity

According to the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the annual status of America’s health has declined 69 percent compared to the 1990s. Obesity continues to be a serious issue in America, growing at an epidemic rate — almost tripling since 1990. In fact, about one in every three adults is currently considered obese. This statistic illustrates the importance of intercepting the epidemic in youth. Overall, 27.5 percent of people in the United States are currently obese.

In an effort to educate Americans and encourage them to take steps toward a healthier future, the United Health Foundation annually presents America’s Health Rankings®: A Call to Action for Individuals and Their Communities.

Obesity among Children and Adolescents

“Obesity now affects 17 percent of all children and adolescents in the United States. The percentage of adolescents and children who are obese tripled from 1980 to 2008. In 2008 alone, more than one third of U.S. children and adolescents were overweight or obese.

“Obese children are more likely to become obese adults. Statistics show that children and adolescents who are obese have a 70% to 80% chance of becoming overweight or obese adults.”

Center for Disease Control
America’s Health Rankings has tracked the health of the nation for the past 22 years, providing a unique, comprehensive perspective on how the nation (and each state) measures up. The 2011 edition of the Rankings suggests the nation is extremely adept at treating illness and disease. However, Americans are struggling to change unhealthy behaviors such as smoking and obesity, which cause many of these diseases. Obesity continues to be one of the fastest growing health issues in the nation, and America is spending billions in direct health care costs associated with poor diet and physical inactivity.

As obesity in the United States continues to be a topic of interest for legislators and the government, there continues to be research suggesting that activity levels are stagnant among all age groups. The following are statistics that support this concern.

- Only 25 percent of adults and 27 percent of youth (grades 9-12) engage in recommended levels of physical activity.
- 59 percent of American adults are sedentary.
- Children born now have a lower life expectancy than their parents.
- Children nationally spend 4.5 to 8 hours daily (30-56 hours per week) in front of a screen (television and/or computer).
- Prevalence of overweight children:
  - Ages 2–5 years (12.4%)
  - Ages 6–11 years (17%)
  - Ages 12–19 years (17.6%)

**Local Trends**

The United Health Foundation ranked South Carolina 45th this year, unchanged from 2011, but lower than in 2010, when it was ranked 41st.

According to the UHF 2011 report, South Carolina’s strengths and weaknesses are as follows:

**Strengths:**
- Low prevalence of binge drinking
- High immunization coverage

**Challenges:**
- High prevalence of obesity
- Low high school graduation rate
- High percentage of children in poverty
- High prevalence of diabetes

**Other Highlights:**
In the past ten years, obesity increased from 22.0 percent to 32.0 percent of adults, with more than 1.1 million obese adults in the state.

In the past ten years, diabetes increased from 7.1 percent to 10.7 percent of adults. Now 379,000 South Carolina adults have diabetes.

South Carolina ranks 45th among states in the percentage of residents consuming a diet of fruits and vegetables, at 17 percent.

South Carolina ranks 50th, with 41 percent of the adult population having high cholesterol, and 32 percent of the state’s population is obese.
Economic Effects of Inactivity and Obesity

Inactivity and obesity in the United States cost the country hundreds of billions of dollars annually. Some local governments are now accepting the role of providing preventative health care through park and recreation services. The following are facts from the International County/County Management Association.
- 89% believe P&R departments should take the lead in developing communities conducive to active living.
- Nearly 84% supported recreation programs that encourage active living in their community.
- 45% believe the highest priority is a cohesive system of parks and trails and accessible neighborhood parks.

N. Healthy Lifestyle

Supporting Healthy Communities in South Carolina

Eat Smart, Move More South Carolina (ESMM) is a state-wide non-profit which administers several initiatives, including the “South Carolina Obesity State Plan,” which can be used by policy makers, individuals, and organizations at all levels to guide and inform actions and activities to create supportive environments for a healthier South Carolina. An ESMM Chapter, one of 12 coalitions funded statewide by ESMM, is located in Charleston Tri-County (Charleston, Berkeley, and Dorchester), and works to implement “Options for Action,” a how-to guide for achieving objectives of the South Carolina Obesity State Plan on the local level that support policy, environmental, and systems change strategies to address healthy eating, active living, and obesity prevention.

The South Carolina Obesity State Plan has four committees with related work plans, Advocacy, Communications and Marketing, Training and Education, and Supporting Community Action, which support the efforts of local chapters.

With the health care issue front and center, parks and recreation departments are finding that they are in a position to be a catalyst in creating healthy lifestyles and communities. Steps such as assessments, policy creation, financial analysis, and management processes are occurring around the country to create and validate a method for building healthy communities, and departments are gaining credibility as a public health provider.

National Trends

In October, 2010 the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s Vulnerable Populations Portfolio shared thoughts on how health is impacted by where and how we live, learn, work, and play. The factors below demonstrate the connection that nonmedical factors play in where health starts before illness sets in.

Where We Live
Residential instability has adverse health impacts. Examples include: Homeless children are more vulnerable to mental health problems, developmental delays, and depression than children who are stably housed.
Difficulty keeping up with mortgage payments may be linked to lower levels of psychological well-being and a greater likelihood of seeing a doctor.

The connection between access to public transportation and health studies found that people who live in counties with high “sprawl indexes” were likely to have a higher body mass index than people living in more compact counties.

Convenient, affordable, and available eating habits result from inability to move from place to place within the community. PolicyLink and the Food Trust, two non-profits focused on expanding access to fresh foods where low-income people live, have found that “decreased access to healthy food means people in low-income communities suffer more from diet-related diseases like obesity and diabetes than those in higher-income neighborhoods with easy access to healthy food, particularly fresh fruits, and vegetables.”

Communities without crime are healthier. Researchers from the Baltimore Memory Study found that residents living in the most dangerous neighborhoods were nearly twice as likely to be obese as those living in the least dangerous neighborhoods.

**Where We Work**
The relationship between work and health is critical to creating productive environments. Investing in the right ways to support employees, businesses can help create a workforce that is less stressed and more content. The net result: a happier, healthier workforce which is more productive and yields better results.

An approach such as “lifestyle leave” to take care of the inevitable personal and family needs that arise is a valuable asset for many of the parents. Programs which help provide employees with the peace of mind also help them to breathe and work more easily.

Business leaders and employees alike should view work as a place of opportunity — a source of support, satisfaction, and motivation, which can offer mutual benefits when done right.

**Where We Learn**
Eight times more lives can be saved with education than with medical advances. Without graduating from high school, one is likely to earn less money and struggle to make ends meet, work longer hours (and maybe even two jobs) just to feed a family, and live in a compromised neighborhood without access to healthy food.

Better educated people have more opportunities to make healthier decisions. They have the money and access necessary to buy and eat healthier foods.

Data from the National Longitudinal Mortality Study indicates that people with higher education levels live five to seven years longer than those who do not finish high school.

In South Carolina, leaders improved the health of citizens by strengthening their education system. A coalition of business and community leaders, politicians, educators, and parents came together to support a one-cent sales tax to fund education improvement.

Schools are not just centers of teaching and learning, they are places that provide the opportunity to improve the health of all Americans.
Where We Play
Play is a profound biological process that shapes brain function. Play prompts us to be continually, joyously, physically active, combating obesity and enhancing overall health and well-being.

Play can interrupt the damage done by chronic stress, and even gives the immune system some relief.

Play is a basic need – a biological requirement for normal growth and development. Scientists associated with the National Institute for Play are united in their concern about “play undernutrition,” noting that the corrosive effects of this form of starvation gradually erode emotional, cognitive and physiologic well-being – a major aspect of sedentary, obesity, and poor stress management can be readily linked to play starvation.

Providing places to spend leisure time and recreate are critical to creating healthy communities.

Additional National Healthy Lifestyle Trends
The population is becoming more diverse. As demographics are experiencing an age and ethnic shift, so too are landscapes, daily lifestyles, and habits changing. The number of adults over the age of 65 has increased, and lifestyle changes have encouraged less physical activity. Collectively, these trends have created profound implications for the way local governments conduct business. Below are examples of trends and government responses.

According to the article “Outdoor Exercise ‘Healthier than Gym Workouts,’” published in March 2011, researchers found that going for a run outdoors is better than exercising in the gym because it has a positive impact on mental, as well as physical health. Levels of tension, confusion, anger, and depression were found to be lowered. This aligns with the trend of adult fitness playgrounds that are popping up all over the world.

Café Plus Concepts – Mather’s Cafes are opening around the country to attract Boomers and seniors. The concept is more than a café. The “plus” offers leisure activities, trips/tours, educational offerings, social opportunities, and fitness. These concepts can be integrated into community centers or stand-alone facilities.

Essential services, healthy food options, workplaces, and other destinations are frequently not located within easy walking or bicycling distance from where people live, work, learn, and play.

The link between health and the built environment continues to grow as a trend for local governments. They are increasingly incorporating active living and physical activity into daily routines.

O. Multiculturalism
The world of business today is more diverse than it ever was. Learning to adapt to this diversity can prove difficult. Cornell University explains that diversity is, “about learning from others who are not the same, about dignity and respect for all, and about creating workplace environments and practices to encourage learning from others and capture the advantage of diverse perspectives.” By examining the current trends in diversity, organizations begin to understand how those trends impact the business world today.
Racial Diversity

The American workforce is becoming increasingly racially diverse. The National Institute for Policy and Higher Education reported in 2005 that by 2020, minorities will make up an additional 20 percent of the work force. These numbers are only predicted to increase. In 2009 article entitled “The End of White America?” The Atlantic reported that by the year 2042, the aggregate number of minorities in the United States will outnumber of White Americans.

Multicultural Communities

Cultural and ethnic diversity adds a unique flavor to communities expressed through distinct neighborhoods, multicultural learning environments, restaurants, places of worship, museums, and nightlife. This influence is prevalent in the Charleston from residents to tourists.

Multiculturalism and Marketing

Recent articles in parks and recreation have addressed multicultural and diversity issues in the leisure service profession. These articles are positive, because as the recreation field continues to function within a more diverse society, race and ethnicity will become increasingly important in every aspect of the profession. More than ever, recreation professionals will be expected to work with, and have significant knowledge and understanding of, individuals from many cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds.

Today the marketplace for consumers has dramatically evolved in the United States from a largely Anglo demographic, to the reality that the United States has shifted to a large minority consumer base known as “new majority.”

The San Jose Group, a consortium of marketing communications companies specializing in reaching Hispanic and non-Hispanic markets of the United States, suggests that today’s multicultural population of the United States, or the “new majority,” is 107.6 million, which translates to about 35.1 percent of the country’s total population. The United States’ multicultural population alone could essentially be the 12th largest country in the world. Parks and recreation trends in marketing and providing leisure services continue to emerge and should be taken into consideration in all planning efforts.

Economic and Health Benefits of Parks

There are numerous economic and health benefits of parks, including the following:

- Trails, parks, and playgrounds are among the five most important community amenities considered when selecting a home.
- Research from the University of Illinois shows that trees, parks, and green spaces have a profound impact on people’s health and mental outlook.
- US Forest Service research indicates that when the economic benefits produced by trees are assessed, the total value can be two to six times the cost for tree planting and care.
- Fifty percent of Americans regard outdoor activities as their main source of exercise.
The Trust for Public Land has published a report titled: The Benefits of Parks: Why America Needs More County Parks and Open Space. The report makes the following observations about the health, economic, environmental, and social benefits of parks and open space:

- Physical activity makes people healthier.
- Physical activity increases with access to parks.
- Contact with the natural world improves physical and physiological health.
- Residential and commercial property values increase.
- Value is added to community and economic development sustainability.
- Benefits of tourism are enhanced.
- Trees are effective in improving air quality and act as natural air conditioners.
- Trees assist with storm water control and erosion.
- Crime and juvenile delinquency are reduced.
- Recreational opportunities for all ages are provided.
- Stable neighborhoods and strong communities are created.

Researchers have long touted the benefits of outdoor exercise. According to a study published in the Journal of Environmental Science and Technology by the University of Essex in the United Kingdom, “as little as five minutes of green exercise improves both mood and self-esteem.” A new trend emerging in parks and recreation aims to enable people to reap these benefits by working out on outdoor fitness equipment.

This trend started in China as they prepared to host the 2008 Summer Olympics. Their aim was to promote a society that promoted physical fitness. The United States is now catching up on this trend, as park and recreation departments have begun installing “outdoor gyms.” According to John Drew from ExerSkys, “The equipment is designed to use resistance of the body and weight.”

Equipment that can be found in these outdoor gyms is comparable to what would be found in an indoor workout facility, such as leg and chest presses, elliptical trainers, pull down trainers, etc. With no additional equipment such as weights and resistance bands, the gear is fairly easy to install.

Outdoor fitness equipment provides a new opportunity for parks and recreation departments to increase the health of their communities, while offering them the opportunity to exercise outdoors. Such equipment can increase the usage of parks, trails, and other outdoor amenities while helping to fight the obesity epidemic and increase the community’s interaction with nature.

Q. Nature Programming

The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) sent out a survey to member agencies in order to learn more about the programs and facilities that public park and recreation agencies provide to connect children and their families with nature. A summary of the results follow:

- Sixty-eight percent (68%) of public parks and recreation agencies offer nature-based programming, and 61 percent have nature-based facilities.
- The most common programs include nature hikes, nature-oriented arts and crafts, fishing-related events, and nature-based education in cooperation with local schools.
When asked to describe the elements that directly contribute to their most successful programs, agencies listed staff training as most important followed by program content and number of staff/staff training.

When asked what resources would be needed most to expand programming, additional staff was most important followed by funding.

Of the agencies that do not currently offer nature-based programming, 90 percent indicated that they want to in the future. Additional staff and funding were again the most important resources these agencies would need going forward.

The most common facilities include: nature parks/preserves, self-guided nature trails, outdoor classrooms, and nature centers.

When asked to describe the elements that directly contribute to their most successful facilities, agencies listed funding as most important followed by presence of wildlife and community support.

Figures from the Association for Interpretative Naturalists, a national group of nature professionals, illustrate that nature-based programs are on the rise. According to Tim Merriman, the association’s executive director, the group was founded in 1954 with 40 members. It now boasts 4,800 members, with research indicating that about 20,000 paid interpreters are working nationally, along with an army of more than 500,000 unpaid volunteers staffing nature programs at parks, zoos, and museums. The growth of these programs is thought to come from replacing grandparents as the teacher to these outdoor programs. It is also speculated that a return to natural roots and renewed interest in life’s basic elements was spurred as a response to the events of September 11, 2001.

R. Outdoor Recreation

Local parks and recreation departments are a common place for residents to look when getting outside for leisure activities. It is often the mission of parks departments, as well as of private or non-profits, to get more people outdoors.

The Outdoor Foundation released the “2010 Participation in Outdoor Recreation” report. The report highlights growth in nature based outdoor activities and continued decline in youth outdoor participation. The Foundation states that trends show the beginning of adjustments in American lifestyles brought about by a challenging economy, shifting demographics, and changing times. Their research brought the following key findings.

Participation in Outdoor Recreation

Return to Nature: Nearly 50 percent of Americans ages six and older participated in outdoor recreation in 2009. That is a slight increase from 2008 and equates to a total of 137.8 million Americans.

Fitness and Health Benefits: Outdoor participants rate their fitness level at 6.4 on a 10-point scale versus 4.9 for nonparticipants. In terms of health, outdoor participants rate their health level at 7.5 versus 6.6 for non-participants.
Preservation of Land: The majority of Americans agree that preserving undeveloped land for outdoor recreation is important. A large percentage of outdoor participants also believe that developing local parks and hiking and walking trails is important and that there should be more outdoor education and activities during the school day.

Youth Participation

More Indoor Youth: An overall downward slide in outdoor recreation participation among 6 to 12 year olds has been realized.

The Influence of Family: Most youth are introduced to outdoor activities by parents, friends, family, and relatives.

Physical education in schools: The importance cannot be understated. Among adults ages 18 and older who are current outdoor participants, 83 percent say they had PE in school between the ages of 6 and 12. That compares with just 70 percent of non-outdoor participants.

5. Riparian and Watershed Best Practices

The ability to detect trends and monitor attributes in watershed and/or riparian areas allows planners opportunities to evaluate the effectiveness of their management plan. By monitoring their own trends, planners can also identify changes in resource conditions that are the result of pressures beyond their control. Trend detection requires a commitment to long-term monitoring of riparian areas and vegetation attributes.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency, (EPA) suggests the following steps to building an effective watershed management plan. See Water.epa.gov for more information from the EPA.

- Build partnerships
- Characterize the watershed
- Set goals and identify solutions
- Design and implementation program
- Implement the watershed plan
- Measure progress and make adjustments

7. Role and Response of Local Government

Collectively, these trends have created profound implications for the way local governments conduct business. Some local governments are now accepting the role of providing preventative health care through parks and recreation services. The following are facts from the International County/County Management Association.

- Eighty-nine percent (89%) believe Parks and Recreation departments should take the lead in developing communities conducive to active living.
- Nearly 84 percent supported recreation programs that encourage active living in their community.
- Forty-five percent (45%) believe the highest priority is a cohesive system of parks and trails and accessible neighborhood parks.
In summary, the United States of America, its states, and its communities share the enormous task of reducing the health and economic burden of obesity. While numerous programs, policies, and products have been designed to address the problem, there is no magic bullet to make it go away. The role of public parks and recreation as a health promotion and prevention agency has come of age. What matters is refocusing the organization’s efforts to insure the health, well-being, and economic prosperity of their communities and their citizens.

Administration Trends for Recreation and Parks

Municipal parks and recreation structures and delivery systems have changed, and more alternative methods of delivering services are emerging. Certain services are being contracted out and cooperative agreements with non-profit groups and other public institutions are being developed. Newer partners include the health system, social services, justice system, education, the corporate sector, and community service agencies. These partnerships reflect both a broader interpretation of the mandate of parks and recreation agencies and the increased willingness of other sectors to work together to address community issues. The relationship with health agencies is vital in promoting wellness.

The traditional relationship with education and the sharing of facilities through joint-use agreements is evolving into cooperative planning and programming aimed at addressing youth inactivity levels and community needs.

Listed below are additional administrative national trends:

- Level of subsidy for programs is lessening and more “enterprise” activities are being developed, thereby allowing subsidy to be used where deemed appropriate.
- Information technology allows for better tracking and reporting.
- Pricing is often determined by peak, off-peak, and off-season rates.
- More agencies are partnering with private, public, and non-profit groups.

Agency Accreditation

Parks and Recreation agencies are affirming their competencies and value through accreditation. This is achieved by an agency’s commitment to 150 standards.

There are currently 109 agencies around the nation that have received the Commission for Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) accreditation. In South Carolina, only the Richland County Recreation Commission is accredited.

Additional benefits of CAPRA accreditation include:

- Boosts staff morale
- Encourages collaboration
- Improves program outcomes
- Identifies agency and cost efficiencies
- Builds high level of trust with the public
- Demonstrates promise of quality
- Identifies best management practices

Accreditation is a distinguished mark of excellence that affords external recognition of an organization’s commitment to quality and improvement.

Accreditation has two fundamental purposes – to ensure quality and to ensure improvement.

The National Recreation and Parks Association administratively sponsors two distinct accreditation programs. The Council on Accreditation of Parks, Recreation, Tourism, and Related Professions (COAPRT) approves Academic institutions and Commission for Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) approves agencies. It is the only national accreditation of parks and recreation agencies, and is a valuable measure of an agency’s overall quality of operation, management, and service to the community.
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance

On September 14, 2010 the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) issued an amended regulation implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA 2010 Standards). On March 15, 2011 the amended Act became effective and, for the first time in history, includes recreation environment design requirements. Compliance of the regulations were to be effective March 15, 2012. This includes design and construction requirements and the development of three-year transition plan. By March 15, 2015 implementation of the three-year transition plan must be complete.

The Role of the ADA
How a community interprets and implements the guidelines of the ADA regarding parks and recreation programs and services for children, youth, and adults with disabilities ultimately depends upon the philosophy of staff and how accepting they are of people with disabilities. Some organizations provide a basic level of service as per the law and other communities embrace the notion of accessibility and choose to exceed what is expected.

Community therapeutic recreation programs must address the needs of all people with disabilities. Disabilities may include autism, developmental, physical, learning, visual impairments, hearing impairments, mental health, and more. Community therapeutic recreation programs should also serve children, youth, and adults of all ages.

The types of programs offered by a community therapeutic recreation program may include specialized, inclusive, and unified programs. Specialized recreation programs generally serve the needs specifically for someone with a disability. A “Learn to Swim” program for children with autism or an exercise program for adults with arthritis are just two examples of specialized programs. An inclusive program is one in which a person with a disability chooses to participate in a regular recreation program with a reasonable accommodation, alongside typical peers who do not have a disability. A third type of program is a unified program. This program is for individuals with and without disabilities who participate together as a “buddy,” or are paired or matched – able-bodied with disabled. Many Special Olympic programs are offered as unified programs.

Funding

According to Recreation Management magazine’s, “2011 State of the Industry Report,” from fiscal 2010 to fiscal 2012, the largest increases in operating budgets are expected among community centers, where State of the Industry survey respondents are expecting a 12.4 percent increase to operating expenditures, and among camps at 11 percent. The lowest increases are found among health clubs, where respondents projected a 0.4 percent increase to operating budgets, and colleges at 3.1 percent.

YMCAst reported the highest operating expenditures for fiscal 2010 at $2,008,000, 40.7 percent more than the across-the-board average. They were followed by parks and recreation at $1,614,000, 13.1 percent more. The lowest operating expenditures in 2010 were found among community centers at $923,000 and camps, at $991,000.
Marketing

Niche marketing trends have experienced change more frequently than ever before as technology affects the way the public receives information. Web 2.0 tools and now Web 3.0 tools are a trend for agencies to use as a means of marketing programs and services. Popular social marketing electronic tools include:

- Facebook
- Google +
- Twitter
- You Tube
- Tagged
- LinkedIn

Mobile marketing is a trend of the future. Young adults engage in mobile data applications at much higher rates than adults in age brackets 30 and older. Usage rates of mobile applications demonstrate that chronologically across four major age cohorts, millennials tend to get information more frequently using mobile devices such as smart phones. For example, 95 percent of 18-to-29-year-old cell phone owners send and receive text messages, compared to 82 percent of 30-to-49-year-olds, 57 percent of 50-to-64-year-olds, and 19 percent of 65 and older. It is also a fact that minority Americans lead the way when it comes to mobile access. Nearly two-thirds of African-Americans (64%) and Latinos (63%) are wireless internet users, and minority Americans are significantly more likely to own a cell phone than are their white counterparts (87 percent of blacks and Hispanics own a cell phone, compared with 80 percent of whites).

U. Therapeutic Recreation

Nationally, therapeutic recreation as a service is experiencing many struggles and challenges. The changing face of health care is having a dramatic effect on therapeutic recreation (TR) services in many rehabilitation settings and specifically in physical rehabilitation settings, thus affecting community recreation programs.

A secondary issue caused by the decreased stay is the need for a clinical facility to promote community reintegration. In the past, clinical facilities provided programs such as wheelchair basketball, but due to the reduction of expenditures, facilities no longer provide such services and expect communities to address these needs.

The fundamental goal of TR services is to enable participants to return successfully to their communities. This not only means that they need to have the functional skill, but also that they have physical and social environments in the community that are receptive to the individual.

Another trend is the renewed focus on serving people with psychiatric disabilities. In 2004, The National Council on Disability (NCD) issued a comprehensive report, *Livable Communities for Adults with Disabilities*. This report identified six elements for improving the quality of life for all citizens, including children, youth, and adults with disabilities. The six elements are:

1. Provides affordable, appropriate, accessible housing
2. Ensures accessible, affordable, reliable, safe transportation
3. Adjusts the physical environment for inclusiveness and accessibility
4. Provides work, volunteer, and education opportunities
5. Ensures access to key health and support services
6. Encourages participation in civic, cultural, social, and recreational activities
The right to enjoy services and programs offered to all members by both public and private entities is the essence of the elements. Unlike persons with physical disabilities, people with psychiatric disabilities face attitudinal barriers of those around them. Attitudinal barriers are exemplified by policies, programs, and beliefs about psychiatric disabilities. Fortunately, the mental health system is moving toward a model based on recovery. This model believes that everyone with a mental health diagnosis is able and capable of living independently within the community with supports.

Across the nation, the current financial condition has also put constraints on community recreation programs. Staff are cutting budgets, yet also trying to determine how to provide recreation services to people with disabilities.

V. Trends Analysis Summary

The following key industry and behavioral trends are reflective of Charleston County. These will be important to evaluate for future planning efforts and include the following:

- Active transportation programs, policy, and funding are getting recognition in communities across the Country.

- There is an increasing trend toward indoor leisure and therapeutic pools. Additional amenities like “spray pads” are becoming increasingly popular as well.

- The top five athletic activities ranked by total participation included: exercise walking, exercising with equipment, swimming, camping, and aerobic exercising.

- The United Health Foundation has ranked South Carolina 45th in its 2011 State Health Rankings.

- Therapeutic recreation programs and inclusion services are considered an important trend when planning for the future.

- Fitness programs, educational programs, teen programs, mind body balance, and active adults were listed at the top of the ten programs that parks and recreation departments are planning to add within the next three years.

- The most common programs offered in communities are holiday events and other special events, fitness programs, educational programs, day camps, and summer camps; mind-body/balance programs such as yoga, tai chi, Pilates, and martial arts; and youth sports teams.

- Trails, parks, and playgrounds are among the five most important community amenities considered when selecting a home.

- National trends in the delivery of parks and recreation systems reflect more partnerships and contractual agreements reaching out to the edges of the community to support specialized services.

- The majority of Americans agree that preserving undeveloped land for outdoor recreation is important. A large percentage of outdoor participants also believe that developing local parks and hiking and walking trails is important and that there should be more outdoor education and activities during the school day.
Parks and recreation administration trends include increased partnerships, agency accreditation, and enterprising budgets. Web-based niche marketing tools are more popular for agencies to use as a means of marketing programs and services.

By March 15, 2012 an ADA transition plan must be in place with organizations to demonstrate compliance to the amended regulations.
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A. Partnerships

Local government agencies should pursue partnerships with land trusts and land managers to make more effective use of their land acquisition funds and strategies. The following offers recommendations on how these partnerships could be strengthened.

Land Trusts

Land trust organizations are valuable partners when it comes to acquiring land and rights-of-way for parks and greenways. These groups can work directly with landowners and conduct their business in private so that sensitive land transactions are handled in an appropriate manner. Once the transaction has occurred, the land trust will usually convey the acquired land or easement to a public agency, such as a town or county, for permanent stewardship and ownership.

Private Land Managers

Another possible partnership that could be strengthened would be with the utility companies that manage land throughout the region. Trails and greenways can be built on rights-of-ways that are either owned or leased by electric and natural gas companies. Electric utility companies have long recognized the value of partnering with local communities, non-profit trail organizations, and private land owners to permit their rights-of-ways to be used for trail development. This has occurred all over the United States and throughout North Carolina.

Local government agencies should actively update and maintain relationships with private utility and land managers to ensure that community wide bicycle, pedestrian, and greenway systems can be accommodated within these rights-of-way. The respective municipalities will need to demonstrate to these companies that maintenance will be addressed, liability will be reduced and minimized, and access to utility needs will be provided.

B. Government Regulation

Regulation is defined as the government’s ability to control the use and development of land through legislative powers. Regulatory methods help shape the use of land without transferring or selling the land. The following types of development ordinances are regulatory tools that can meet the challenges of projected suburban growth and development as well as conserve and protect greenway resources.
Growth Management Measures (Concurrency)

Concurrency-based development approaches to growth management simply limit development to areas with adequate public infrastructure. This helps regulate urban sprawl, provides for quality of life in new development, and can help protect open space. In the famous case with the Town of Ramapo (1972), the Town initiated a zoning ordinance making the issue of a development permit contingent on the presence of public facilities such as utilities and parks. This was upheld in Court and initiated a wave of slow-growth management programs nationwide. This type of growth management can take the form of an adequate public facilities ordinance.

Performance Zoning

Performance zoning is zoning based on standards that establish minimum requirements or maximum limits on the effects or characteristics of a use. This is often used for the mixing of different uses to minimize incompatibility and improve the quality of development. For example, how a commercial use
Appendix I – SWOT Analysis
Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission

SWOT Analysis Results

July 2012
Current condition

**Strengths** →
positioned for preservation or advancement – core competencies

**Weaknesses** →
may provide negative impacts, or are detrimental or harmful

**Opportunities** →
opportunity for enhancement or development

**Threats** →
challenge provided by unfavorable trend, event, or development

**Internal Influences**

**External or Environmental Influences**

SWOT Analysis
### Major Strength / High Importance
- High degree of governmental autonomy
- Positive employee culture – good employee morale
- Logo/branding/image/marketing/reputation
- High standards
- Quality & well maintained facility/programs; diverse
- Commission understands role; doesn’t micromanage
- Relationship with media
- Financial management & enterprise approach
- Relationships/partnerships with agencies/public
- Leadership/commitment to core values
- Problem solving empowerment culture
- Staff experience/talent/knowledge/certifications
- Employee buy-in
- Staff-driven organization; staff empowerment
- Customer service/accommodating
- Family oriented
- Land resources; diversity
- Planning/agency vision/sustainability/innovative
- Safety
- Affordable
- Staff retention
- Number of first responders on staff

### Major Weakness / High Importance
- Too much paper-moving; procedures/protocol; Bureaucracy; slow decision-making
- Work-load balance with quality; project completion
- Busy; going in a lot of directions – summer impact
- Growth
- Technology
- Unqualified employees/accountability/inequity
- Aging facilities/infrastructure/maintenance
- $2,500 purchasing cap barrier
- Communication
- Resistance to change/support after change is made
- Training/accessibility for those with special needs
- Marketing/self-promotion
- Partnership with CCSD
- Staff resources (support and other); spread too thin
- Lack of overall structure/efficiency/direction
- Decision-making doesn’t always consider staff end user or front line perspective
- Salaries & office space
- Sponsorship

### Performance Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Lack of grievance policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job training; professional development</td>
<td>Restricted flex schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire from within</td>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion staff</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Strength / Medium Importance</th>
<th>Major Weakness / Medium Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; office space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- High Importance
- Medium Importance
Potential Solutions for Weaknesses

- Communication
  - Accountability
  - Require use of Outlook
  - Use tools provided
  - Written procedures
  - Standardization of outlets
  - One message from top
  - Disseminating responsible party
  - Willingness to listen
Potential Solutions for Weaknesses

• **Bureaucratic – Red tape – Inefficient Processes**
  • Consistency
  • Streamline
  • Trust
  • Standardization
  • Eliminate redundancy
  • Going electronic
  • Raise the $2,500 cap
Potential Solutions for Weaknesses

• **Do more with less**” mentality
  - Hire more people

• **Technology**
  - Software upgrades; CLASS registration system
  - Bandwidth
  - Buy what works
  - Financial software; point of sale
  - Vision/technology plan
  - TRC Ap
Potential Solutions for Weaknesses

• **Self promotion/marketing**
  • Consistency
  • Target audiences
  • Track success
  • Data collection
  • Technology
  • Utilize market data
  • Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Attractive / Low Probability of Success</th>
<th>Highly Attractive / High Probability of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Storage</td>
<td>• Outdoor music venue; large event venue; weddings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Updated/more office space</td>
<td>• Extreme activities; outdoor adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural events (more)</td>
<td>• More races (road, mud); special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dry-stack boat storage</td>
<td>• Cross divisional mentoring; home office/job share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnerships with private business</td>
<td>• National accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adventure center</td>
<td>• ADA; special needs; accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campgrounds; gym for campground; upgrade cabins</td>
<td>• Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park based interpreters</td>
<td>• LEED buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beach parking</td>
<td>• Facilities &amp; buses in rural areas; rural outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expansion to new areas of county</td>
<td>• Sponsorships; partnerships; add. funding; grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop undeveloped parks</td>
<td>• Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand programs into other parks</td>
<td>• Trails to connect parks; greenways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation of the agency master plan</td>
<td>• Diversified programming; swimming lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organized sports</td>
<td>• Technology advancements; upgrade equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facility renovations</td>
<td>• Finish master plans for day parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paddle/boat center; golf course</td>
<td>• Overnight accommodations; camping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marketing – 30 minute TV show on local channel</td>
<td>• Develop more facilities; art center; indoor aquatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cruise industry; film industry</td>
<td>• Specialty training; part-time staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanding waterpark amenities</td>
<td>• Expansions; land acquisition &amp; development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint ventures with companies/municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New outdoor programming (adventure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restructuring to have interpretive staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adding park managers residences – security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision making in community education programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Attractiveness / Low Probability of Success

Opportunity Matrix

• Water-based facility; tours of facilities
• Learning from other agencies
• Specialized training/networking
• Environmental education; recycling, composting
• Greenhouse/horticulture center; garden; sod farm

Low Attractiveness / High Probability of Success

Success Probability

| Low | High |
### Lower Seriousness / Low Probability of Occurrence
- Inclusion into other government entity
- Incidents/trust
- Government funding; loss of funding
- General public
- Natural wildlife conflicts (birds/hogs)
- Lack of public interest/trust
- Weather
- Terrorist attack; epidemics; crime
- County council; politics
- Legal restrictions
- Bad PR

### Highly Serious / High Probability of Occurrence
- Funding; taxes; economy; depending on partners
- Competitive wages
- Bureaucracy
- Highway 526
- Evergreen job assessments
- Aging facilities
- Private industry; competition; land development
- Weather; hurricanes; climate change; erosion
- Residential/commercial development (wildlife issues)
- Politics; liabilities; legislation
- Limited resource (personnel, money, etc.)
- Over extension/decentralization
- Over crowding due to population growth
- Geographical size of county
- Urban sprawl
- Not enough volunteers

### Threat Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Seriousness / Low Probability of Occurrence</th>
<th>Low Probability of Occurrence</th>
<th>High Seriousness / High Probability of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Competition</td>
<td>• Politics/appointments</td>
<td>• Politics/appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in trends</td>
<td>• Media</td>
<td>• Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employee turnover</td>
<td>• Decreased security at events</td>
<td>• Decreased security at events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipality control</td>
<td>• Lawsuits</td>
<td>• Lawsuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health insurance spikes</td>
<td>• Vandalism/theft</td>
<td>• Vandalism/theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost of doing business</td>
<td>• Competition</td>
<td>• Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General public/anti-government</td>
<td>• Changing trends</td>
<td>• Changing trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Year-round schooling</td>
<td>• Retirement system</td>
<td>• Retirement system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lose tax revenue</td>
<td>• Lose tax revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>