Legend of Documents:

1. Budget Work Session Agenda for June 13th and July 6th Sessions (white)
2. Narrative of 2017 Budget Strategy and Key Issues, with Legislative Summary of Senate Substitute for House Bill 2088 (tax lid) (white, stapled)
3. 10-Year Retrospective of Budgeted Revenues and Expenditures, Actual Cash Balances and Mill Rates (pink)
4. 10-Year Retrospective of Budgeted Expenditures, Graphed (beige)
5. 10-Year Retrospective of Mill Rate Values, Graphed (yellow)
6. Draft Master Facilities Plan and related Documents; will be sent electronically on Friday, June 10th and copies provided at the work session
June 13, 2016: Budget Work Session #1 (Perkins Room 201, 9:00 AM to Noon)

Meeting Purpose: First review of preliminary 2017 budget strategy, the draft Master Facilities Plan and other key issues

Expected Product: Engage Trustees and Library Management Team members in budget planning and development, understand and discuss key issues and consider prioritization and funding strategies with emphasis on facilities

Agenda
- Review and discuss “final draft” of the Master Facilities Plan, including a review of prioritized infrastructure projects and cost estimates in the “Opinion of Probable Construction Cost” – Tevis Architects – David Heit, Associate Principal, Bob Fincham, Associate Principal, Theodore Demonchaux, Project Manager
- Review of historical data, 2017 budget strategy and key issues – Sheryl Weller, Chief Financial Officer

Refreshments will be provided at this session.

July 6, 2016: Budget Work Session #2 (Perkins Room 201, Noon to 3:00 PM)

Meeting Purpose: Review proposed 2017 budget, including county property valuations

Expected Product: Reach agreement on the 2017 budget proposal to allow action at the July 21st Board meeting for publication requirements

Agenda
- Review updated information for property valuations and other key expenditures for the budgeted funds: General, Employee Benefit, Debt Service and State Aid – Sheryl Weller, Chief Financial Officer
- Review proposed documents to be published: Budget Summary, Notice of Budget Hearing – Sheryl Weller, Chief Financial Officer

Lunch will be provided at this session.
Budget Narrative
June 13, 2016
Board of Trustees 2017 Budget Work Session #1

Overview
The Board of Trustees and Library management have worked to develop a budget review and preparation process that is based on a comprehensive assessment of operational and strategic needs. This is a logical and responsible progression for funding, and more importantly accomplishing, the initiatives within strategic, community and facilities plans, as well as fulfilling Topeka and Shawnee County Public Library’s (TSCPL’s) mission and goals. This methodology will be particularly important as the Library implements a strategic plan for the next decade based on five Community Impact Goals and makes decisions regarding prioritization of projects in the multi-year Master Facilities Plan. Further, the Library’s past success has been accomplished by wisely using its resources and maintaining a stable mill levy rate.

During the 2016 budget preparation process, the first Board budget work session was re-designed to focus more on education, review and discussion of key issues and prioritization of initiatives. This seemed to work well in advance of the property valuations, actual budget numbers and the technical budget document. Thus, this year’s first budget work session will follow a similar approach.

These key goals, initiatives and issues must guide the 2017 budget preparation:

- Supporting strategies and tactics for implementation of the Community Impact Goals:
  1. Every child will be ready for kindergarten.
  2. Everyone will discover their passion for learning.
  3. Everyone will continue learning new ways to live their best life.
  4. Topeka & Shawnee County will be an engaged community of readers.
  5. The library will be a learning organization committed to excellence in: leadership, planning, customer focus, process management and partner focus.

- Prioritizing and funding phases, projects and infrastructure needs on the Master Facilities Plan.

- Leading and funding technological advancements, including electronic materials, to support the expectations and requirements of customers and the community, and to demonstrate how technology can enhance learning and living.
The budget should emphasize partnerships, an exceptional customer experience everywhere library services are provided, and funding operations within the resources provided at the current mill levy rate.

This may present some challenges and decisions will be necessary on how best to continue the Library’s current momentum and community impact. Property valuation information will not be available from the County Clerk until after June 30th. The 2017 budget may have several scenarios presented in which revenues remain the same, but different combinations of expenditures could be considered. These scenarios will be presented at the second Board budget work session on July 6th.

**Status**
Here is what is known at this point in the process:

- There has been little reported in local media this year regarding property valuations. However, the *Topeka Capital-Journal* reported on February 22, 2016 that 2015 home sales were the highest since 2007, as well as an upswing in new construction, both commercial and residential. Shawnee County Appraiser Steve Bauman provided the following statistics to the County Commission:
  - Commercial market values are increasing this year by about 3.5% and new commercial construction has added a little more than $41.4 million (11% increase from last year) to Shawnee County property values.
  - Residential/farm home market values are rising about 1.5% and new residential construction has added a little more than $51.25 million (8% increase from last year) to Shawnee County property values.

  The actual valuations will be available from the Shawnee County Clerk the first week in July.

- Estimates of motor vehicle tax revenues provided by Shawnee County for use in the budget are just over $73,000 more than 2016 for the three levied funds.

- Cash balances remain healthy and stable. Use of these balances must be weighed against the need to retain a superior credit rating for the bonds and having sufficient fund reserves in the event of an emergency or other unplanned situation.

- As part of the first Board budget work session last year, the Board and management team recognized and discussed facility needs, both in terms of infrastructure and the way in which customers need to use the Library now. This resulted in two actions by the Board:
  - On July 22, 2015, the Board approved the Chief Executive Officer to contract with an architect for the development of a multi-year Master Facilities Plan. This plan is expected to:
    - allow the Library to support service changes;
    - keep the library current and relevant to 21st century library users;
minimize inconvenience to customers;
allow the Board to fund any structural changes in a reasonable and cost-effective manner;
address long-standing challenges with way-finding and awareness of collections and services;
redesign the children’s library.

The local architectural firm, Tevis Architects, was selected to develop the Master Facilities Plan.

- On March 17, 2016, the Board adopted and approved guidelines for the draft Master Facilities Plan, with these guidelines intended to provide direction and set priorities in the Plan’s development and implementation.
  1. Maintain optimal conditions and operation of the building, its site, systems, furnishings, technology and other physical infrastructure.
  2. Increase public space used to support learning, literacy and civic engagement.
  3. Preserve the Library’s architectural integrity and character.
  4. Improve people’s ability to use the services, programs, collections and learning experiences provided by a 21st century library.
  5. Exercise good stewardship of public and private resources in maintaining and improving the building, its site, its systems, furnishings, technology and other physical infrastructure.

- Staff have been working with Tevis Architects since late summer 2015 and the Board has been shown a couple of presentations of some of the ideas from which to choose. It is now time for the presentation of the final draft of the Master Facilities Plan, along with a prioritized analysis with cost estimates by year for infrastructure needs. The timing works well with the budget preparation process. Further, it gives the Board and staff more time for questions and discussion before the final Master Facilities Plan is presented for Board approval, proposed for the July Board meeting.

Professional staff from Tevis Architects will present the proposed final draft documents at this budget work session. The documents are still considered work products, but will be made available electronically to Trustees on Friday, June 10th and paper copies will be available at Monday’s work session.

- Funding for the phases and projects of the Master Facilities Plan is expected to originate from a combination of the General Fund operating budget, the Capital Improvements Fund and the Lingo gift for permanent improvements to the library or library facilities, currently invested by the Library Foundation (just under $550,000). As a reminder, no additional funds can be added to the Capital Improvement Fund until the debt service is fully paid in September 2019. The fund balance as of May 31, 2016 is $2,065,083.
• The Major Initiatives Funding Matrix is a multi-year planning and funding tool that has proven successful for all three Boards – Library, Foundation and Friends. However, with the Master Facilities Plan and “Opinion of Probable Construction Cost” (for infrastructure projects) documents encompassing most of the priority needs on the Funding Matrix, these documents will temporarily supersede it.

Three specific future equipment/vehicle replacements to keep in mind that will need funding sources are: (1) the automated materials handling system which is at end of life, but currently satisfactorily operational (parts are becoming difficult to obtain); (2) the self-service kiosks, in year two of an estimated five year life; and (3) the possible replacement of the Adventuremobile.

• During the past few years, the administration team has been working to find the best way to continue to deliver health benefits of the highest quality and value at a competitive cost for the Library and its employees. Cost containment must continue, to maximize the ability to meet the Library’s public service goals. Below is a summary of changes already enacted and actions still necessary.

  o A qualified high deductible health plan (QHDHP), with pre-loaded Health Savings Accounts (HSA) as an incentive, was implemented for the 2015 plan year. A little over one-third of the active employees are enrolled in the plan. This plan is expected to provide significant savings over the long term. It also dovetails with the team’s opinion that the Library and its employees will benefit from increasing emphasis on wellness and from a consumer’s perspective on health care costs.

  o The premium cost sharing between the employee and the Library for the traditional medical plan, as well as some of the co-payments, were changed beginning with the 2016 plan year. Employees who choose this less risky plan are charged slightly more under the assumption that less risk generally means increased price.

  o A decision about the continuation and amount of employer contributions to the Health Savings Accounts will be made for 2017 and future years. It should be considered part of the employer’s cost of the health insurance premium.

  o The retiree post-employment health care policy for participation in the health plan was significantly amended by the Board effective April 16, 2015. The Library moved from a 50% premium subsidy to a flat dollar premium reduction. For 2016 the premium contribution by the Library for all retiree health plans is $300 per month. No subsidy of dental plans is offered. The rate of subsidy in 2017 will be determined as a part of budget development. Effective January 1, 2017, all retirees age 65 or older must leave the Library’s plan and find other health insurance options, instead of allowing lifetime participation. The proliferation of affordable, quality Medicare supplemental plans was a major reason for
Changes to this policy. Overall health plan savings are expected to be realized when the Medicare-eligible retirees move out of the Library’s group plan.

- The health and dental plans were taken to market for the 2016 plan year. This was the first time in many years that the plans were opened for competitive pricing. The medical plan remains very competitive in premium pricing, provides the best local network of health care providers and has excellent negotiated service rates. Thus, Blue Cross Blue Shield was again selected as the medical insurance carrier. However, the bid process resulted in a dental premium savings of over 25% by moving from Blue Cross Blue Shield to Delta Dental with virtually identical benefits. An employee-paid vision plan also was offered for the first time.

- The Library has historically received a refund from Blue Cross Blue Shield at the conclusion of each plan year. This is because of the structure of the Library’s fully insured plan and is based on actual versus projected claims, premiums and reserves. If claims are lower, Blue Cross issues a refund. Unexpectedly the Library received a large refund of $462,836 from Blue Cross Blue Shield in early 2016. This exceeded the total of the refunds received in the previous five years.

Although no data is provided to truly prove the components of this large refund, theoretically the health plan strategies, bidding and related decisions are achieving the desired goals of cost savings and cost containment. This includes: (1) the move of over one-third of active participants to the high-deductible health plan which provides fewer immediate claims for the insurance carrier; (2) the change in retiree health policy to no longer offer health benefits to those age 65 or over; and (3) the move of the dental plan to another carrier which eliminated the Blue Cross dental reserve. Thus, some of this should be expected to have been a one-time return of money previously paid via premiums.

- The administration team asked for both an opinion from legal counsel and a consultant’s recommendation on how to properly manage this refund. Legally, the refund must be deposited into and remain in the Employee Benefit Fund (which has already occurred). State law prohibits the transfer of money from one fund to another unless expressly permitted. (The Library has no funds transfer provision within law.) However, the money in the Employee Benefit Fund may be used for any allowable purpose related to employee benefits and not only for health insurance premiums.

The Library’s benefits consultant suggested a portion of the refund be “returned” to active health plan participants. This could be done through a premium “holiday” in which employees are not charged. However, because the Library pays the majority of the premiums (81% to 89%) of the medical plan, this return of funds will not address the majority of the refund.
The consultant again suggested the Library consider self-insuring its medical plan. Previous meetings and discussions have occurred on this idea, but the administration team was not confident in recommending it due to the cost savings not being a certain return on the investment in additional administrative time and management. However, the consultants suggested a new partial self-funding option available from Blue Cross Blue Shield in which the third-party administration and stop loss insurance would all be managed under their umbrella. This would prevent fronting the costs of claims exceeding the stop loss insurance maximum, requesting a refund and managing cash flow until the refund was received. Thus, it is a reduction in risk assumption. The administration team wanted to provide due diligence and offered one more meeting; this time with both the consultants and Blue Cross Blue Shield plan administrators.

Further, this adheres to last year’s phased approach to a decision about self-insuring. It was planned that the impact of key decisions be assessed after implementation to review their impact and make a more informed determination about the real value of self-insurance vs. full funding:

- 2015: assess effects of plan design changes, utilize information in developing bid requests for fully-insured and self-insured healthcare coverage; consider adding supplemental benefits; continue employee & retiree education; expand wellness initiatives
- 2016: evaluate data and measure success of plan designs and funding choices; decision regarding self-funding vs fully-insured; retiree premium subsidy changes begin
- 2017: Medicare-eligible retirees must leave the Library plan

After meeting with the consultants and Blue Cross Blue Shield plan administrators, the administration team prepared a “plus/delta” analysis for becoming self-insured versus staying fully insured. Again, increased risk assumption and increased administrative time and management outweighed the potential cost savings, especially with the need for a fairly low stop loss insurance maximum and the plan size decreasing due to the move of the retirees age 65 and over out of the plan. At this point, maintaining a fully insured medical plan for the foreseeable future is the team’s recommendation.

The recommended solution for the refund and Employee Benefit Fund cash balance is to enact a premium “holiday’ for employees in the last quarter of 2016, then carry the remaining refund (employer paid share) over to 2017. This cash can then be used in lieu of new year tax revenues to fund employee benefits. Within a flat total mill levy, that would allow some revenues to return to the General Fund to fund one-time operational needs, such as phases and projects on the Master Facilities Plan.

In prior years when health insurance costs were continuing with double-digit annual increases and refunds were much smaller, the portion of the total mill levy allocated to the Employee Benefit Fund was increased
and the General Fund tax revenues, and related operating expenditures, were decreased. Now that strategies and decisions regarding the health plan have proven successful, the mill levy can return to operational needs, at least in the short term. Care must be exercised that ongoing operational expenditures are not funded from this temporary funding allocation and spend down of available cash balance.

- The employer share of KPERS will decrease by .72% on January 1, 2017 in accordance with state law; from 9.18% to 8.46%. The rates were set by state law to meet unfunded actuarial projections and this was leveling off for local, non-school employers. With the recent actions by the Kansas Legislature to balance the State’s budget, it is unknown how future rates for local governments will be impacted. The death and disability insurance rate for employers will be 0% effective January 1 – June 30, 2017 and 1% from July 1 – December 31, 2017.

- The Federal Department of Labor has finalized overtime regulations. This more than doubles the minimum salary threshold for the executive, professional and administrative exemptions within the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). It impacts 13 positions that are currently paid below the new threshold. Managers are meeting this week to make decisions about exempt/non-exempt classifications which will drive the decision to either increase base salary or pay overtime as incurred. Either way, this will be accounted for within existing resources in the 2016 (effective December 1) and 2017 budgets.

- Communication has been received from State Librarian Jo Budler regarding state budget reductions to the State Library and their potential impact on individual libraries.

  - Current year reductions are met through a suspension of KPERS employer contributions so there is no effect on the State Library’s operations.

  - The State Library’s share of the 2017 budget cuts is $161,001 which is slightly less than 5% of their budget. It will be applied across services and public libraries should plan to receive 5% less in 2017 State Aid from 2016 State Aid. For TSCPL, that is a reduction of $2,738 from $54,756 to $52,018 annually. This money is always budgeted for funding of one-time expenditures and projects due to its uncertainty.

  - The financial contribution by individual libraries to the shared statewide collection of new ebooks and ebook copies is encouraged, since state funding for this is expected to be reduced. The same holds true for the cost of statewide databases. They quote a cost of $1.3 million for the current annual subscriptions versus $54 million if subscribed to individually (in 2011 dollars so that cost is likely more). TSCPL expects to provide continued support.

- Just a reminder about Senate Substitute for House Bill 2088; the amended tax lid bill that was signed into law effective July 1, 2016. The legislative summary prepared by the Kansas Legislative Research Department is enclosed. The
amendments primarily impact the public voting requirement for cities and counties for proposed tax increases over the statutorily calculated limit. The amendments may impact TSCPL through the State’s formula for the “Computation to Determine Limit” for the budget year due to changes in exemptions in property tax increases. The County Clerk will provide the relevant amounts in the proper categories.

Under current law, the Library’s taxing limit and requirements for a proposal to exceed it would apply as follows.

- If and when the property (ad valorem) tax funding in the approved 2017 budget exceeds the property tax funding for 2016 by more than the Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI) for the prior calendar year (2015 is .125%), the statutory calculation would be exceeded. (This is based solely on a dollar amount increase, even if that increase occurs from applying a flat total mill levy to increased valuations).

- If the increase in property tax funding exceeds the limit and is approved by a majority vote of the Board, the vote must be published in the official county newspaper. This is the Topeka Metro News, not the Topeka Capital Journal in which the Notice of Budget Hearing is historically published. The vote by individual Trustee need not be published and the publication cannot occur until after the Board approves its budget, currently scheduled for August 11th. A copy of the dated newspaper clipping must accompany the budget filed with the County Clerk (done by the CFO).

The Kansas Department of Administration offers these sample publications:

Notice of Vote – Topeka and Shawnee County Public Library

In adopting Topeka and Shawnee County Public Library’s 2017 budget, the governing body voted to increase property taxes in an amount greater than the amount levied for the Library’s 2016 budget, adjusted by the 2015 Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers. XX members voted in favor of the budget, while XX members voted against the budget.

Or,

Notice of Vote – Topeka and Shawnee County Public Library

Pursuant to K.S.A. 2015 Supp. 79-2925b, as amended by 2016 Senate Substitute for House Bill 2088

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total property tax levied</th>
<th>Mill Levy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Budget</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Budget</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved (vote) ______ to _______

*2016 mill levy is actual. 2017 mill levy is estimated.
This example would demonstrate a flat mill levy approach with additional revenues created only as a result of increasing valuations. It is also acceptable to modify it to only show the amounts of property taxes levied, without mill rates.

- The big concern with the law is that the requirement that cities and counties must conduct a public vote, if the proposed property tax revenues exceed the CPI test, could be eventually applied to all taxing subdivisions.
Senate Sub. for HB 2088 accelerates by one year (from January 1, 2018, to January 1, 2017) the effective date of a tax lid for cities and counties, originally approved in 2015 legislation. Under the tax lid provisions, increases in property tax dollars levied beyond the rate of inflation generally require voter approval, except that certain types of property tax increases are exempt from the computation involved in determining whether mandatory elections are necessary.

New clarifying language stipulates that the inflation measure utilized will be a five-year rolling average, and under no circumstances could a figure be utilized of less than zero.

A number of exemptions enacted in the 2015 law also are modified. Under the new language, exemptions will apply for property tax increases attributable to:

- Construction of new structures, improvements, remodeling or renovation of existing structures, or improvements on real property, exclusive of ordinary maintenance or repair;
- Increased personal property valuation;
- Real property located within added jurisdictional territory;
- Real property that has changed in use;
- Certain bond and interest payments;
- Certain special assessments;
- Court judgments or settlements of legal actions against the cities or counties, as well as legal costs directly related to such judgments or settlements;
- Expenditures specifically mandated by federal or state law becoming effective after July 1, 2015. (Additional language clarifies this exemption applies to taxes levied to recover the loss of funds from federal sources after January 1, 2017, where local units are contractually obligated to provide services);
- Expenses relating to certain federal, state, or local disasters or emergencies declared by a federal or state official (including certain financial emergencies). Boards of county commissioners may request the Governor to declare such disaster or emergency;
- Expenditures used exclusively for increased law enforcement, fire protection, or emergency medical services above the rate of inflation. Such expenditures may not be utilized for the construction or remodeling of buildings;
• Principal and interest on state infrastructure loans, bonds, temporary notes, no-fund warrants, and certain payments made to public building commissions and lease payments;

• Expiration of property tax abatements;

• Expiration of tax increment financing districts, rural housing incentive districts, neighborhood revitalization areas, or other property tax rebate or redirection programs; and

• Certain increases associated with the loss of property valuation occurring as a result of legislative action, judicial action, or Board of Tax Appeals rulings.

An additional exemption from the mandatory election requirements applies when property tax dollars levied have declined in one of the three preceding years and the proposed increase for the upcoming year does not exceed the average rate of inflation for the three preceding years.

Finally, certain property tax increases are excluded from the computation relative to levies made by cities and counties on behalf of other subordinate political or governmental subdivisions when cities and counties are not empowered to modify or reduce such levies.

Language relative to tax-lid elections that are triggered clarifies such elections could occur as special elections, as part of regularly scheduled elections held in August or November of election years, or as elections held pursuant to the provisions of the Mail Ballot Election Act (MBEA). An existing MBEA restriction is relaxed to authorize cities and counties to hold tax-lid related elections under the MBEA on the same day. Under the legislation, cities and counties are responsible for paying all costs associated with conducting tax-lid elections.

Several statutory dates relating to the transmission of assessed valuation estimates and certification of tax rolls by local officials are adjusted to accommodate those cities and counties subject to the election requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual Mill Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefit Fund</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>1.802</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>2.011</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>1.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from Prior Year</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>(0.712)</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from Prior Year</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td>-7.36%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Mill</strong></td>
<td>12,951,891</td>
<td>13,361,954</td>
<td>13,175,350</td>
<td>13,175,349</td>
<td>14,292,852</td>
<td>14,280,835</td>
<td>14,677,924</td>
<td>14,688,989</td>
<td>15,072,469</td>
<td>15,146,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Budgeted Revenues</td>
<td>85.77%</td>
<td>82.97%</td>
<td>83.92%</td>
<td>83.63%</td>
<td>83.77%</td>
<td>85.22%</td>
<td>85.41%</td>
<td>87.29%</td>
<td>85.75%</td>
<td>86.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Ad Valorem Property Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>10,082,994</td>
<td>9,903,624</td>
<td>9,825,044</td>
<td>9,186,035</td>
<td>8,909,342</td>
<td>10,040,747</td>
<td>10,228,960</td>
<td>10,375,781</td>
<td>10,444,222</td>
<td>11,007,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefit Fund</td>
<td>2,067,141</td>
<td>1,522,181</td>
<td>2,095,591</td>
<td>2,745,241</td>
<td>2,561,476</td>
<td>2,634,392</td>
<td>2,529,505</td>
<td>3,016,383</td>
<td>2,735,758</td>
<td>2,618,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>1,576,816</td>
<td>1,526,086</td>
<td>1,441,319</td>
<td>1,244,074</td>
<td>1,704,531</td>
<td>1,617,713</td>
<td>1,522,370</td>
<td>1,285,760</td>
<td>1,509,009</td>
<td>1,446,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>13,726,951</td>
<td>12,951,891</td>
<td>13,361,954</td>
<td>13,175,350</td>
<td>13,175,349</td>
<td>14,292,852</td>
<td>14,280,835</td>
<td>14,677,924</td>
<td>14,688,989</td>
<td>15,072,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>11,784,782</td>
<td>11,904,160</td>
<td>11,737,998</td>
<td>11,224,107</td>
<td>10,823,376</td>
<td>11,845,801</td>
<td>12,026,117</td>
<td>11,940,924</td>
<td>12,424,743</td>
<td>12,747,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefit Fund</td>
<td>2,386,736</td>
<td>1,909,570</td>
<td>2,441,463</td>
<td>3,101,651</td>
<td>3,040,055</td>
<td>3,094,495</td>
<td>2,992,599</td>
<td>3,453,950</td>
<td>3,240,757</td>
<td>3,125,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>1,833,380</td>
<td>1,797,251</td>
<td>1,741,896</td>
<td>1,429,357</td>
<td>1,864,001</td>
<td>1,831,295</td>
<td>1,701,456</td>
<td>1,420,636</td>
<td>1,646,673</td>
<td>1,613,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual Unencumbered Beginning Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>2,769,792</td>
<td>2,919,843</td>
<td>2,685,502</td>
<td>2,240,018</td>
<td>2,557,418</td>
<td>2,694,568</td>
<td>2,532,937</td>
<td>2,619,880</td>
<td>2,616,796</td>
<td>2,789,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefit Fund</td>
<td>1,070,598</td>
<td>1,109,316</td>
<td>587,781</td>
<td>252,481</td>
<td>628,427</td>
<td>891,375</td>
<td>1,072,681</td>
<td>852,355</td>
<td>1,361,347</td>
<td>1,407,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>1,498,859</td>
<td>1,543,807</td>
<td>1,514,846</td>
<td>1,323,668</td>
<td>928,367</td>
<td>981,364</td>
<td>994,896</td>
<td>1,017,984</td>
<td>828,862</td>
<td>836,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5,339,249</td>
<td>5,572,966</td>
<td>4,788,129</td>
<td>3,816,167</td>
<td>4,114,212</td>
<td>4,567,327</td>
<td>4,600,514</td>
<td>4,490,219</td>
<td>4,807,005</td>
<td>5,034,097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TSCPL 10-Yr Retrospective - Actual Mill Rate Values (2016 budgeted @ 9.782 mills)