



**AGENDA
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
IRMO HIGH SCHOOL'S CAFETERIA
MAY 7, 2012**

1. Call to order at **6.00 p.m.**
2. Enter executive session to consider the following:
 - a. Selected employment items (Exhibit A)
 - b. Briefing regarding legal matters involving District 5
 - c. Receipt of legal advice on the contractual procedures for the Superintendent's evaluation
3. Welcoming remarks at 7 p.m.
4. Invocation – David Clifton, youth pastor, Union United Methodist Church
5. Pledge of Allegiance – Caroline Garris, student body president, Irmo High School
6. School Board Spotlight
7. Approve the agenda
8. Welcome and brief overview of Irmo High School by Caroline Garris, student body president
9. Superintendent's report (**30 minutes**)
 - a. Superintendent
10. Public participation*

ACTION AGENDA (30 minutes)

11. Items considered in executive session

12. Approval of bid for phase one improvements at Irmo High School (Exhibit B)
13. Moving the July 9, 2012 school board meeting to July 23, 2012
14. Approval of the minutes of the April 23, 2012 board meeting (**3 minutes**)

DISCUSSION AGENDA

15. Conduct a budget work session on the 2012-2013 General Fund Budget (Exhibit C)
16. Adjourn at 9:30 p.m.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

17. The next regular scheduled board meeting will be May 21, 2012 at CrossRoads Middle School.

*The Board welcomes and encourages public participation and includes an opportunity during its meetings for the public to do so. We respectfully ask that you adhere to the procedures and the decorum provided in board policy BEDH "Public Participation at Meetings". We ask that you sign-up to speak before the meeting begins and that you provide us your name, address and topic of input. Your comments should be limited to three minutes. Questions asked during public participation and placed in writing will receive a written response in a timely manner. Comments, questions and opinions are appreciated but should always be presented in a manner that reflects the respect and dignity expected by our community. Personal attacks on members of the community, the Board, or the staff of the school system will not be allowed.



Minutes/ April 23, 2012

The Board of Trustees of School District Five of Lexington and Richland Counties met at Chapin Middle School with the following members present:

Mr. Robert Gantt, Chairman
Mrs. Beth Hutchison-Watson, Vice Chairman
Mrs. Ellen Baumgardner, Secretary
Mrs. Jan Hammond
Mrs. Kim Murphy
Mr. Jim Turner
Mr. Ed White
Dr. Stephen Hefner, District Superintendent

The following staff were in attendance:

Ms. Helen Anderson, Chief Instructional Services Officer
Dr. Angela Bain, Chief Human Resource Services Officer
Dr. Karl Fulmer, Chief Financial Services Officer
Mr. Michael Harris, Director of Student Services
Mr. Keith McAlister, Director of New Design and Construction
Mr. Buddy Price, Director of Office of Community Services

Chairman Robert Gantt called the meeting to order and gave welcoming remarks.

The Invocation was given by Buddy Price. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Robert Gantt.

The School Board Spotlight was led by Robert Gantt, Beth Watson and Ellen Baumgardner.

During the superintendent's report, a report was given on Chapin High School and Missy Wall-Mitchell presented the enrollment report (Exhibit B). Dr. Karl Fulmer presented the monthly general fund financial report (Exhibit C).

During the public participation, Craig Young spoke regarding school board transparency; Sam Delaney spoke regarding construction; and Tracey Hagerty spoke regarding a Chapin High School Auditorium.

Dr. Fulmer presented the FY 2012-2013 General Fund Budget (Exhibit E).

A = Absent
AB = Abstain
N = No
X = Yes
R = Recuse

SCHOOL DISTRICT FIVE
OF
LEXINGTON AND RICHLAND COUNTIES

Meeting of April 23, 2012

		B A U M G A R D N E R	G A N T T	H A M M O N D	M U R P H Y	T U R N E R	W A T S O N	W H I T E
1.	M. Watson S. Hammond Enter executive session to consider the following : a) selected employment items (Exhibit A), b) contractual matter: site package at CATE and new high school, and c) contractual matter: regarding property at Chapin High School	X	X	X	X	X	X	A
2.	M. Watson S. Baumgardner Approve the agenda with the addition of 2a1 negotiated contract M. Murphy S. Turner Amend item 2b the language be instead of contractual matter be legal matter Vote on original motion							
		No	No	No	X	No	No	No
		X	X	X	No	X	X	X
3.	M. Watson S. Baumgardner Approve 2a-1 negotiated contract as presented	X	X	X	AB	X	X	X
4.	M. Baumgardner S. Hammond Approve the selected employment items (Exhibit A)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5.	M. White S. Baumgardner I move that the District 5 Board approve settlement of the lawsuit and dispute with Palmetto Grading and Drainage, Inc. related to the Site Package for New High School No. 4 and CATE Center in Chapin, SC in the amount of \$300,000.00	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6.	M. Watson S. Baumgardner Give endorsement of Robert Gantt for office of Vice President to the South Carolina School Boards Association	X	X	X	No	X	X	X

A = Absent
AB = Abstain
N = No
X = Yes
R = Recuse

SCHOOL DISTRICT FIVE
OF
LEXINGTON AND RICHLAND COUNTIES

Meeting of April 23, 2012

		B A U M G A R D N E R	G A N T T	H A M M O N D	M U R P H Y	T U R N E R	W A T S O N	W H I T E
7.	<p>M. Watson S. Baumgardner</p> <p>Give approval of proposed revisions to timeline for 2012-2013 budget (Exhibit D)</p> <p>M. Murphy S. Hammond</p> <p>Amend to schedule a special work session specifically for the budget and keep our two meetings in place the regular scheduled board meetings and publish the proposed budget on the website for the public to see in advance of those meetings</p> <p>M. Gantt S. Watson</p> <p>Amend to add the June 11 meeting for the primary mission to have the superintendent's evaluation</p> <p>M. Murphy S. Turner</p> <p>Publish the proposed budget on the website before the May 7 meeting</p> <p>Vote on original motion</p>	No	No	No	X	No	No	No
		X	X	X	No	X	X	X
		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
		X	X	X	No	X	X	X
8.	<p>M. Watson S. Baumgardner</p> <p>Approve the minutes of the April 9, 2012 board meeting</p> <p>M. Murphy S.</p> <p>I move that the cover sheet on our minutes include an asterisk at the bottom of the page to reference that any attached for the record document or statement is considered part of the official minutes of the meeting. The asterisk can read pursuant to SC FOIA documents or statements attached hereto were placed on the record at the request of a board member the mere inclusion of the document or statements in the minutes does not infer they were approved nor disapproved by the board.</p>							

A = Absent
AB = Abstain
N = No
X = Yes
R = Recuse

SCHOOL DISTRICT FIVE
OF
LEXINGTON AND RICHLAND COUNTIES

Meeting of April 23, 2012

	B A U M G A R D N E R	G A N T T	H A M M O N D	M U R P H Y	T U R N E R	W A T S O N	W H I T E
Vote on original motion	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
9. M. Watson S. Baumgardner	X	X	X	X	X	X	A
Adjourn at 10:05 p.m.							

A = Absent
AB = Abstain
N = No
X = Yes
R = Recuse

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF LEXINGTON) 2011 DEC 16 P 1:00 C.A. NO.: 2011-CP-32-

FILED

Palmetto Grading & Drainage, Inc.)
BETH A. CARRIGG)
CLERK OF COURT)
LEXINGTON SC)
Plaintiff,)

v.)

District 5 of Lexington & Richland Counties)
and Cumming/SMG Management Group,)

Defendants.)

COMPLAINT
(Jury Trial Demanded)

2011CP3204840

Plaintiff Palmetto Grading & Drainage, Inc., by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby complains of Defendants District 5 of Lexington & Richland Counties and Cumming/SMG Management Group and alleges as follows:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Palmetto Grading & Drainage, Inc. (hereinafter "Palmetto Grading") is a South Carolina corporation that is authorized to conduct business in the State of South Carolina, and maintains its principal place of business in Spartanburg, South Carolina. Palmetto Grading is engaged in the business of performing earthwork within the State of South Carolina.

2. Upon information and belief, District 5 of Lexington & Richland Counties (hereinafter, "District 5") is a South Carolina political body that maintains its principal place of business in Lexington County, South Carolina. Upon further information and belief, District 5 is responsible for the administration and provision of public education to students in Richland and Lexington Counties of South Carolina including, but not limited to, the construction of the facilities required to provide such public education.

3. Upon information and belief, Cumming/Southern Management Group (hereinafter

Attachment 1 is included with the minutes of the 4-23-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item "For The Record" requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

"Cumming/SMG") is a partnership, professional association, corporation or other business entity that is conducting business in the State of South Carolina. Upon further information and belief, Cumming/SMG is engaged in the business of providing construction management services to owners.

FILED
2011 DEC 16 9 1:00
BETH A. CARRIGG
CLERK OF COURT
LEXINGTON SC

4. As set forth herein below, this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this dispute, personal jurisdiction over the parties, and venue is proper.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

5. This civil action pertains to District 5's ongoing construction of a project known as the New High School No. 4 and CATE Center (hereafter, the "Project"), its contracting of the early site work package to Palmetto Grading, its improper termination of this contract, and, its failure and refusal to pay sums justly due and owing to Palmetto Grading.

6. Upon information and belief, District 5 contracted with McMillan/Pazdan/Smith Architects (the "Project Architect") to serve as the Project Architect and Cumming/SMG to manage the construction and administer the work.

7. The Project was broken into two phases: (1) an early site package that involved certain clearing, grading, storm drainage, building pad, parking lot, driveway, curb/gutter, on-site utility, finish grading, irrigation, landscaping and grassing work (hereinafter the "Site Work") and (2) a building package that involved all vertical construction associated with the New High School and CATE center (hereinafter the "Building Work").

8. District 5 contracted the Site Work for the Project to Palmetto Grading on or about May 3, 2011, for a lump sum price of \$8,800,000. The contract contemplated that certain out of scope work would be done at agreed upon unit prices.

Item "For The Record" requested by Kim Murphy for attachment to the Minutes.

9. Palmetto Grading's scope of work was defined by the written contract documents contained within the Project Manual or incorporated therein by reference (the "Contract Documents").

FILED
2011 DEC 16 5 14 00
BETH A. CARRIGG
CLERK OF COURT

10. The Contract Documents provided an overall schedule for Palmetto Grading's work and established interim milestone dates for the building pads. DHEC stormwater and runoff requirements mandated prompt construction of the storm water detention ponds and storm water drainage lines in order for the Site Work to progress and the Building Work to begin.

11. Following installation of required silt fencing and the clearing and grubbing work, Palmetto Grading began excavation of certain deep stormwater lines and the detention pond at which point it encountered substantial quantities of rock which could not be "ripped" with a Caterpillar D-8 dozer (or equivalent). Per the terms of its contract, Palmetto Grading requested that District 5 and its representatives confirm that the material was un-rippable and that it should be blasted and removed at the unit price set forth in Palmetto Grading's bid.

12. Palmetto Grading's request was based on its belief that the Site Work had been let on a "classified" basis, meaning that additional money would be paid if un-rippable rock was encountered on the Project.¹ This belief stemmed from clear language in Addendum No. 3:

"Contractors asked if a unit price would be added to the bid form for the Rock Allowance. Contractors also wanted to know how the determination will be made between blasting and ripping of rock. The engineers will review and publish by addendum a standard that all contractors can use to identify the method that will determine if the rock is to be blasted or ripped. The special inspector will monitor and confirm the correct application and note it in all

¹ "Unclassified" projects, on the other hand, are ones in which no distinction is made between the excavation of earth and rock such that the same lump sum price is paid regardless of the type of material encountered.

Attachment 3 is included with the minutes of the 4-23-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §90-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item "For The Record" requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

reports. The designation of soils will not be changed to unclassified. The idea of adding a unit price section to the bid form will be reviewed.

FILED

2011 DEC 16 P 1:00

Addendum No. 4 supported this interpretation by revising the bid form to request unit prices for "Rock Excavation and Removal" and adding a section on "Rock Classification" which read:

BETH A. CANNING
CLERK OF COURT
LEXINGTON SC

"Rock that can be ripped with a Caterpillar D-8 dozer (or equivalent), as determined by the Owner's Special Inspector or Owner's Geotechnical Consultant, shall not require blasting. The cost for rock removal that can be ripped with the D-8 dozer or equivalent shall be included in the base bid cost and cannot be charged against the rock blasting allowance as noted in Subparagraph 2.04D. Only rock that must be blasted will be considered eligible to be addressed through the rock blasting allowance.

13. The School District's Civil Engineer confirmed that "based on unit priced being on the bid form, the site was classified," but District 5 and Cumming/SMG expressed reluctance to acknowledge this fact. With the exception of very limited areas² in which they approved blasting, the Defendants directed Palmetto Grading to refrain from any blasting. Palmetto Grading's progress was severely restricted while the School District and its representatives apparently engaged in extensive internal discussions about ways to avoid paying Palmetto Grading in accordance with the contract terms. Palmetto Grading's progress was also impacted due to the fact that materials which could be ripped contained large pieces of rock and the Defendants would not approve the use of this material as fill or its removal from the site. As a result, Palmetto Grading was forced to stockpile the unsuitable material and import substantial quantities of suitable fill.

14. District 5 and Cumming/SMG further impeded Palmetto Grading's progress during

² District 5's representatives confirmed and quantified the existence of 144.7CY of unrippable rock in the area of pond 1 outfall on the Project and Palmetto Grading blasted and excavated this material between June 8, 2011 and June 17, 2011.

Attachment 4 is included with the minutes of the 4-23-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item "For The Record" requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

June and July of 2011 by:

FILED

- a. Failing to provide access to the full limits of the site;
- b. Refusing to acknowledge errors in their topographic survey;
- c. Refusing to approve the re-use of excavated materials and/or the removal of these materials from the site and their replacement with suitable fill;
- d. Failing and refusing to acknowledge Palmetto Grading's written claims and the additional compensation and time requested therein; and,
- e. Such other and further manners as may be discovered prior to trial.

2011 DEC 16 P 1:00

BETH A. CARRIGG
CLERK OF COURT

15. After having impeded Palmetto Grading's progress the better part of two months, Cummings/SMG issued a letter dated July 22, 2011 giving notice that District 5 was terminating the Site Work contract for convenience. District 5 later issued a written justification for this termination which stated that the cost of paying for all the rock that required blasting was too high.

16. Palmetto Grading objected to the Defendants' actions because, among other things, District 5's purported cost savings were not being achieved by a fair re-bidding of an established scope of work, but rather through private negotiations with other bidders involving different construction standards and specifications that made the job easier (and less expensive) for these other bidders to perform. Such an approach contrasts sharply with the open and fair requirements set forth in the District's Procurement Code.

17. Under a full reservation of rights, Palmetto Grading demobilized from the Project and submitted pay applications in accordance with the agreed schedule of values covering the balance of its work.

18. In response to Palmetto Grading's request for payment, District 5 and Cumming/SMG

FILED

countered with heavy handed tactics including, but not limited to,

- a. Failing and refusing to acknowledge that Palmetto Grading was denied access to the full limits of the construction site;
- b. Failing and refusing to acknowledge errors in their topographic survey;
- c. Failing and refusing to honor written Construction Change Directives that were issued by District 5; signed off on by the School District, Cumming/SMG, and the Architect; and, accepted and performed by Palmetto Grading prior to the termination;
- d. Failing and refusing to acknowledge and honor verbal directions given by the Defendants to Palmetto Grading with respect to out-of-scope work;
- e. Taking contradictory positions concerning extra payment for rock which could not be "ripped" with a Caterpillar D-8 dozer³;
- f. Their bad faith termination for convenience of Palmetto Grading; and,
- g. Their improper re-procurement of the site work on an emergency basis coupled with false and/or misleading statements to members of the School Board and the public at large concerning the justifications for this re-procurement to wit: the Defendants claimed that the replacement contractor had offered to do the same work for less money, when in fact the Defendants had privately negotiated a relaxed set of standards and specifications such that they job was easier (and less expensive) for this contractor to build;

2011 DEC 16 P 1:00
 BETH A. CARRIGG
 CLERK OF COURT
 LEVINGTON, SC

³ Originally, the Defendants had claimed that the contract did not allow extra payment for the un-rippable rock which Palmetto Grading was encountering. After agreeing to pay for limited blasting, they terminated Palmetto Grading because the cost of paying for all of the rock which required blasting, was going to be too high. Now, they say that there was no un-rippable rock which begs the question: why did the Defendants really terminate Palmetto Grading?

Attachment 6 is included with the minutes of the 4-23-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item "For The Record" requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

- h. Their arbitrary, capricious, subjective, and differing application of the construction requirements such that the second site work contractor was allowed to perform the project in manners not made available to Palmetto Grading;
 - i. Their exclusion of the Project Architect from its contractually defined role in reviewing and approving Pay Applications and resolving claims;
 - j. Their concealment from members of the School Board and the public at large of opinions expressed by the Project Architect while acting in its official capacity;
 - k. Their refusal to pay Palmetto Grading in accordance with the agreed upon schedule of values and for percentages of work previously acknowledged by representatives of Cummings/SMG as being complete;
 - l. District 5's failure to comply with requests made by Palmetto Grading under the Freedom of Information Act in regards to this matter;
 - m. District 5's wrongful withholding of sums justly due for construction work performed by Palmetto Grading; and,
 - n. Their repeated and persistent denial of due process to Palmetto Grading such that a reasonable informed person would not believe that District 5 can impartially resolve this dispute as contemplated by its own Procurement Code.
19. Based on the foregoing, Palmetto Grading sues for the relief set forth herein.

FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment - Right To Fair Trial)

20. Palmetto Grading realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

Attachment 7 is included with the minutes of the 4-23-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

FILED
2012 DEC 16 P 1:00
J. TH. A. CARRIG
CLERK OF COURT
WILMINGTON, NC



MEMORANDUM

May 7, 2012

To: Members of the Board of Trustees

From: Keith McAllister 
Director, New Design and Construction

Re: Irmo High School Phase I Improvements and Renovations Bids

ADMINISTRATION CONSIDERATION

Administration provides information regarding the bids for improvements and renovations to Irmo High School Phase I.

RECOMMENDATION

Administration seeks approval to proceed with Irmo High School Phase I improvements and renovations.


ATTACHMENT

Exhibit to be given at board meeting



May 2, 2012

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees
Stephen Hefner, Ed.D., Superintendent

FROM: Karl E. Fulmer, Ed.D. 
Chief Financial Services Officer

RE: FY 2012-2013 General Fund Budget Summary

Attached is a summary of the proposed General Fund Budget for FY 2012-2013 to be used for the budget work session. Board members have submitted a number of questions to be answered. These questions will be addressed with a PowerPoint presentation during the session.

SCHOOL DISTRICT FIVE OF LEXINGTON AND RICHLAND COUNTIES
Projected Revenue FY 2012 - 2013

	FY 2010-2011 <u>Audited</u>	FY 2011-2012 <u>Approved Budget</u>	FY 2012-2013 <u>Proposed Budget</u>
Revenue From Local Sources:			
11100 Tax Levies	37,382,880	40,349,649	40,279,123
11120 Vehicle Taxes	7,953,545	7,819,315	8,460,642
11130 Current Tax Penalties		310,000	377,732
11400 Delinquent Taxes & Penalties	2,779,615	1,400,000	1,911,313
12800 Revenue in Lieu of Taxes	464,974	416,169	600,000
13100 Regular School Day Patron	18,033	-	5,000
15100 Interest on Investments	94,732	100,000	100,000
17400 Student Fees	77,304	50,000	85,000
19100 Rentals	64,011	50,000	55,000
19930 Insurance Settlements	-	-	-
19500 Refund of Prior Year Expenditures	2,650	5,000	6,500
19990 Other Local Revenue	173,266	10,000	10,000
Total Local Revenue	<u>49,011,010</u>	<u>50,510,133</u>	<u>51,890,310</u>
Revenue From State Sources			
31000 Restricted, Consolidated, etc.	979,070		
31600 School Bus Driver Salaries	681,144	537,739	548,494
31800 Fringe Benefits Contributions	12,509,006	12,504,822	12,924,252
31810 Retiree Insurance	2,700,578	2,700,578	3,252,096
33000 Education Finance Act	25,058,832	29,037,292	30,749,856
38100 Act 388 - One Cent Prop. Tax Relief	27,570,059	27,996,015	28,626,522
38100 Reimbursement For Prop. Tax Relief	10,580,071	10,580,071	10,580,071
38200 Homestead Exemption	1,758,200	1,758,200	1,758,200
38300 Merchant's Inventory Tax	213,955	213,955	213,955
38400 Manufacturer's Depreciation Reimbursement	343,788	303,663	303,663
38900 Motor Carrier Revenue	131,015	125,000	125,000
39900 Other State Revenue	83,048	67,944	68,000
Total State Revenue	<u>82,608,766</u>	<u>85,825,279</u>	<u>89,150,109</u>
Transfer From Other Funds			
52800 Indirect Costs Transfer and Other	285,804	600,000	205,550
52300 Transfer from EIA	2,718,286	2,452,880	2,452,880
Total Transfers	<u>3,004,090</u>	<u>3,052,880</u>	<u>2,658,430</u>
385 Maintenance of Effort			1,081,630
19999 Operational Balance		2,935,628	2,333,819
Total Funds Available	<u>134,623,866</u>	<u>142,323,920</u>	<u>147,114,298</u>

GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES AND OTHER FINANCING USES

THREE-YEAR COMPARISON 2010-11 TO 2012-13

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Amount Change	Percent Change
	Original Budget	Original Budget	Proposed Budget		
INSTRUCTION					
Salaries & Bonuses	62,876,306.50	63,781,234.54	64,563,675.77	782,441.23	1.23%
Fringe Benefits	20,348,026.37	21,708,275.87	23,124,534.64	1,416,258.77	6.52%
Contracted Services	62,750.00	240,632.00	317,660.00	77,028.00	32.01%
Supplies & Materials, etc	1,348,736.00	1,074,948.75	954,465.77	-120,482.98	-11.21%
Insurance, Principal, etc	39,590.00	34,438.00	32,449.00	-1,989.00	-5.78%
	<u>84,675,408.87</u>	<u>86,839,529.16</u>	<u>88,992,785.18</u>	<u>2,153,256.02</u>	<u>2.48%</u>
SUPPORTING SERVICES					
Salaries & Bonuses	32,291,368.09	32,628,724.72	33,187,995.82	559,271.10	1.71%
Fringe Benefits	9,932,203.33	10,424,916.63	11,461,871.05	1,036,954.42	9.95%
Contracted Services	5,357,610.00	5,707,456.16	6,250,482.06	543,025.90	9.51%
Supplies & Materials, etc	4,749,064.00	5,127,336.65	5,584,268.49	456,931.84	8.91%
Equipment & Improvements	16,358.00	11,203.00	12,050.00	847.00	7.56%
Insurance, Principal, etc	321,125.00	316,965.00	680,194.00	363,229.00	114.60%
	<u>52,667,728.42</u>	<u>54,216,602.16</u>	<u>57,176,861.42</u>	<u>2,960,259.26</u>	<u>5.46%</u>
COMMUNITY SERVICES					
Contracted Services	30,960.00	30,960.00	30,960.00	0.00	0.00%
Supplies & Materials, etc	6,800.00	6,800.00	6,800.00	0.00	0.00%
	<u>37,760.00</u>	<u>37,760.00</u>	<u>37,760.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00%</u>
OTHER FINANCING USES					
Transfers & Payments	1,285,059.00	1,230,029.00	906,891.00	-323,138.00	-26.27%
	<u>138,665,956.29</u>	<u>142,323,920.32</u>	<u>147,114,297.59</u>	<u>4,790,377.27</u>	<u>3.37%</u>
Grand Total					