



South Carolina  
Department of Transportation

Secretary of Transportation  
Janet P. Oakley  
(803) 737-1312 Fax (803) 737-2038

June 16, 2015

The Honorable Phyllis J. Henderson  
Subcommittee Chair  
Legislative Oversight Committee  
South Carolina House of Representatives  
Post Office Box 11867  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Dear Representative Henderson:

Thank you for the recent opportunity for our staff to meet with the Economic Development, Transportation, Natural Resources and Regulatory Subcommittee to discuss the budget for the South Carolina Department of Transportation.

We appreciate the Committee's keen interest in the state's infrastructure and we look forward to continued dialogue on this critical item necessary to support our state's economy. Please find enclosed our formal responses to your June 2, 2015 request for information as well as your staff's follow up phone calls to our team.

I trust this information is helpful and we stand by to provide assistance to your convenience.

Sincerely,

Janet P. Oakley  
Secretary of Transportation

JPO:mbb  
Enclosures



## **Define Maintenance & Demonstrate Budget Breakdown**

Simply put, SCDOT defines maintenance as the repair and upkeep of the existing transportation system. It includes items such as the day-to-day activities our Maintenance forces do in the field (mowing, pot hole patching, shoulder and ditch work), all of our resurfacing, pavement rehabilitation and reconstruction work and all bridge replacement projects. We do not include in our "maintenance" figures any road widening projects, new location roadways, safety projects or any congestion mitigation projects. We consider those projects capacity or operational improvement projects. We elected to retain the debt service in the "Other" category for the purposes of this exercise since we are trying to reflect the funding priorities of today. Additionally, we elected to reflect the legislatively directed State Infrastructure Bank pass through funding in the Capacity & Operational category since we are aware that the State Infrastructure Bank uses those funds in that manner. On the next page is a worksheet of the proposed SFY 15-16 budget that categorizes the budget in accordance with these definitions.

This working definition is different from the Accounting definition of Maintenance. In the Accounting arena, any road or bridge project that exceeds a cost of \$500,000 is capitalized and reflected as such in our financial statements and reported to FHWA as a capital outlay. Many of our bridge replacement projects and resurfacing and rehabilitation projects exceed this threshold and are categorized by our accountants, in accordance with government accounting standards, as a capital project. This can be confusing if the financial statements or FHWA tables are used to describe how the agency prioritizes its spending.

	Budget (\$ 000,000)	% of Total	Maintenance (\$ 000,000)	Capacity & Operational (\$ 000,000)	Other (\$ 000,000)
Administration	41.7	2.55%	-	-	41.7
Land & Building	<u>1.3</u>	<u>0.08%</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1.3</u>
Total Administration	43.0	2.6%	-	-	43.0
Engineering Admin & Project Mgmt.	86.6	5.3%	-	-	86.6
Engineering Construction					
SIB 1 Cent Equivalent	26.8	1.6%	-	26.8	-
SIB Debt Service Ravenel Bridge	8.0	0.5%	-	-	8.0
SIB Debt Service Conway Bypass	7.6	0.5%	-	-	7.6
SIB Debt Service Multi Project	10.0	0.6%	-	-	10.0
Other Operating	25.0	1.5%	-	-	25.0
Bridge	221.3	13.6%	221.3	-	(0.0)
Rehabilitation & Resurfacing	269.5	16.5%	269.5	-	-
Operational & Safety Improvements	202.5	12.4%	-	202.5	-
Widening's and New Locations	141.7	8.7%	-	141.7	-
Enhancements	18.4	1.1%	-	-	18.4
Port Access Roads	25.0	1.5%	-	25.0	-
SIB Transfer	50.0	3.1%	-	50.0	-
Debt Service MPO/COG & Interstate	52.0	3.2%	-	-	52.0
Debt Service US 17	5.0	0.3%	-	-	5.0
Allocations Municipalities	1.0	0.1%	-	-	1.0
Allocations Counties	0.2	0.01%	-	-	0.2
Allocations Other Entities	0.1	0.01%	-	-	0.1
General Fund Transfer	<u>-29.7</u>	<u>-1.8%</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>(29.7)</u>
Total Construction	1034.4	63.4%	490.8	446.0	97.6
Highway Maintenance (Field Forces)	216.8	13.3%	216.8	-	-
Non-Federal Aid Highway Fund	<u>128.0</u>	<u>7.8%</u>	<u>128.0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total Engineering	1465.8	89.8%	835.6	446.0	184.2
Toll Operations	7.5	0.5%	-	-	7.5
Intermodal & Planning					
Personnel Cost	2.6	0.2%	-	-	2.6
Other Operating	1.1	0.1%	-	-	1.1
Allocations Municipal	0.1	0.01%	-	-	0.1
Allocations Other entities	<u>22.6</u>	<u>1.4%</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>22.6</u>
Total Intermodal & Planning	26.4	1.6%	-	-	26.4
Employee Benefits*	<u>84.5</u>	<u>5.2%</u>	<u>41.7</u>		<u>42.8</u>
Total Non General Fund Budget	1627.2	99.7%	877.3	446.0	303.9
General Funds					
Intermodal Aid to Other Entities	0.1	-	-	-	0.1
Capital Project Request	<u>5.5</u>		<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>5.5</u>
Total General Fund Request	5.6	0.3%	-	-	5.6
Total Submitted SCDOT Budget	1632.8	100.0%	877.3	446.0	309.5
			54%	27%	

\* \$41.7M reflects the portion of the fringe benefits necessary to support the Field Maintenance employees. The Engineering Administration (Project Management) charges to projects and associated Fringe component are retained completely in the "Other" category.

## Outstanding Debt

Below is a summary of all of SCDOT's outstanding debt for bonds and various project loans through the State Infrastructure Bank, as of June 30, 2015. A detailed schedule follows on the following pages.

Type	Maturity Date (SFY)	Average Annual Debt Service		Remaining Interest Due	Total	Effective Interest Rate	Call Date
		Payment (Remaining)	Principal Balance (as of June 30, 2015)				
2003A Highway Bonds	2019	\$203,000	\$750,000	\$61,691	\$811,691	Yield between 1.2% & 4.3%	October 1, 2013
2005A Highway Bonds	2016	\$8,692,000	\$8,480,000	\$212,000	\$8,692,000	Yield between 2.3% & 4.6%	August 1, 2015
2010A Highway Refunding Bonds	2021	\$35,064,101	\$182,020,185	\$28,364,423	\$210,384,608	2.60%	Non-Refundable
2013A Highway Refunding Bonds	2022	\$3,359,475	\$19,930,000	\$3,586,325	\$23,516,325	1.60%	Non-Refundable
2014A Highway Refunding Bonds	2023	\$10,734,107	\$63,410,000	\$14,899,250	\$78,309,250	1.50%	Non-Refundable
<b>Outstanding Bonds</b>		<b>\$58,052,683</b>	<b>\$274,590,185</b>	<b>\$47,123,689</b>	<b>\$321,713,874</b>		
SIB Project Loan: US 17	2037	\$4,979,751	\$69,851,845	\$39,702,671	\$109,554,516	4.50%	Non-Refundable
SIB Project Loan: Conway Bypass II	2019	\$7,600,000	\$26,604,370	\$3,162,297	\$29,766,667	4.80%	Non-Refundable
SIB Project Loan: Ravenel Bridge	2027	\$8,000,000	\$95,333,333	\$0	\$95,333,333	0.00%	-
SIB Project Loan: Multi-Project	2022	\$10,000,000	\$58,324,423	\$10,842,244	\$69,166,667	4.00%	Non-Refundable
<b>Outstanding Project Loans</b>		<b>\$30,579,751</b>	<b>\$250,113,971</b>	<b>\$53,707,212</b>	<b>\$303,821,183</b>		
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>\$88,632,434</b>	<b>\$524,704,156</b>	<b>\$100,830,901</b>	<b>\$625,535,057</b>		

## 2003A Highway Bonds

Other

Effective Interest Rate - Annual Issues Sold to Yield between 1.2% and 4.3%

Call Date - October 1, 2013

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	750,000
Remaining Interest Due	61,691
Total Payments Due	811,691

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	201,391
2017	199,400
2018	206,900
2019	204,000
Total Payments Due	811,691

## 2005A Highway Bonds

MPO/COG/Interstate & Other

Effective Interest Rate - Annual Issues Sold to Yield between 2.3% and 4.6%

Call Date - August 1, 2015

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	8,480,000
Remaining Interest Due	212,000
Total Payments Due	8,692,000

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	8,692,000
Total Payments Due	8,692,000

## 2010A Highway Refunding Bonds

MPO/COG/Interstate & Other

Effective Interest Rate - 2.6%

Call Date - Non Refundable

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	182,020,185
Remaining Interest Due	28,364,423
Total Payments Due	210,384,608

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	40,917,538
2017	40,227,150
2018	39,557,676
2019	38,884,181
2020	25,364,652
2021	25,433,411
Total Payments Due	210,384,608

## 2013A Highway Refunding Bonds

Cross Island Parkway & Other

Effective Interest Rate - 1.6%

Call Date - Non Refundable

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	19,930,000
Remaining Interest Due	3,586,325
Total Payments Due	23,516,325

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	3,552,450
2017	3,482,625
2018	3,416,625
2019	3,347,125
2020	3,264,375
2021	3,285,875
2022	3,167,250
Total Payments Due	23,516,325

**2014A Highway Bonds**  
MPO/COG/Interstate & Other

Effective Interest Rate - 1.5%

Call Date - Non Refundable

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	63,410,000
Remaining Interest Due	<u>14,899,250</u>
Total Payments Due	78,309,250

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	3,170,500
2017	10,736,500
2018	10,733,625
2019	10,735,375
2020	10,735,625
2021	10,733,375
2022	10,732,500
2023	<u>10,731,750</u>
Total Payments Due	78,309,250

**State Infrastructure Bank Project Agreement**

Highway 17

Effective Interest Rate - 4.5%

Call Date - Non Refundable

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	69,851,845
Remaining Interest Due	39,702,671
Total Payments Due	<hr/> 109,554,517

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	4,979,751
2017	4,979,751
2018	4,979,751
2019	4,979,751
2020	4,979,751
2021	4,979,751
2022	4,979,751
2023	4,979,751
2024	4,979,751
2025	4,979,751
2026	4,979,751
2027	4,979,751
2028	4,979,751
2029	4,979,751
2030	4,979,751
2031	4,979,751
2032	4,979,751
2033	4,979,751
2034	4,979,751
2035	4,979,751
2036	4,979,751
2037	4,979,751
Total Payments Due	<hr/> 109,554,517

**State Infrastructure Bank Project Agreement****Conway Bypass (II)**

Effective Interest Rate - 4.8%

Call Date - Non Refundable

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	26,604,370
Remaining Interest Due	3,162,297
Total Payments Due	29,766,667

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	7,600,000
2017	7,600,000
2018	7,600,000
2019	6,966,667
Total Payments Due	29,766,667

**State Infrastructure Bank Project Agreement****Ravenel Bridge**

Effective Interest Rate - 0.0%

Call Date - Non Refundable

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	95,333,333
Remaining Interest Due	-
Total Payments Due	95,333,333

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	8,000,000
2017	8,000,000
2018	8,000,000
2019	8,000,000
2020	8,000,000
2021	8,000,000
2022	8,000,000
2023	8,000,000
2024	8,000,000
2025	8,000,000
2026	8,000,000
2027	7,333,333
Total Payments Due	95,333,333

## State Infrastructure Bank Project Agreement

### Multi-Project

Approximate Interest Rate - 4.0%

Call Date - Non Refundable

Principal Balance 6/30/2015	58,324,423
Remaining Interest Due	10,842,244
Total Payments Due	69,166,667

Remaining Payments by State Fiscal Year

2016	10,000,000
2017	10,000,000
2018	10,000,000
2019	10,000,000
2020	10,000,000
2021	10,000,000
2022	9,166,667
Total Payments Due	69,166,667

## Payroll Information

The request for detailed payroll information is being compiled by SCDOT's Human Resource Office and will be provided when complete.

In the interim, we are providing some information compiled from a standard, statewide SCEIS Agency Compensation Report that provides a profile of SCDOT's workforce. See below for a summary table and detailed report, sorted by Pay Band. The last column was added to the standard SCEIS report by SCDOT and reflects the SFY 14-15 fringe rate of 42.82%. For your information, the fringe rate for SFY 15-16 is expected to be 43.75%.

### SCEIS Agency Compensation Report

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION										<i>This Column Added by SCDOT</i>
Pay Grade	Number of Employees	Class Service Years	Agency Service Years	State Service Years	Average Salary	Lowest Salary	Highest Salary	Total Annual Salary	Entire FTE Expense Salary Plus Fringe at 42.82% (SFY 14-15 Rate)	
BAND 01	1	7.81	7.81	7.81	\$16,884	\$16,884	\$16,884	\$16,884	\$24,114	
BAND 02	1047	5.57	6.05	6.63	\$25,668	\$2,473	\$32,667	\$26,874,833	\$38,382,636	
BAND 03	792	5.96	11.56	12.28	\$30,131	\$2,473	\$39,754	\$23,863,421	\$34,081,738	
BAND 04	983	7.17	13.55	14.47	\$35,633	\$26,922	\$48,469	\$35,027,613	\$50,026,437	
BAND 05	564	5.76	13.61	14.84	\$44,298	\$31,805	\$58,848	\$24,983,933	\$35,682,053	
BAND 06	445	6.18	13.47	15.04	\$56,947	\$41,025	\$72,548	\$25,341,585	\$36,192,852	
BAND 07	344	7.31	16.29	17.39	\$72,394	\$54,156	\$90,623	\$24,903,515	\$35,567,200	
BAND 08	160	7.77	17.76	19.00	\$92,640	\$69,331	\$111,635	\$14,822,347	\$21,169,276	
BAND 09	25	4.88	20.99	22.31	\$110,317	\$91,316	\$128,858	\$2,757,929	\$3,938,874	
U12B	1	2.50	6.80	9.42	\$97,175	\$97,175	\$97,175	\$97,175	\$138,785	
U12C	1	1.02	3.44	3.44	\$112,367	\$112,367	\$112,367	\$112,367	\$160,483	
U12D	1	4.97	20.60	20.60	\$147,011	\$147,011	\$147,011	\$147,011	\$209,961	
U12UA01	1	1.04	1.04	1.04	\$156,220	\$156,220	\$156,220	\$156,220	\$223,113	
<b>Total:</b>	4365				\$41,032			<b>Total:</b> \$179,104,833	<b>\$255,797,522</b>	

*\*Report only includes permanent full-time employees*

## SCEIS Agency Compensation Report

### *This Column Added*

by SCDOT

1.4282

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Data Date: JUN 5, 2015 12:04 PM

**Report only includes permanent full-time employees**

**\*Report only includes permanent full-time employees**

\*Report only includes permanent full-time employees





Pay Band	Job Class Code	Position Job (Medium Name)	Employee Count	Class Service Years	Agency Service Years	State Service Years	Average Salary	Lowest Salary	Highest Salary	Total Annual Salary	Entire FTE Expense Salary Plus Fringe at 42.82% (SFY 14-15 Rate)
07	AD28	ACCOUNTING/FISCAL MANAGER I	5	4.42	14.43	14.43	\$68,381	\$56,983	\$90,623	\$341,904	\$488,307
	AH20	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER I	1	1.59	25.84	25.84	\$59,784	\$59,784	\$59,784	\$59,784	\$85,384
	AE30	ATTORNEY III	1	0.13	0.13	2.51	\$58,000	\$58,000	\$58,000	\$58,000	\$82,836
	AD15	AUDITS MANAGER I	2	5.80	12.31	15.98	\$71,595	\$68,078	\$75,111	\$143,189	\$204,503
	HD70	ENG/ASSOC ENG III	241	7.96	16.28	16.91	\$74,580	\$64,192	\$87,125	\$17,973,791	\$25,670,168
	AI20	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT II	1	1.33	1.33	1.33	\$81,600	\$81,600	\$81,600	\$81,600	\$116,541
	BA75	FTS MANAGER II	1	8.06	17.23	17.23	\$76,693	\$76,693	\$76,693	\$76,693	\$109,533
	HA35	GIS MANAGER II	1	10.64	41.68	43.96	\$67,613	\$67,613	\$67,613	\$67,613	\$96,565
	AJ10	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MGR I	5	11.34	21.85	24.17	\$75,625	\$69,908	\$80,589	\$378,126	\$540,040
	AC40	PROCUREMENT MANAGER II	2	0.13	0.13	5.26	\$65,476	\$58,952	\$72,000	\$130,952	\$187,026
	AH45	PROGRAM MANAGER I	64	5.08	16.34	18.92	\$65,429	\$54,156	\$87,125	\$4,187,461	\$5,980,532
	BC40	PUBLIC INFORMATION DIRECTOR II	1	7.05	15.99	15.99	\$74,366	\$74,366	\$74,366	\$74,366	\$106,210
	EA30	REGISTERED NURSE II	1	11.59	11.59	11.59	\$59,946	\$59,946	\$59,946	\$59,946	\$85,615
	AJ08	SENIOR APPLICATIONS ANALYST	5	6.44	15.94	16.28	\$67,643	\$54,156	\$77,990	\$338,213	\$483,036
	AH42	SENIOR CONSULTANT	1	3.42	20.21	20.21	\$75,338	\$75,338	\$75,338	\$75,338	\$107,598
	AJ46	SENIOR INFORMATION RESO CONLT	7	6.98	15.87	16.47	\$65,970	\$56,738	\$74,013	\$461,792	\$659,531
	AJ25	SYSTEMS PROGRAMMER II	4	11.94	22.53	23.12	\$81,152	\$71,806	\$86,002	\$324,608	\$463,605
	AG45	TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT DIR II	1	7.39	10.76	30.58	\$70,139	\$70,139	\$70,139	\$70,139	\$100,173
		<b>Employee Total:</b>	344				<b>Average:</b>	\$72,394	<b>Total Annual Salaries:</b>	\$24,903,515	\$35,567,200

\*Report only includes permanent full-time employees

Pay Band	Job Class Code	Position Job (Medium Name)	Employee Count	Class Service Years	Agency Service Years	State Service Years	Average Salary	Lowest Salary	Highest Salary	Total Annual Salary	Entire FTE Expense Salary Plus Fringe at 42.82% (SFY 14-15 Rate)
08	AD30	ACCOUNTING/FISCAL MANAGER II	3	2.57	5.17	13.12	\$91,604	\$87,367	\$95,081	\$274,811	\$392,485
	AH25	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER II	1	3.30	29.56	29.56	\$91,764	\$91,764	\$91,764	\$91,764	\$131,057
	AE40	ATTORNEY IV	4	8.10	19.32	21.07	\$88,843	\$76,500	\$93,498	\$355,373	\$507,544
	AD18	AUDITS MANAGER II	4	3.25	9.08	9.08	\$79,524	\$78,438	\$81,655	\$318,096	\$454,305
	BC50	DIRECTOR OF INFO SVCS	1	7.05	16.39	26.90	\$94,563	\$94,563	\$94,563	\$94,563	\$135,055
	HD75	ENG/ASSOC ENG IV	119	8.62	18.72	19.35	\$94,496	\$77,819	\$106,012	\$11,245,016	\$16,060,132
	AG25	HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR II	2	1.84	2.35	11.30	\$86,190	\$85,680	\$86,700	\$172,380	\$246,193
	AJ12	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MGR II	5	7.31	22.32	24.76	\$87,003	\$79,115	\$95,839	\$435,017	\$621,291
	AC50	PROCUREMENT DIRECTOR	2	4.40	8.91	29.00	\$83,350	\$79,565	\$87,134	\$166,699	\$238,080
	AH50	PROGRAM MANAGER II	19	5.53	16.03	16.70	\$87,823	\$69,331	\$111,635	\$1,668,628	\$2,383,135
		<b>Employee Total:</b>	160				<b>Average:</b>	\$92,640	<b>Total Annual Salaries:</b>	\$14,822,347	\$21,169,276

\*Report only includes permanent full-time employees

Pay Band	Job Class Code	Position Job (Medium Name)	Employee Count	Class Service Years	Agency Service Years	State Service Years	Average Salary	Lowest Salary	Highest Salary	Total Annual Salary	Entire FTE Expense Salary Plus Fringe at 42.82% (SFY 14-15 Rate)
09	AD32	ACCOUNTING/FISCAL MANAGER III	1	0.18	0.18	0.18	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$142,820
	AJ14	AGENCY CHIEF INFO OFFICER	1	10.30	27.01	27.01	\$105,208	\$105,208	\$105,208	\$105,208	\$150,258
	AE50	ATTORNEY V	1	14.39	25.17	25.17	\$108,158	\$108,158	\$108,158	\$108,158	\$154,471
	HD80	DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING	16	5.35	24.34	24.38	\$114,401	\$102,890	\$128,858	\$1,830,412	\$2,614,194
	AG28	HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR III	1	2.88	9.62	30.99	\$99,434	\$99,434	\$99,434	\$99,434	\$142,012
	AH55	PROGRAM MANAGER III	5	1.74	14.64	16.84	\$102,943	\$91,316	\$114,492	\$514,717	\$735,119

<b>Employee Total:</b>	25		<b>Average:</b>	\$110,317	<b>Total Annual Salaries:</b>	\$2,757,929	\$3,938,874
*Report only includes permanent full-time employees							

## **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](http://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%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>73.95%</b>	<b>61.07%</b>	<b>58.62%</b>	<b>53.48%</b>	<b>63.94%</b>	<b>40.49%</b>

**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%</								

## 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**.

	CTC EXPENDITURES				Prior Year Expenditures 2013-2014	Budget 2014-15	Proposed Executive Budget 2015-16
	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2009-2010	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2010-2011	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2011-2012	Prior Year Actual Expenditures 2012-2013			
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
<b>Total CTC Budget</b>	<b>86,814,002</b>	<b>78,024,550</b>	<b>86,705,970</b>	<b>90,763,461</b>	<b>91,348,711</b>	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	\$ 2,892,004.55	\$ 1,364,825.37
28	Kershaw	\$ 3,766,193.95	\$ 1,592,838.11
31	Lee	\$ 2,338,191.72	\$ 835,436.98
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