

CTC Information

As requested, below and attached is some information on the CTC governance structure, % spent on the state system and expenditure information. I would encourage the Committee to consider visiting our webpage at www.scdot.org/doing/cProgram.aspx#laws to view more information on the C Program.

County Transportation Committee Appointments and Responsibilities:

In 1992, a lawsuit was filed against the state claiming the C Fund Program was unconstitutional because it allowed the Legislature to directly control the expenditure of funds they had appropriated themselves. The State Supreme Court agreed and in 1994 the C Fund statutes were revised by removing the legislative delegation's control and creating County Transportation Committees (CTCs). Present legislation, South Carolina Code of Laws §12-28-2740 (the C fund statute), requires each county to have a CTC. Members of the CTC must be appointed by the county legislative delegation. There is no prescribed number of members for the CTC. All CTCs must be made up of fair representation from municipalities and unincorporated areas of the county. A county's legislative delegation may by delegation resolution abolish the CTC and devolve its powers and duties to the governing body of the county. This devolution may be reversed and the CTC reestablished by a subsequent delegation resolution. There is no standard established by law as to how a county legislative delegation makes their Committee selections and appointments.

The responsibilities of the CTC include the selection of transportation projects and the approval of C fund expenditures based on their annual income. CTCs are also responsible for the formation and necessary maintenance of a county transportation plan. It is desirable for the CTC to coordinate with the local South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) offices regarding the state roads which are to be improved. This may avoid duplication of effort and possible conflicts with ongoing SCDOT road projects and maintenance activities. CTCs are encouraged to obtain SCDOT's state secondary road ranking list or input from their local SCDOT field office in order to assist the Committee in the selection of resurfacing projects. Paragraph (C) of the C fund statute states that C funds can be used as follows:

"At least twenty-five (25%) percent of a county's apportionment of "C" funds must be expended on the state highway system for construction, improvements and maintenance....The county transportation committee, at its discretion, may expend up to seventy-five (75%) percent of "C" construction funds for activities including other local paving or improving county roads, for street and traffic signs, and for other road and bridge projects."

SCDOT provides the following guidance to CTCs for selecting local paving projects, which are projects not on the state highway system: C funds are for transportation projects on public property and must be accessible to the public.

SCDOT Program Administration:

Each County Transportation Committee has the option of administering the county's C Program or may request SCDOT to administer the county's program. Under the SCDOT type of Program Administration, when a project is "programmed," it is placed by the Department on a list of approved projects and funds are allocated or obligated for the project. Projects may be programmed if funds are available to pay the estimated project cost. To initiate a state or local road project, the CTC submits a "Request for Programming" form to SCDOT. This form indicates the description of the project including the type of improvement to be made, the project termini, costs, and the government agency that the CTC desires to be responsible for the work. SCDOT will verify that funds are available, confirm that the project type is appropriate for the C program, assign a project identification number, and notify the entity responsible for the project management that funds have been committed. SCDOT will maintain financial records for the project and pay, from the county's C fund allocation, invoices for the project not to exceed the amount approved by the CTC. Projects include various types of work such as grading and paving, resurfacing, intersection improvements, drainage improvements and sidewalk construction on the existing highway system.

For state road projects developed and bid by SCDOT, contract field management shall be provided by SCDOT. This service includes management of the construction project, inspection, and materials testing. The contract field management activities assure that the project is built to high standards in compliance with the plans and specifications, and that payment is commensurate with the construction progress and quality standards. SCDOT does not manage the development or construction of local paving projects.

Self-Administered Program Administration:

Self-Administration of the program includes the management of finances, accounting, and record keeping. It also includes compliance with all provisions of state law applicable to the C Program including the submittal by December of each year an annual financial report illustrating project expenditures to SCDOT. Specifically, a Self-Administered CTC must ensure it meets the minimum requirements for expenditures on the state highway system, adherence to procurement requirements, and compliance with project selection requirements. Furthermore, the CTC must assign to appropriate entities project responsibilities including project management, engineering, right of way acquisition, and construction services for its projects.

A CTC choosing to administer its own C Program will receive a monthly allocation of funds from the County Transportation Fund. These funds are held and managed by the CTC for the payment of all qualified and eligible costs of engineering, construction, and inspection for its projects. Interest earned on funds held by the CTC is accrued to the committee's account to be used in the same manner as the original C Funds.

Annual Reports and SCDOT Compliance Reviews:

Currently 19 of the 46 CTCs are Self-Administered. These CTCs are required by Section D of South Carolina Code of Laws §12-28-2740 to prepare and submit to the South Carolina Department of Transportation each year a financial report listing funds expended. Expenditures must be documented on a per project basis and are to include a description of the completed project and a general accounting of all expenditures made in connection with the project. These individual reports are then compiled by SCDOT into an annual statewide report and submitted to the General Assembly by the second Tuesday of January of each year. The latest C Program Annual Report (SFY 13-14) prepared by SCDOT has been provided to the House Legislative Oversight Committee staff.

Paragraph (P) of the C fund statute requires compliance reviews by SCDOT of these 19 Committees based on the information supplied to the Department in the Committee's annual reports to ensure that each CTC is complying with paragraphs (C), (D), (F), and (I) of the statute. The reviews include spot checking individual project expenditures and financial record keeping but are not considered an audit. Each CTC is reviewed to ensure a sufficient quantity of transportation related projects have been programmed on the state highway system to comply with the law. Furthermore, the balance of uncommitted funds carried forward from one year into the next is checked to ensure they did not exceed three hundred percent of the county's total apportionment for the most recent year. If there are discrepancies in the project documentation or questions regarding management of C Funds, a formal audit may be requested. Funds may be withheld from CTCs who fail to comply with the law.

CTC FUNDS EXPENDED ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM FROM FY 08-09 THRU FY 13-14

County	Percent Expended FY 08-09	Percent Expended FY 09-10	Percent Expended FY 10-11	Percent Expended FY 11-12	Percent Expended FY 12-13	Percent Expended FY 13-14
Abbeville	48.25%	6.33%	44.51%	29.45%	25.42%	32.78%
Aiken	105.64%	101.69%	74.43%	25.00%	111.75%	62.83%
Allendale	187.85%	3.51%	97.03%	-7.86%	129.61%	-9.27%
Anderson	114.77%	23.28%	67.68%	55.33%	29.60%	74.48%
Bamberg	32.74%	62.05%	248.51%	21.87%	31.15%	264.77%
Barnwell	42.29%	54.11%	13.47%	37.62%	12.94%	58.78%
Beaufort	22.26%	42.00%	59.00%	0.00%	64.99%	0.00%
Berkeley	18.33%	140.48%	116.71%	4.84%	120.00%	-16.09%
Calhoun	120.46%	52.04%	66.61%	22.59%	38.69%	23.35%
Charleston	55.59%	54.57%	59.79%	164.40%	171.15%	71.74%
Cherokee	68.26%	29.30%	58.58%	35.10%	77.13%	27.37%
Chester	32.87%	25.76%	32.13%	48.51%	4.59%	45.51%
Chesterfield	56.03%	80.68%	62.95%	0.18%	50.34%	4.52%
Clarendon	36.40%	19.94%	34.19%	25.76%	26.40%	23.93%
Colleton	18.04%	125.10%	10.03%	68.03%	93.45%	-11.30%
Darlington	74.81%	23.96%	32.40%	35.81%	109.02%	112.20%
Dillon	31.60%	44.45%	48.36%	34.00%	90.59%	35.26%
Dorchester	46.33%	39.85%	46.94%	17.92%	36.71%	18.68%
Edgefield	48.50%	25.91%	82.87%	31.45%	19.82%	38.06%
Fairfield	63.06%	0.00%	62.26%	14.87%	40.79%	19.91%
Florence	136.63%	134.50%	76.40%	217.31%	52.82%	80.71%
Georgetown	30.85%	44.84%	74.01%	50.95%	24.63%	29.91%
Greenville	101.76%	104.05%	73.46%	38.33%	37.30%	43.81%
Greenwood	68.00%	28.18%	37.49%	37.60%	23.06%	37.40%
Hampton	0.00%	51.10%	18.00%	75.07%	-0.88%	53.21%
Horry	105.13%	109.42%	46.58%	123.18%	92.34%	80.81%
Jasper	124.37%	37.14%	100.06%	18.80%	47.30%	57.07%
Kershaw	73.20%	53.16%	93.93%	4.57%	53.78%	55.20%
Lancaster	25.25%	37.22%	33.06%	10.28%	39.85%	29.38%
Laurens	56.19%	45.67%	48.10%	25.29%	26.29%	44.33%
Lee	187.51%	203.59%	11.22%	98.96%	38.35%	103.37%
Lexington	62.50%	8.66%	50.45%	4.93%	45.33%	9.54%
McCormick	120.27%	105.88%	50.35%	69.20%	34.46%	107.28%
Marion	59.86%	-0.26%	56.57%	61.88%	23.25%	49.45%
Marlboro	35.34%	32.02%	87.09%	75.72%	63.81%	30.76%
Newberry	78.77%	59.49%	36.84%	101.71%	58.92%	42.60%
Oconee	35.04%	163.89%	42.58%	10.42%	39.53%	81.04%
Orangeburg	128.40%	94.77%	24.88%	47.53%	24.39%	32.71%
Pickens	171.90%	65.25%	10.19%	115.77%	135.76%	35.10%
Richland	21.28%	6.99%	25.04%	63.99%	57.63%	14.14%
Saluda	94.62%	-6.00%	83.93%	25.08%	28.20%	43.76%
Spartanburg	73.70%	22.64%	76.30%	22.74%	93.97%	5.40%
Sumter	56.12%	96.28%	21.22%	37.44%	15.66%	38.92%
Union	81.92%	110.75%	213.97%	-31.94%	95.10%	-9.25%
Williamsburg	53.68%	7.48%	63.43%	70.59%	-7.74%	60.71%
York	156.33%	68.86%	46.83%	141.99%	167.11%	9.32%
Totals	73.95%	61.07%	58.62%	53.48%	63.94%	40.49%

CTC FUNDS EXPENDED ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM FROM FY 08-09 THRU FY 13-14

County	Amount Expended FY 08-09	Percent Expended FY 08-09	Amount Expended FY 09-10	Percent Expended FY 09-10	Amount Expended FY 10-11	Percent Expended FY 10-11	Amount Expended FY 11-12	Percent Expended FY 11-12	Amount Expended FY 12-13	Percent Expended FY 12-13	Amount Expended FY 13-14	Percent Expended FY 13-14
Abbeville	\$ 398,239.85	48.25%	\$ 53,803.48	6.33%	\$ 396,482.63	44.51%	\$ 262,328.76	29.45%	\$ 224,545.19	25.42%	\$ 289,471.76	32.78%
Aiken	\$ 2,362,643.00	105.64%	\$ 2,341,346.03	101.69%	\$ 1,796,777.31	74.43%	\$ 601,848.53	25.00%	\$ 2,706,391.99	111.75%	\$ 1,521,744.35	62.83%
Allendale	\$ 1,017,756.96	187.85%	\$ 19,580.10	3.51%	\$ 567,431.73	97.03%	\$ (45,973.32)	-7.86%	\$ 751,193.23	129.61%	\$ (53,727.59)	-9.27%
Anderson	\$ 2,595,796.00	114.77%	\$ 542,155.00	23.28%	\$ 1,652,293.05	67.68%	\$ 1,346,857.67	55.33%	\$ 725,022.67	29.60%	\$ 1,824,495.00	74.48%
Bamberg	\$ 200,098.75	32.74%	\$ 390,365.56	62.05%	\$ 1,639,179.86	248.51%	\$ 142,795.78	21.87%	\$ 202,048.00	31.15%	\$ 1,717,299.01	264.77%
Barnwell	\$ 311,695.30	42.29%	\$ 410,617.71	54.11%	\$ 107,143.94	13.47%	\$ 299,292.24	37.62%	\$ 101,763.99	12.94%	\$ 462,391.40	58.78%
Beaufort	\$ 290,346.00	22.26%	\$ 563,904.00	42.00%	\$ 830,550.26	59.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,000,000.00	64.99%	\$ -	0.00%
Berkeley	\$ 393,788.05	18.33%	\$ 3,106,999.07	140.48%	\$ 2,706,349.56	116.71%	\$ 112,565.68	4.84%	\$ 2,906,260.10	120.00%	\$ (389,757.93)	-16.09%
Calhoun	\$ 683,030.29	120.46%	\$ 303,769.41	52.04%	\$ 407,677.53	66.61%	\$ 138,254.37	22.59%	\$ 234,949.10	38.69%	\$ 141,761.12	23.35%
Charleston	\$ 1,491,813.00	55.59%	\$ 1,507,758.00	54.57%	\$ 1,731,946.00	59.79%	\$ 4,762,430.00	164.40%	\$ 4,971,798.00	171.15%	\$ 2,084,103.00	71.74%
Cherokee	\$ 623,592.00	68.26%	\$ 275,574.00	29.30%	\$ 573,620.00	58.58%	\$ 343,743.00	35.10%	\$ 745,066.00	77.13%	\$ 264,429.00	27.37%
Chester	\$ 304,441.78	32.87%	\$ 245,594.48	25.76%	\$ 321,148.05	32.13%	\$ 484,870.00	48.51%	\$ 45,333.40	4.59%	\$ 449,039.63	45.51%
Chesterfield	\$ 780,114.69	56.03%	\$ 1,156,501.63	80.68%	\$ 946,019.26	62.95%	\$ 2,779.89	0.18%	\$ 764,122.27	50.34%	\$ 68,537.92	4.52%
Clarendon	\$ 360,000.00	36.40%	\$ 203,000.00	19.94%	\$ 365,000.00	34.19%	\$ 275,000.00	25.76%	\$ 284,178.00	26.40%	\$ 257,554.00	23.93%
Colleton	\$ 250,000.00	18.04%	\$ 1,785,000.00	125.10%	\$ 150,000.00	10.03%	\$ 1,022,360.00	68.03%	\$ 1,399,240.86	93.45%	\$ (169,237.97)	-11.30%
Darlington	\$ 867,222.64	74.81%	\$ 285,987.89	23.96%	\$ 403,130.50	32.40%	\$ 448,042.48	35.81%	\$ 1,331,490.52	109.02%	\$ 1,370,271.05	112.20%
Dillon	\$ 232,924.80	31.60%	\$ 340,183.02	44.45%	\$ 388,047.86	48.36%	\$ 272,779.19	34.00%	\$ 718,804.11	90.59%	\$ 279,757.09	35.26%
Dorchester	\$ 580,897.87	46.33%	\$ 514,366.86	39.85%	\$ 635,166.42	46.94%	\$ 242,505.64	17.92%	\$ 549,663.71	36.71%	\$ 279,695.00	18.68%
Edgefield	\$ 384,960.56	48.50%	\$ 211,772.45	25.91%	\$ 710,000.00	82.87%	\$ 269,441.01	31.45%	\$ 170,925.32	19.82%	\$ 328,337.39	38.06%
Fairfield	\$ 588,000.00	63.06%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 626,562.62	62.26%	\$ 149,658.00	14.87%	\$ 410,928.47	40.79%	\$ 200,611.73	19.91%
Florence	\$ 2,444,576.13	136.63%	\$ 2,477,448.94	134.50%	\$ 1,475,532.00	76.40%	\$ 4,181,921.26	217.31%	\$ 1,009,550.91	52.82%	\$ 1,542,683.16	80.71%
Georgetown	\$ 357,667.05	30.85%	\$ 535,149.05	44.84%	\$ 926,047.50	74.01%	\$ 637,514.38	50.95%	\$ 307,608.03	24.63%	\$ 373,511.09	29.91%
Greenville	\$ 3,583,707.00	101.76%	\$ 3,765,727.00	104.05%	\$ 2,792,406.00	73.46%	\$ 1,457,154.00	38.33%	\$ 1,461,848.00	37.30%	\$ 1,717,014.00	43.81%
Greenwood	\$ 681,188.06	68.00%	\$ 290,585.25	28.18%	\$ 405,314.43	37.49%	\$ 409,121.13	37.60%	\$ 246,664.66	23.06%	\$ 400,000.00	37.40%
Hampton	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 394,407.00	51.10%	\$ 145,662.49	18.00%	\$ 607,494.00	75.07%	\$ (7,096.66)	-0.88%	\$ 429,583.66	53.21%
Horry	\$ 2,722,206.67	105.13%	\$ 2,917,024.78	109.42%	\$ 1,301,737.63	46.58%	\$ 3,434,325.63	123.18%	\$ 2,803,484.68	92.34%	\$ 2,453,270.33	80.81%
Jasper	\$ 987,255.81	124.37%	\$ 303,538.23	37.14%	\$ 857,356.73	100.06%	\$ 159,800.00	18.80%	\$ 411,205.09	47.30%	\$ 496,194.65	57.07%
Kershaw	\$ 940,816.26	73.20%	\$ 703,390.98	53.16%	\$ 1,303,014.31	93.93%	\$ 63,400.46	4.57%	\$ 760,745.31	53.78%	\$ 780,825.08	55.20%
Lancaster	\$ 283,150.00	25.25%	\$ 429,659.97	37.22%	\$ 400,150.54	33.06%	\$ 124,390.08	10.28%	\$ 500,447.77	39.85%	\$ 369,071.08	29.38%
Laurens	\$ 757,516.86	56.19%	\$ 633,940.75	45.67%	\$ 700,000.00	48.10%	\$ 366,302.01	25.29%	\$ 370,000.00	26.29%	\$ 624,048.42	44.33%
Lee	\$ 1,216,773.03	187.51%	\$ 1,360,152.11	203.59%	\$ 78,594.85	11.22%	\$ 693,087.25	98.96%	\$ 264,648.82	38.35%	\$ 713,257.25	103.37%
Lexington	\$ 1,511,919.00	62.50%	\$ 215,748.00	8.66%	\$ 1,317,348.66	50.45%	\$ 128,822.00	4.93%	\$ 1,237,662.59	45.33%	\$ 259,357.19	9.54%
McCormick	\$ 719,816.28	120.27%	\$ 652,402.23	105.88%	\$ 325,231.24	50.35%	\$ 447,012.57	69.20%	\$ 223,523.13	34.46%	\$ 695,796.08	107.28%
Marion	\$ 501,594.66	59.86%	\$ (2,285.20)	-0.26%	\$ 511,611.00	56.57%	\$ 559,664.00	61.88%	\$ 205,318.52	23.25%	\$ 436,763.73	49.45%
Marlboro	\$ 289,473.53	35.34%	\$ 269,954.61	32.02%	\$ 769,889.06	87.09%	\$ 669,362.61	75.72%	\$ 559,201.01	63.81%	\$ 269,516.78	30.76%
Newberry	\$ 813,824.28	78.77%	\$ 632,761.35	59.49%	\$ 410,802.73	36.84%	\$ 1,141,155.69	101.71%	\$ 658,647.38	58.92%	\$ 476,230.59	42.60%
Oconee	\$ 454,783.18	35.04%	\$ 2,189,676.41	163.89%	\$ 596,395.72	42.58%	\$ 145,934.74	10.42%	\$ 556,450.00	39.53%	\$ 1,140,762.77	81.04%
Orangeburg	\$ 2,661,352.25	128.40%	\$ 2,022,316.92	94.77%	\$ 556,698.55	24.88%	\$ 1,060,150.29	47.53%	\$ 536,934.90	24.39%	\$ 720,072.80	32.71%
Pickens	\$ 2,339,233.77	171.90%	\$ 914,187.00	65.25%	\$ 149,742.00	10.19%	\$ 1,700,424.00	115.77%	\$ 1,967,118.00	135.76%	\$ 508,633.15	35.10%
Richland	\$ 655,531.64	21.28%	\$ 221,768.78	6.99%	\$ 832,739.75	25.04%	\$ 2,127,793.00	63.99%	\$ 1,988,230.90	57.63%	\$ 487,993.07	14.14%
Saluda	\$ 733,189.72	94.62%	\$ (47,892.06)	-6.00%	\$ 702,000.00	83.93%	\$ 211,497.67	25.08%	\$ 237,372.66	28.20%	\$ 368,408.61	43.76%
Spartanburg	\$ 2,089,488.47	73.70%	\$ 660,762.77	22.64%	\$ 2,334,769.66	76.30%	\$ 695,988.03	22.74%	\$ 2,885,305.58	93.97%	\$ 165,919.30	5.40%
Sumter	\$ 837,865.95	56.12%	\$ 1,479,984.88	96.28%	\$ 342,044.75	21.22%	\$ 605,906.31	37.44%	\$ 246,414.94	15.66%	\$ 612,362.09	38.92%
Union	\$ 650,277.80	81.92%	\$ 897,946.04	110.75%	\$ 1,833,303.19	213.97%	\$ (273,694.81)	-31.94%	\$ 800,527.82	95.10%	\$ (77,867.98)	-9.25%
Williamsburg	\$ 700,000.00	53.68%	\$ 100,490.54	7.48%	\$ 892,785.83	63.43%	\$ 993,600.00	70.59%	\$ (106,779.09)	-7.74%	\$ 837,815.36	60.71%
York	\$ 2,934,894.28	156.33%	\$ 1,331,011.64	68.86%	\$ 949,004.01	46.83%	\$ 2,887,026.73	141.99%	\$ 3,747,332.23	167.11%	\$ 209,026.37	9.32%
Totals	\$ 46,585,463.22	73.95%	\$ 39,608,136.66	61.07%	\$ 39,864,709.21	58.62%	\$ 36,366,731.95	53.48%	\$44,116,092.11	63.94%	\$27,937,023.59	40.49%

C PROGRAM COST RECOVERY

By adoption of the C fund law in the early 1990s as a means for local communities to maintain a source of funds to improve transportation needs in their areas, the current legislation places an inordinate amount of responsibility on the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) to provide program administration. This responsibility translates into a considerable fiscal burden on the Department as well. However, measures and initiatives are in place in an effort to capture part of the expenses incurred by the agency while maintaining required oversight. They have been established in order to assure to the extent possible that all project costs are allocated. Program administration services would include those items such as management, accounting, project management/preliminary engineering, and construction management and inspection. These measures and initiatives are identified as follows:

1. **Annual Administrative Charges:** An administration charge is placed on those County Transportation Committees (CTCs) that are managed by SCDOT. This measure shown in Section III (H) in the standard “Agreements for C Fund Administration and Project Development” executed by the SCDOT administered CTCs has been in effect since 1998. Section H states “The CTC will approve the transfer to SCDOT in July of each fiscal year **3%** of the county’s annual C Funds allocation as payment for administrative services, accounting services, and general overhead expenses incurred by SCDOT in the administration and management of the C Program. In 2014 the total amount of funds transferred to the agency through this initiative was **\$1,144,988.45**.”
2. **Resurfacing Work on the State System:** In an effort to encourage County Transportation Committee’s (CTCs) to increase funding for resurfacing projects on the state system beginning in 2001, SCDOT waived the practice of charging engineering and construction inspection fees to pay for contract preparation and field management costs. As a result of this, the expense to provide these services to CTCs was absorbed in local SCDOT administrative budgets. Since 2001, SCDOT’s costs for maintaining the conditions of state roads as well as providing the required engineering services on all transportation projects have steadily increased while revenues have remained fairly constant. In 2012, SCDOT informed the CTCs that the agency was no longer in a position to perform these activities at no cost.

The greater majority of CTCs have informed SCDOT that they want to know the costs for the agency’s services prior to allocating their funds to a project. For resurfacing programming requests on the state system received by SCDOT after January 1, 2012, SCDOT has returned to the practice of charging 1% of the project bid price for engineering services and 6% for the construction engineering and inspection services. These percentages are in line with a recent analysis of SCDOT’s costs for resurfacing projects. The lump sum amounts constitute full payment for the engineering services. SCDOT would absorb additional costs if these expenses exceed the lump sum price. Similarly, should the charges be less than the lump sum price, a credit would not be allowable. If major changes or revisions either increasing or decreasing the project costs

are required due to unforeseen circumstances, a request by the CTC, and/or local community action, necessary adjustments would be made. As always, CTCs have the option to have SCDOT develop and construct projects for the lump sum fees quoted or to have projects developed by consultants or other governmental entities. The 1% and the 6% fees are applicable to both the SCDOT Administered CTCs as well as the Self-Administered CTCs. In 2014 the total amount of funds transferred to the agency through this initiative was **\$984,482.37**.

3. **Construction Work on the State System:** In 2007 when the Commission placed further restrictions on the size of the secondary road system by establishing a policy that would reverse the growth of the system, the C Program essentially changed from a road construction program to one of resurfacing. In 2014 only six CTC road construction projects were administered by SCDOT on the state system.

Fees for PE:

- A. **SCDOT Administered CTCs:** For road construction programming requests on the state system, SCDOT typically charges a lump sum fee of **12%** of the estimated construction cost for preliminary engineering services. Cost estimates for preliminary engineering include the cost of project management, engineering, plan preparation, right of way acquisition (excluding legal costs for condemnation, settlements, and judgments), and other costs necessary to develop a project to the point of receiving bids. The price quoted shall be full payment for SCDOT's services in developing the project. Should the cost of preliminary engineering be less than the lump sum price, no return or refund will be made to the CTC. Should the cost of preliminary engineering exceed the lump sum price, the overrun will be at SCDOT's expense. Should major changes be required in a project due to unforeseen circumstances or CTC action, an additional lump sum amount shall be requested from the CTC.
- B. **Self-Administered CTCs:** For road construction programming requests on the state system, SCDOT typically charges a lump sum fee of **18%** of the estimated construction cost for preliminary engineering services. The increased fee for Self-Administered CTCs is to capture SCDOT administrative overhead as the Self-Administered CTCs do not pay the 3% administrative fee stated in Section #1 above.

Fees for CE&I:

- A. **SCDOT Administered CTCs:** For road construction programming requests on the state system, SCDOT charges a lump sum fee of **14%** of the construction cost for construction management and inspection services. The price quoted shall be full payment for SCDOT's services in constructing the project. Should the cost of contract field management be less than the lump sum price, no return or refund will be made to the CTC. Should the cost of contract field management exceed the lump

sum price, the overrun will be at SCDOT's expense. Should major changes be required in a project due to unforeseen circumstances or CTC action, an additional lump sum amount shall be requested from the CTC.

- B. **Self-Administered CTCs**: For road construction programming requests on the state system, SCDOT charges a lump sum fee of **21%** of the construction cost for construction management and inspection services. The increased fee for Self-Administered CTCs is to capture SCDOT administrative overhead as the Self-Administered CTCs do not pay the 3% administrative fee stated in Section #1 above.

Again, CTCs have the option to have SCDOT develop and construct projects for these lump sum fees quoted or to have projects developed by consultants or other governmental entities. In 2014 the total amount of funds transferred to the agency through this initiative for PE and CE&I was **\$226,409.72**.



COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL (CTC) FUND BUDGET

CTC EXPENDITURES

	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2009-2010	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2010-2011	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2011-2012	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2012-2013	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2013-2014	Budget 2014-15	Proposed Executive Budget 2015-16
Land & Buildings	16,917,921	26,587,222	19,351,254	21,228,851	19,606,747	22,500,000	22,500,000
Other Operating	8,914,205	5,318,682	3,130,749	678,355	569,971	3,500,000	3,500,000
Allocations to Municipalities	4,865,871	2,945,661	4,069,237	1,923,644	3,210,666	2,000,000	2,000,000
Allocations to Counties	56,116,005	43,172,984	60,154,731	66,932,611	67,961,327	67,000,000	78,000,000
Total CTC Budget	86,814,002	78,024,550	86,705,970	90,763,461	91,348,711	95,000,000	106,000,000

A) Increase revenues \$11.0m. (\$2.0m + \$1.5m + \$7.5m)

- Increase fuel revenues \$2.0m.
- Increase program activity \$1.5m.
- \$15.0 m additional (\$1.5m CRF and \$13.5m from proviso 118.16) \$7.5m budgeted in each year 2015 and 2016.

SCDOT ADMINISTERED

APRIL 2015

	Cash Balance	Uncommitted Balance
01 Abbeville	\$ 1,346,128.59	\$ 388,720.74
02 Aiken	\$ 11,324,158.59	\$ 2,844,663.13
03 Allendale	\$ 1,826,342.70	\$ 1,315,665.87
05 Bamberg	\$ 2,399,229.31	\$ 1,283,402.42
06 Barnwell	\$ 3,059,633.47	\$ 1,843,824.33
09 Calhoun	\$ 2,477,581.65	\$ 265,952.87
13 Chesterfield	\$ 5,404,674.73	\$ 3,047,572.50
16 Darlington	\$ 3,162,332.51	\$ 1,592,747.59
17 Dillon	\$ 1,631,122.49	\$ 533,710.34
18 Dorchester	\$ 3,806,552.38	\$ 500,279.01
20 Fairfield	\$ 1,370,634.56	\$ 717,617.79
21 Florence	\$ 4,603,992.47	\$ 1,085,410.69
22 Georgetown	\$ 3,845,380.00	\$ 1,380,215.43
25 Hampton	\$ 1,218,762.50	\$ 153,977.32
26 Horry	\$ 10,171,646.37	\$ 4,292,880.53
27 Jasper	\$ 2,892,604.55	\$ 1,364,825.37
28 Kershaw	\$ 3,766,193.95	\$ 1,592,838.11
31 Lee	\$ 2,338,191.72	\$ 855,436.98
33 McCormick	\$ 1,917,766.87	\$ 477,615.26
34 Marion	\$ 2,093,174.83	\$ 331,861.33
35 Marlboro	\$ 3,465,289.64	\$ 1,893,085.62
36 Newberry	\$ 2,893,451.56	\$ 1,267,525.95
37 Oconee	\$ 3,538,451.00	\$ 1,989,390.22
38 Orangeburg	\$ 9,967,721.78	\$ 2,353,052.40
40 Richland	\$ 10,817,012.12	\$ 4,916.41
44 Union	\$ 3,234,704.89	\$ 901,429.63
45 Williamsburg	\$ 1,845,829.73	\$ 353,868.37
Grand Total	\$ 106,418,564.96	\$ 34,632,486.21

SELF ADMINISTERED ANNUAL REPORTS - FY 13-14

County	Date Received	Date Scheduled for Review	Comments	Cash Balance	Uncommitted Balance	25% FY 11-12	25% FY 12-13	Biennial Average
Anderson	9/19/2014	12/18/2014	met 25% & 300%	\$ 3,086,443.00	\$ 2,066,064.00	29.60%	74.48%	52.04%
Beaufort	10/6/2014	3/10/2014	met 25% & 300%	\$ 2,448,651.00	\$ 1,095,394.00	64.99%	0.00%	32.50%
Berkeley	11/25/2014	4/28/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 9,248,255.29	\$ 2,652,795.99	120.00%	-16.09%	51.96%
Charleston	10/1/2014	2/10/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 8,927,670.00	\$ 465,338.00	171.15%	71.74%	121.45%
Cherokee	10/6/2014	2/18/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 1,628,743.00	\$ 595,136.00	77.13%	27.37%	52.25%
Chester	10/2/2014	1/13/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 822,937.00	\$ 809,023.00	4.59%	45.51%	25.05%
Clarendon	9/22/2014	11/1/2014	met 25% & 300%	\$ 665,086.00	\$ 594,428.00	26.40%	23.92%	25.16%
Colleton	10/6/2014	11/4/2014	met 25% & 300%	\$ 5,148,707.00	\$ 2,020,988.00	93.45%	-11.30%	41.08%
Edgefield	10/28/2014	3/3/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 1,717,106.00	\$ 539,190.00	19.82%	38.06%	28.94%
Greenville	9/30/2014	2/4/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 2,663,413.00	\$ (2,537,907.00)	37.30%	43.81%	40.56%
Greenwood	10/2/2014	3/19/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 2,041,864.90	\$ 412,048.54	23.06%	37.40%	30.23%
Lancaster	11/17/2014	4/14/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 1,286,343.91	\$ 1,286,343.91	39.85%	29.38%	34.62%
Laurens	9/30/2014	12/14/2014	met 25% & 300%	\$ 1,315,166.08	\$ 1,315,166.08	26.29%	44.33%	35.31%
Lexington	10/1/2014	1/21/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 11,419,554.55	\$ 1,280,647.30	45.53%	9.54%	27.54%
Pickens	10/2/2014	4/8/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 4,272,330.00	\$ 366,597.00	135.76%	35.10%	85.43%
Saluda	7/23/2014	9/4/2014	met 25% & 300%	\$ 742,148.23	\$ 335,568.23	28.20%	43.76%	35.98%
Spartanburg	9/30/2014	2/18/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 7,445,446.00	\$ 3,413,282.00	93.97%	5.40%	49.69%
Sumter	10/7/2014	1/29/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 1,973,894.84	\$ 1,482,030.06	13.94%	38.92%	26.43%
York	10/2/2014	1/13/2015	met 25% & 300%	\$ 12,603,238.96	\$ 2,672,013.29	167.11%	9.32%	88.22%
				\$ 79,456,998.76	\$ 20,864,136.40			