

CHAPTER 12: FINANCIAL PLAN

12.1 Introduction

The Financial Element is a critical component of the *Midlands Tomorrow* LRTP. It contains forecasts of federal, state and local funding anticipated during the planning period. This chapter contains a review of the SAFETEA-LU requirements for financial planning; a brief summary of funding issues in the COATS region; a review of likely sources of state and federal funding; tables projecting the funding likely to be available through the end of the planning period; discussion of possible alternate funding sources; and tables showing the projected funding available for the financially constrained plan.

The project needs identified in the Midlands Tomorrow planning process would require considerably more funding to implement than is projected to be available in the Cost-Constrained Plan. Additional funding sources outside the traditional Federal funds passed through to CMCOG from SCDOT are needed to respond to our region's transportation needs. For this reason, an Enhanced Revenue Plan, which would support a more extensive program of transportation improvements, is included. The Enhanced Revenues Plan is provided for illustrative purposes, since the additional funding sources are largely dependent on actions of local governments.

12.2 Financial Planning Requirements

Under the requirements of SAFETEA-LU, the MPO must adopt a financially constrained plan, showing prioritized projects that can be funded with revenues that are reasonably expected to be available during the planning period. SAFETEA-LU requires the long range transportation plan to include a financial element that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.

The financial plan must result from a collaborative effort by the MPO, public transportation operator(s), and state. The plan must include estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, and all necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available. The financial plan may (but is not required to) include projects that would be included in the adopted, financially constrained plan if additional resources beyond the funds identified in the financial plan were to become available.

12.3 Financial Issues

Funding for transportation infrastructure has not kept pace with the growth in population in the Central Midlands region. Increased costs of construction and right of way acquisition has severely hampered the local efforts to solve traffic challenges. The current Federal transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU was signed by President Bush in 2005. It was hoped that passage of SAFETEA-LU would bring new transportation construction funding to the COATS planning area, but that has not been the case. Approximately sixty (60) legislative funding earmarks for projects in South Carolina, including the new Interstate 73, were included in SAFETEA-LU. These earmarks are subtracted from the funding available to be distributed to MPO regions.

Like other South Carolina MPOs, COATS participated in the SCDOT's "27 in 7" bonding program earlier in this decade (1998-2008). This program allowed the SCDOT to sell bonds to fund an accelerated construction program. While there was an infusion of funding for a few years, the projects have now been completed and COATS must pay approximate \$6 million per year in debt service on the bonds through 2022. This significantly reduces the effectiveness of the Guideshare funding for the current planning period and beyond.

The most prominent transportation issue in the Central Midlands region over the past decade has been the continuation of public transit service. The CMRTA was created in 2002 as a public, regional system replacing a local system operated by SCANA, the parent company of the regional electric utility.

The Columbia and Charleston transit systems were the last remaining urban transportation systems in the US operated by electric utilities. This arrangement was very common before World War II when electric trolley systems were operated by local electric companies. As part of the arrangement worked out to let SCANA divest itself of the transit system, the utility set up a trust fund to assist with operations of the new transit authority. This funding will be depleted in 2009.

CMRTA also receives approximately \$1 million each year from the City of Columbia, and earns approximately \$2 million per year in farebox revenues. The population of the metropolitan area served by CMRTA is too large to qualify for federal operating subsidies. The system does, however, receive federal funding for capital facilities-- buildings, equipment and transit vehicles-- and for vehicle maintenance. These funds require local matching contributions, and the

City and SCANA subsidies are very important because they are the source of these matching funds.

In 2007 Richland County instituted a vehicle user fee to help the CMRTA survive financially until a local capital sales tax initiative to fund the system could be put before the voters. With the failure of the Richland County Council to authorize the sales tax initiative, the local funding issue is still not resolved, and the possibility exists that South Carolina's capitol city will be without public mass transit.

The CMCOG planning team determined that is reasonable to include future funding of the CMRTA system in the cost constrained plan. There will be further opportunities for passing a sales tax initiative, and such initiatives have been passed in other South Carolina communities. There are also other possible funding mechanisms, such as the Richland County user fee in effect through October 2008, and there are currently intense discussions underway throughout the region regarding ways to financially rescue the transit system.

Another overriding funding issue in the COATS region is the tremendous imbalance between needed improvements to the roadway system and the dedicated funding sources actually available for this purpose. This is also a common problem in metropolitan areas throughout the United States, and apparently has been a major topic of conversation in the reauthorization of the Federal transportation bill.

12.4 Revenue Projections

CMCOG worked with SCDOT and CMRTA to create revenue forecasts through the year 2035. These forecasts shown in Table 12.1 are based on historic funding trends, with adjustments for inflation.

The most significant funding sources are state/federal Guideshare allocations for major thoroughfare system improvements and transportation enhancements; Federal Transit Administration (FTA) capital funds for mass transit; and federal funding administered by SCDOT for improvements to the interstate highway system. Federal and state legislative earmarks already approved for specific projects are also included. These revenues are sufficient to cover the anticipated costs of constructing, operating and maintaining the proposed financially constrained transportation system. The *Financially Constrained Plan* is based on revenues which are reasonably assured during the planning period.

The Enhanced Revenues Plan adds projects that have been identified through the planning process as high priority needs, but which cannot proceed without identification of new revenue sources beyond those included in the Financially Constrained Plan. A number of alternative funding sources available to local governments in South Carolina are summarized later in this chapter.

Two of the most significant alternative funding sources are local sales tax initiatives and the State Infrastructure Bank. Table 12.2 illustrates the potential results of one-cent sales tax initiatives in Richland and Lexington Counties. Also shown are potential revenues from the South Carolina Transportation Infrastructure Bank (SCTIB). The SCTIB requires 30% local matching contributions and funds projects costing over \$100 million. These figures are for illustrative purposes only, showing the level of funding that could be available through alternative funding measures. Specifics of any sales tax initiative and the projects to be funded would be at the discretion of the local government adopting the sales tax funding plan.

The *Vision Plan* projects shown in Chapter 7 are long-range regional projects for which no funding source has been identified.

Table 12.1: Base Funding/Cost Constrained Plan

Base Funding/Cost Constrained Plan (costs in \$1,000s)													
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019-28	2029-35	TOTAL
Itemized Guideshare													
Intersections	660	832	832	832	832	832	1,220	1,220	1,220	1,220	13,441	10,773	23,138
Signal Systems	600	693	693	693	693	693	915	915	915	915	10,081	8,384	17,805
Congestion Management/ITS	486	541	541	541	541	541	595	595	595	595	6,552	5,313	12,120
Bonding Debt Service (Expense)	5,374	5,130	5,093	5,059	5,069	5,051	5,031	5,013	4,980	4,955	21,584	0	72,338
Road Widening	6,740	6,665	6,702	6,736	6,726	6,744	7,486	7,504	7,537	7,562	122,905	110,197	303,505
Total Guideshare	13,860	13,860	13,860	13,860	13,860	13,860	15,246	15,246	15,246	15,246	168,011	134,668	428,904
Other Highway Related													
Transportation Enhancement	938	938	938	938	938	938	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032	11,352	11,692	32,800
U.S. Congressional Earmarks	Not determined as of 10/22/08												
SC General Assembly Earmarks													
State Infrastructure Bank													
Interstate Highways													

(SCDOT)														
Mass Transit														
FTA Section 5307	4,106	4,324	4,553	4,793	5,047	5,314	5,595	5,891	6,203	6,531	87,682	94,602	234,642	
Local Funds	Not determined as of 10/22/08													
Fare box Revenues, Fixed Route														
Fare box Revenues, DART														
FTA Section 5316 through SCDOT	64	66	68	70	72	74	77	79	82	84	1,005	1,273	3,013	
FTA Section 5317 through SCDOT	47	49	50	52	53	55	57	59	61	63	916	1,561	3,022	
Section 5316 Direct Recipient	234	250	267	286	305	326	349	372	398	425	6,244	7,619	17,076	
Section 5317 Direct Recipient	137	151	166	182	200	219	241	264	290	318	5,514	8,379	16,061	
Total	19,387	19,637	19,901	20,181	20,476	20,787	22,596	22,944	23,312	23,700	280,725	259,793	735,519	

Table 12.2: Enhanced Revenues Plan

	Enhanced Revenues Plan (costs in \$1,000s)												TOTAL
	<i>Illustrative Purposes</i>												
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019-28	2029-35	
Sales Tax Intitatives			102,000	104,040	106,121	108,243	110,408	112,616	114,869				758,297
State Infrastructure Bank					50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	150,000		450,000
Total					156,121	158,243	160,408	162,616	164,869	50,000	150,000		2,255,971

12.5 Existing and Potential Funding Sources

Presented in this report are several funding options at federal, state and local levels that may be considered in addressing the transportation needs of our region. While many of the potential funding sources discussed below continued to be considered by the MPO and local governments, the most significant alternative funding sources are clearly sales tax initiatives and the State Infrastructure Bank. These sources are capable of supporting a broad, comprehensive and substantial program of transportation system improvements. Most of the other sources identified are limited in their scope or applicability.

12.5.1 Federal Revenue Sources for Transportation Projects

The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) funds highway and mass transit projects through Highway Trust Fund. In 1956, the Highway Trust Fund was created to collect user fees to pay for highway and mass transit improvements without relying on General funds from Congress. Emergencies and major natural disaster have been funded from the General Fund but in times of federal deficits, it is not a reliable source of revenue.

Fuel user fees account for 90% of the revenues in the Highway Trust Fund. These fees include the 18.4¢ per gallon on gasoline, 24.4¢ on diesel, 13¢ on gasohol and various other fees on special fuels including compressed natural gas utilized in on the road vehicles. The gasoline tax has increased over the years from 3¢ in 1956, to 4.0¢ in 1960, to 7.8¢ in 1983, and to 9.0¢ in 1984. In 1994, the gasoline went to 18.4¢ and has not been raised or adjusted since then. In past years, 4.0¢ has gone to the General fund to reduce deficit but in last several years all the money collected for fuel user fees has gone to Highway Fund with 2.86¢ per gallon being deposited in the Mass Transit fund.

The three other fees collected for Highway Trust fund are: Vehicle Excise Tax; Tire Tax; and Heavy Vehicle User Fee. New tractors, trucks and trailers pay 12% Vehicle Excise Tax which adds 5% to the Highway Trust fund. The Tire Tax (for tires weighing over 40 pounds) brings in another 1%. Based on the weight of large trucks, the Heavy Vehicle User fee contributes another 4% to the Highway Trust Fund.

The Federal government does not spend the money in the Highway Trust Fund but allocates it the states by various programs. For Fiscal Years 2006, 2007 and 2008, between \$34 billion and \$40 billion will be spent yearly. Some states have received only 80% to 85% of the user

fees collected in their states while other states are allocated 110% to 115%. Part of SAFETEA-LU (The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) requires adjustments to a minimum of 92% to 95% of fuel user fees to be returned to states where it is collected. Historically South Carolina has been a donor state and received only 85% to 90% collected within our state. South Carolina therefore, should benefit from this law and increases in allocation should eventually be seen in the budget of SCDOT.

12.5.2 South Carolina Department of Transportation Revenue Sources

South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) revenue sources include: user fuel fee; tolls; interest on funds in accounts; federal funds from federal fuel user fees; and Federal Transit funds. The General Assembly provides a small amount of General Tax Funds but the amount varies from year to year and some of the funds are designated for certain projects or programs.

The user fuel fee (formerly know as the Gasoline Tax) began as 2¢ per gallon in 1922. By 1923, the user fuel fee went to 3¢, then 5¢ in 1926. The next increase was 6¢ in 1929. In 1950, the General Assembly increased the tax to 7¢ where it remained until 1972 when it was increased to 8¢. In 1977, the user fuel fee increased to 9¢. The years 1979 and 1980 saw increases of 1¢ each year. Two more increases followed in 1981 to 13¢ and finally in 1987 to 16¢ for Department of Transportation plus 3/4¢ for Department of Health and Environmental Control and Department of Agricultural. It should be noted that not all fuel user fees are unrestricted to road and bridge projects.

Fees at the Pump

16.00¢ per gallon to Department of Transportation

.50¢ per gallon Environmental fee to Department of Health & Environmental Control

.25¢ per gallon Inspection fee paid to Department of Agriculture

16.75¢ per gallon Total User fees at pump

DISTRIBUTIONS of User Fees on Gasoline and Diesel Fuel

16.00 ¢ Total	10.34 ¢	SCDOT general fund (less 0.25¢ for Transit)
	2.66 ¢	County Transportation Committees (25% must be spent on SCDOT roads)
	1.00 ¢	Department of Natural Resources for water recreation purposes
	2.00 ¢	State Highway Fund

Tolls collected on the Cross Island Parkway on Hilton Head and Southern Connector in Greenville County are dedicated to pay for operation of these facilities and to repay the bonds issued to build these projects. The General Assembly and USDOT have approved tolls for the construction of I-73 from the North Carolina border to Myrtle Beach. Tolls on I-95, from Georgia to North Carolina, are being considered to widen and make major improvements on this vital East Coast link of the Interstate system.

In 1997, the General Assembly created the South Carolina Transportation Infrastructure Bank (SCTIB) for major road and bridge projects in the state. SCDOT has exclusive use of this fund though all projects must be approved by its own Board of Directors. The three state sources of this fund are: Truck Registrations, Vehicle Registrations, and 1¢ of the fuel user fee. Other state agencies, private companies and individuals are also allowed to add funds to this bank. In the Central Midlands region, Lexington County and South Carolina Electric and Gas Company utilized SCTIB funds to rebuild and widen N. Lake Drive (SC 6) over Lake Murray Dam. SCTIB requires at least a 30% match from a dedicated source, such as a county sales tax.

Interest on funds collected but yet spent, amounts to \$6 million in the Fiscal Year 2008 Budget of SCDOT.

In the last several years, legislative committees in General Assembly have discussed increases in funds to SCDOT. One idea was to redirect funds collected for Vehicle Sales Tax from the General Fund to SCDOT. This tax has a limit up to \$300 which has not been increased since 1984. This tax brings in between \$85 to \$90 million annually. Another suggestion would be to increase the limit to \$500 or \$1000 and direct the increase to SCDOT.

One proposed bill, in 2007, would have transferred \$20 million in 2008, \$40 million in 2009, \$60 million in 2010, \$80 million in 2011

and \$100 million in 2012 from the General Fund to SCDOT for improvements of the secondary road system.

SCDOT Commissioners have asked for fuel user fee increase of 5¢ over a three to five year time span [1¢ fuel user fee brings in \$24 million statewide annually] for the past several years. With higher gasoline prices and the increase efficiencies in vehicle mileage, it has been suggested that the fuel user be changed from 16.75¢ per gallon to 8¢ or 10¢ sales tax fee. Another option would be to combine a user fee per gallon and a sales tax (Georgia has such a system).

Larger budgets for SCDOT may or may not increase the funds sent to MPOs for road improvement projects.

12.5.3 Revenue Sources for Local Transportation Projects

There are three types of **Local Option Sales Taxes**. Two of them are available as a transportation funding tool.

The Local Sales Tax was created to reduce property tax. This countywide tax is shared by county and its municipalities. It must be passed by voters in a general election year. This one (1) cent tax generates funds which lower the milage rate. This tax does not apply to transportation funding. **Capital Project Sales Tax** pays for capital projects, including roads and bridges in part or all of a county. This one (1) cent tax has a sunset provision of seven years or when bonds are repaid, whichever comes sooner. Projects must be listed on the ballot. It must be voted on in a general election. Capital projects for transit can be funded with this tax. To be successful, both Lexington and Richland counties would need to pass this tax. Lexington County recently passed school building sales tax. Several towns and cities have also expressed an interest in this funding source to use for capital improvements in their communities.

Local Sales Tax for Transportation Facilities generates funds to be spent on transportation projects, including transit. This tax can be any portion up to one (1) cent. Projects must be listed on the ballot in a general election. The sunset provision on this tax is any length up to 25 years or when bonds are repaid.

In Richland County, a one (1) cent tax would generate approximately \$67 million a year and in Lexington County it would generate approximately \$35 million.

The Property Tax can be levied for transportation similar to taxes for schools. If special transportation districts are established then this tax could be applied to portions of counties instead of countywide. It appears that the property tax can include transit funding but a referendum is required. Voter dislike of property tax increases is a major problem with this funding source.

Tolls can be levied on new roads and bridges to pay for bonds issued to build this infrastructure. This funding source is ideal for new limited access roads or bridges because users would pay for it directly. In our MPO area, few projects lend themselves to this funding source. Transit projects cannot be funded by tolls.

User Fees can be levied by counties for road maintenance and public transportation. Automobile owners pay these fees with their annual registration fees and property tax. Richland County has a \$20 fee for road maintenance.

Local Hospitality Tax is levied on prepared food and beverages with a maximum rate of 2%. The intention of this tax is for tourism related activities. Highways which increase access to tourism destinations are eligible for this funding. Roads to local and state parks, local museums, Lake Murray and the Congaree National Park would meet this requirement. Transit could not use these funds except to operate tourism related transit such as the Five Points and Vista shuttle service. Locally, the Town of Lexington has recently repealed this tax.

Local Accommodation Tax is levied on hotel/motel rooms with a maximum rate of 3%. Persons visiting for conventions, Fort Jackson and USC are the largest payers of this tax. Most local taxpayers do not pay this tax. Like the local hospitality tax, tourism related activities are the only recipients of these funds. Again, our MPO has few tourism destinations and thus few road projects would be eligible. Several local governments use funds from this tax for other tourism related activities. The unincorporated areas of Lexington and Richland counties and the City of Columbia have a 3% tax.

Franchise Fees are levied by cities and counties on cable television companies and/or ambulance services. Most local taxpayers do not see fees as an additional tax. With deregulation pending, the future of this funding source is uncertain. Both Lexington and Richland counties use this source of revenue. Local governments have already dedicated this revenue to other programs or projects.

Business License Fees are levied by local governments on gross income of persons or businesses. Local taxpayers do not see this fee as an increase in taxation. Richland County imposes this fee already. Local governments have already dedicated this revenue to other programs or projects.

The South Carolina Transportation Infrastructure Bank (SCTIB) will match large projects or groups of projects (over \$100 million). The revenue of the bank is one (1) cent of the sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel collected by the state (\$24 million annually), truck registration and licenses (\$53 million), vehicle registration fees (new revenue source), federal funds, private donations or funds appropriated by the General Assembly, and interest from bonds issued by the bank. Locally, the Lexington County Lake Murray Dam and Highway 6 road widening has tapped this fund. A match of at least 30% by local source is required. This match can come from local sales tax, tolls, local hospitality revenue or other sources. With a local referendum passing in Florence county and a request by SCDOT for US 17 widening in Beaufort and Colleton (approximately a \$200 million project), this fund may not be available for the few years. Transit projects are eligible for these funds.

Development Agreements are allowed between municipalities and counties with developers for subdivisions over 25 acres. The agreements may include provisions to improve existing public facilities or construct new facilities (including roads, water and sewer and drainage). Intersection improvements and additional turn lanes could be required to be built by developers.

Development Impact Fees are levied on new developments. State law requires that fees reflect impact of the development to local infrastructure. This fee is paid indirectly by new homeowners, and not by local taxpayers, since they increase the price of new housing.

Table 12.3: Revenue Sources for Local Transportation Projects Summary

Type of Funding	Funding Use	Potential Annual Income
Capital Project Sales Tax	roads, bridges, water, sewer, capital projects for transit	1¢ = Richland County \$67 million 1¢ = Lexington \$35 million
Local Sales Tax for Transportation Facilities	roads, bridges, & transit	1¢ = Richland County \$67 million 1¢ = Lexington \$35 million
Property Tax	roads, bridges, & transit	1 mill = Richland County \$1 million - 2003 1 mill = Lexington County \$655,000 - 2002
Tolls	roads, bridges	variable
User Fees	roads, bridges, & transit	variable
Local Hospitality Tax	roads to tourist attractions	Columbia = \$1.9 million
		Richland County = \$3.8 million
		Lexington County = \$901,200
Local Accommodation Tax	roads to tourist attractions	Richland County = \$450,000 in 2005 Lexington County = \$274,850 in 2005-06
Franchise Fees	county/city general funds	Columbia = \$4.5 million in 1996-7
		Richland County = \$1.7 million
Business License Fees	county/city general funds	Richland County = \$5.3 million
SC Transportation Infrastructure Bank Pool (SCTIB)	roads, bridges, & transit	Requires 70/30 match
Development Agreements	roads, water, sewer, drainage	variable
Development Impact Fees	roads, water, sewer, drainage, schools, fire stations	variable
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	roads, sidewalks, lighting, parks	variable
Special Assessment District	roads, water, sewer, drainage	variable

City Vehicle Registration	roads, sidewalks, trails	variable
Congestion Tax	Roads	variable
Parking Tax	Roads	variable
Environmental Levies	roads, sidewalks, trails	variable
Local Fuel User Fee	roads, bridges, & transit	See table in Local Fuel User Fee section

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a tool to assist in redevelopment of “blighted areas”. Any increases in taxes collection due to increased value of property in a defined area are collected to pay for improvements in that designated district. Columbia’s Vista District is an example of this financing in which roads and sidewalks were improved. All entities which collect taxes in district must agree to the district (such as school district, county, cities, and special tax districts for fire or water and sewer). Road improvements in the district are eligible for this financing.

Special Assessment Districts are created to provide additional services to special district such as paving roads, sewer service or transportation. They can be created by three methods. A petition containing the signature of 15% of voters would initiate a special election with a majority approval needed. Method two would be a petition that has 75% of voters with at least 75% of assessed property value with no election. The third method of creating a special assessment districts would be for county council to declare all unincorporated land in the county as one special assessment district.

City Vehicle Registration is allowed by state law for any city with a population over 70,000. It does not appear there are not any restrictions on how these funds collected for this registration can be spent. (SC Code of Law Section 56-3-440).

Transit Funding

The following is a summary of the revenue sources available to local Transit Operators. The Local Sales Tax for Transportation Facilities for operations and capital projects and Capital Project Sales Tax for capital projects, Property Tax (countywide or as Special Assessment District), Vehicle Registration Fees (User Fees), and General Funds from local governments and user fees (fares collected by transit system). Local

referendums are required for Local Sales Tax, Property Tax for transit operations and for Vehicle Registration Fees. If no property tax funds are spent from General Funds from local governments (such as, Franchise and Business License Fees), no referendum is required. Transportation Infrastructure Bank (SCTIB) can also be utilized to fund transit operations and capital improvements.

Any supplemental funding source could allow funds to also be shared with transit providers for capital and operations expenditures.

Other Supplemental Funding Sources: These sources are currently not available for transportation and transit projects. The South Carolina Legislature would need to approve the following options for SCDOT or local governments. Any of these fees or taxes could support transit operations and capital needs.

Value Pricing (Congestion or Parking Tax) would increase parking fees or fees for peak usage of roadways. Locally, parking lots would charge an additional dollar or two each space daily, weekly or monthly. Some preference could be given to carpoolers. Congestion fees could include usage of HOV lanes or fees for peak time usage.

Environmental Levies are based on the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by automobiles and trucks. This charge could be based on emissions data collected at annual inspections stations and could help with local air quality problems.

Local User Fuel Fee would allow counties to levy either a sales tax on fuels of 1¢ to 5¢ (allowed in Georgia) or fuel user fee of 1¢ to 5¢ per gallon (Florida counties impose between 10¢ and 18¢). Depending on the restrictions put on from the General Assembly and if “C” funds are still rebated to counties, this fee could be an excellent revenue source for local major and minor road improvements (including paving of dirt roads) and could even assist local transit authorities. The following table shows a 1¢ per gallon user fee and 1¢ sales tax fee:

Table 12.4: Revenue by County

County	# of Vehicles Registered in 2004	Fuel Usage in 2004	Total County Fuel Usage (vehicles x fuel)	Income=1¢ per gallon	Income=1¢ sales tax (\$2.00 price per gallon)
Richland	265,964	1,020	271,283,280	\$2,712,833	\$5,425,666
Lexington	239,325	1,020	244,111,500	\$2,441,115	\$4,882,230
COATS (Richland & Lexington)	505,289	1,020	515,394,780	\$5,153,948	\$10,307,896
Newberry	35,129	1,020	35,831,580	\$358,158	\$716,316
Fairfield	22,562	1,020	23,013,240	\$230,132	\$460,264

12.6 Objectives & Strategies

1. Make efficient use of SCDOT/ Federal Guideshare funds by effectively prioritizing projects and expenditures.

- Provide increased funding for intersections, signalization, intelligent transportation systems and other congestion management techniques
- Encourage SCDOT to reallocate funding to MPO's based on more recent population data.

2. Find new sources of transportation funding to supplement the inadequate Federal allocations.

- Carefully study the benefits of sales tax programs in Lexington and Richland Counties; if warranted, encourage ballot initiatives for the 2010 Election.
- Use any local/ alternative funding source to “leverage” State Infrastructure Bank funding