MURFREESBORO CITY COUNCIL
Regular Meeting Agenda
Workshop
Murfreesboro Municipal Airport – Business Center
July 13, 2022 – 11:30 AM

Action Items
1. Board of Zoning Appeals Reappointment (Administration)
2. Historic Zoning Commission Reappointments (Administration)
3. Planning Commission Reappointment (Administration)
4. Amendment to the Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate with Kasai North America
5. Salem Hwy. Sewer Upgrades-Easement Offers (Water Resources)

Workshop Items
6. Solid Waste Management Solution Triple Bottom Line Weighting (Water Resources)
7. Road Project Update (Engineering)
8. May Dashboard Information (Administration)

Licensing
Payment of Statements
Other Business
Adjournment
COUNCIL COMMUNICATION
Meeting Date: 07/13/2022

Item Title: Board of Zoning Appeals
Department: Administration
Presented by: Mayor Shane McFarland

Summary
Reappointment to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Background Information
The Board of Zoning Appeals hears requests for variances from the Zoning and Sign Ordinances, requests for Special Use Permits as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and appeals from the administrative decisions.

As established by M.C.C., Appendix A, §30 the Board consists of five members who serve three-year, staggered terms.

Attachments
Memo from Mayor McFarland
July 13, 2022

Members of City Council

RE: Recommended Reappointment – Board of Zoning Appeals
As an item for the Council Agenda, I am recommending the following reappointment to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Reappointment
Mr. Ken Halliburton term expiring June 30, 2025

Sincerely,

Shane McFarland
Mayor
Summary
Reappointment to the Historic Zoning Commission.

Background Information
The purpose of the Historic Zoning Commission is to study, recommend, and oversee historic district boundaries and guidelines for renovation of existing structures or the building of new structures for the protection of historic neighborhoods and districts.

As established by M.C.C.§, Appendix A, Section 24, H-I Historic District (f), the Historic Zoning Commission consists of nine members who serve five-year, staggered terms.

Attachments
Memo from Mayor McFarland
July 13, 2022

Members of City Council

RE: Recommended Appointment – Historic Zoning Commission
As an item for the Council Agenda, I am recommending the following appointments to the Historic Zoning Commission.

Reappointment
  Mr. David Becker term expiring June 30, 2027
  Mr. Chase Salas (Planning Commission liaison) term expiring June 30, 2027
  Mr. Jim Thompson term expiring June 30, 2027

Sincerely,

Shane McFarland
Mayor
Summary
Reappointment to the Planning Commission.

Background Information
The Planning Commission is responsible for coordinating the physical development of the community by developing comprehensive land use plans, zoning regulations, a major thoroughfare plan and other plans and ordinances.

As established by City Code § 22-2 the Planning Commission consists of seven members who serve three-year, staggered terms.

Attachments:
   Memo from Mayor McFarland
July 13, 2021

Members of City Council

RE: Recommended Reappointment – Planning Commission
As an item for the City Council agenda, I am recommending the following reappointment to the Planning Commission.

Reappointment
Mrs. Kathy Jones term expiring June 30, 2025

Sincerely,

Shane McFarland
Mayor
**COUNCIL COMMUNICATION**

**Meeting Date: 07/13/2022**

**Item Title:** Amendment to the Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate with Kasai North America

**Department:** Administration

**Presented by:** Craig Tindall, City Manager

**Requested Council Action:**

- Ordinance
- Resolution
- Motion ☒
- Direction
- Information

**Summary**

Approve First Amendment to Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate and authorize execution of Release of Option.

**Staff Recommendation**

Approve amendment to agreement with Kasai North America, Inc.

**Background Information**

In 2014, the City entered into an agreement with M-Tek, Inc., now Kasai North America, Inc., for the acquisition of approximately 10 acres on Garrison Drive. This agreement provided an option for Kasai to acquire two adjoining acres that would be used for surface parking requirements should a second building be developed on the site. The Agreement also provided that if Kasai sells the property, closes all or substantially all of its operations at the property, or relocates to another city within 10 years from 2016, it would pay the City $15 per square foot for the property.

Kasai constructed a 64,000 square foot building, which the company now occupies. During the intervening years, Kasai has adjusted its space needs and desires to occupy only a portion of the building. The remain portion of this Class A office space would be available for lease. Kasai, however, is not in the real estate business and desires to sell the building so that the space can be relet to other office users.

The proposed amendment eliminates the sell contingency of the clawback. It allows Kasai to sell and lease-back a portion of the building on a 10-year lease agreement for a portion of the building. This will keep Kasai’s operations and employment base within the City over the long term. Alternatively, Kasai will allow the clawback to expire and leave the City. Kasai will also forgo its option on the adjoining two acres. These the two acres can be joined with the adjoining seven-acres of City-owned land for economic development opportunities.
Council Priorities Served

*Improve economic development*

Securing additional land that can be combined with other City-owned land in the Gateway area will assist with economic development projects.

Fiscal Impact

None.

Attachments

1. First Amendment to Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate with M-Tek, Inc.
3. Aerial of 2-acre Option Parcel
FIRST AMENDMENT TO
RESTATED AGREEMENT FOR CONVEYANCE OF REAL ESTATE

This First Amendment to Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate ("First Amendment") is by and between the CITY OF MURFREESBORO, TENNESSEE, a municipal corporation ("City"), and KASAI NORTH AMERICA, INC. (formerly known as "M-TEK, INC."), a Tennessee corporation ("Kasai NA"), each sometimes a “Party” and together sometimes “Parties.”

WHEREAS the following facts exist:

A. Pursuant to a Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate approved by the Murfreesboro City Council on December 4, 2014, and effective December 5, 2014, Kasai NA has acquired certain real property and constructed a Class A office facility.

B. The office facility now has space that substantially exceeds Kasai NA’s requirements.

C. Kasai NA desires to remain in the facility while making the excess space available for occupancy by others.

NOW THEREFORE, for good and valuable mutual considerations, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby irrevocably acknowledged and confirmed, the Parties agree as follows:

1. Section 8, SALE, CLOSURE, ABANDONMENT is amended by deleting the words “sells the Property” from the first line of the fourth unnumbered paragraph.

2. Section 18, M-TEK’S OPTION TO OBTAIN ADDITIONAL PROPERTY, is deleted in its entirety.

3. The Lien to Secure Performance recorded at Record Book 1368 page 3241, RORC, shall be released, but the release of the lien shall not release or discharge Kasai NA’s obligations under the Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate as amended by this First Amendment.

4. The Memorandum of Option recorded at Record Book 1368 page 3246, RORC, and the Lien to Secure Performance recorded at Record Book 1368 page 3241, RORC, shall be released by the execution and recording by the City of a Release of Option and Lien to Secure Performance substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A.

5. All other provisions of the Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate shall remain in full force and effect.

6. This First Amendment shall be effective as of the date of the last party to sign, PROVIDED, HOWEVER, that this First Amendment shall have no force or effect until approved by the Murfreesboro City Council.

signatures on following page
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed by City and Kasai NA on the dates set forth below their respective signatures hereto.

CITY OF MURFREESBORO

By ______________________
Shane McFarland
Mayor
Date: ______________________

KASAI NORTH AMERICA, INC.
(formerly known as M-TEK, INC.)

By ______________________
Mike Layne
Chief Operating Officer
Date: ______________________

ATTEST:

By ______________________
Jennifer Brown, City Recorder

Approved as to Form:

________________________
Adam Tucker, City Attorney

Approved by Murfreesboro City Council: ______________________
RELEASE OF OPTION AND LIEN TO SECURE PERFORMANCE

This Release of Option and Lien to Secure Performance ("Release") is by and between the CITY OF MURFREESBORO, TENNESSEE, a municipal corporation ("City"), and KASAI NORTH AMERICA, INC. (formerly known as "M-TEK, INC."), a Tennessee corporation ("Kasai NA"), each sometimes a “Party” and together sometimes “Parties.”

WHEREAS the following facts exist:

A. Pursuant to a Restated Agreement for Conveyance of Real Estate approved by the Murfreesboro City Council on December 4, 2014, Kasai NA purchased certain real property and received a contractual Option to Purchase certain additional real property.

B. A Memorandum of Option was recorded at Record Book 1368 page 3246, RORC.

C. A Lien to Secure Performance was recorded in Record Book 1368 page 2341, RORC.

C. The Parties have agreed that, due to changed conditions, the Option and Lien should be released.

NOW THEREFORE, for good and valuable mutual considerations, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby irrevocably acknowledged and confirmed, the Parties agree as follows:

1. The Option heretofore granted to Kasai NA is hereby released by Kasai NA, and the Lien to Secure Performance heretofore granted to the City is hereby released by the City.

2. The Memorandum of Option of record at Record Book 1368 page 3246, RORC, is hereby released.

3. The Lien to Secure Performance of record at Record Book 1368 page 2341, RORC, is hereby released.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Release has been executed by City and Kasai NA on the dates set forth below their respective signatures hereto.

CITY OF MURFREESBORO

By__________________________
Shane McFarland
Mayor
Date:__________________________

KASAI NORTH AMERICA, INC.
(formerly known as M-TEK, INC.)

By__________________________
Mike Layne
Chief Operating Officer
Date:__________________________

ATTEST:
By__________________________
Jennifer Brown, City Recorder
STATE OF TENNESSEE )
               : SS
COUNTY OF RUTHERFORD )

Before me, the undersigned authority, a Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared SHANE MCFARLAND and JENNIFER BROWN, with whom I am personally acquainted, or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence and who, upon their oaths acknowledged themselves to be respectively the Mayor and City Recorder of the City of Murfreesboro, a municipal corporation, and that they as such Mayor and City Recorder, being authorized to do so, executed the within instrument (Release of Option and Lien to Secure Performance) for the purposes therein contained, by signing thereto the name of said Corporation, and by attesting said instrument, by themselves as such Mayor and City Recorder, respectively.

WITNESS MY HAND, at office, this ___ day of ________, 2022.

__________________________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC
My Commission Expires:_____________ (seal)

STATE OF TENNESSEE )
            : SS
COUNTY OF ________________)

Before me, the undersigned notary public, personally appeared MIKE LAYNE, with whom I am personally acquainted (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence), and who upon oath acknowledged such person to be the Chief Operating Officer of KASAI NORTH AMERICA, INC. (formerly known as “M-TEK, INC.”), a Tennessee corporation, and that such person, as such Chief Operating Officer, executed the within instrument (Release of Option and Lien to Secure Performance) for the purposes therein contained, by signing the name of the corporation by such person as Chief Operating Officer.

WITNESS MY HAND, at office, this ___ day of ________, 2022.

__________________________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC
My Commission Expires:_____________ (seal)
2-Acre Parcel

Area Result: **89513.7 Square Feet**
COUNCIL COMMUNICATION
Meeting Date: 07/13/2022

Item Title: Salem Hwy. Sewer Upgrades-Easement Offers
Department: Water Resources
Presented by: Darren Gore

Requested Council Action:

- Ordinance ☐
- Resolution ☐
- Motion ☒
- Direction ☐
- Information ☐

Summary
In order to upsize the sewer interceptor, it is necessary to purchase temporary construction easements parallel to the existing permanent easements.

Staff Recommendation
Approve $40,850 for purchase easements or, if easements are not obtained within a reasonable amount of time, approve moving forward with condemnation.

Background Information
The Department is under contract with ELI to design the sewer upgrades as presented to the Board at the combined Nov/Dec 2021 Board meeting. These upgrades are necessary to release the self-imposed sewer moratorium, continue development in the area and avoid sewer capacity issues. The design is nearing completion. In order to construct the sewer main as designed there are 4 permanent and 14 temporary construction easements needed.

The easement amounts were figured based on the easement size along with an average of the tax assessors’ values except for Tract 15, which is a platted commercial lot fronting on the highway, so it was assumed it was purchased full retail price. It is typical for the City to offer 50% of the land value for permanent easement and 10% per year for temporary construction easement. These offer amounts should be worst case because they do not take into consideration that portions of these easements are within Floodway and/or Floodplain. We also anticipate that several properties may agree to donate the easement as they are in the process of redevelopment and are in hopes that this project will allow them to start construction on next phases soon. The easement offers were rounded up and also staff thought it best to offer a minimum of $1000.

Council Priorities Served

Expand infrastructure
Obtaining these easements will allow the Department to move forward with the upsizing of the sewer interceptor.

Maintain public safety
Upsizing of the sewer interceptor will allow development to continue in the area while reducing the threat of a sewer overflow due to lack of capacity and therefore maintaining public safety with regard to the health of Spence Creek.
Fiscal Impact

There are adequate reserves to fund this amount. These improvements are expected to be incorporated into a revised special sanitary sewer assessment district once the overall costs of the improvements are finalized.

Attachments

   Easement Offer Spreadsheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Prop. Acreage</th>
<th>$/Acre</th>
<th>Permanent Easement Offer</th>
<th>Temporary Easement Offer</th>
<th>Total Easement Offer</th>
<th>Temp Easement Offer</th>
<th>Total Easement Offer Recorded + $5000 Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>Jackson Family General Partnership</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$98,000.00</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>4,503.63</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>$9,540.75</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$1,873.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2248 New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>Trustees of River Rock Baptist Church</td>
<td>144°F“W”</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>$165,700.00</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$5,724.45</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2151 New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>World Outreach Church of Murfreesboro, Inc.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>$1,082,600.00</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>$2,081.62</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>17,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2253 New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>G. Allen Jackson, Jr and Wife Kathy Jackson</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>$76,800.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$1,144.89</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>106 Spence Creek</td>
<td>William Jonathon Scott and Brooke Scott</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>$373,700.00</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$1,144.89</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2151 New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>William R. Waite and Wife Caroline A. Waite</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>$356,500.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$1,144.89</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2329 New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>Bart Gordon and Leslie Gordon</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>$2,056,000.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$1,144.89</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2339 New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>Cason Lane Creekside Villas, LLC</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>$527,800.00</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$1,144.89</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2498 Cason Lane</td>
<td>Coldwell Village, LLC</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>$527,800.00</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$1,144.89</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stonewater Ct</td>
<td>Terravossa Development Corp.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>$527,800.00</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$1,144.89</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2525 Presley Dr</td>
<td>Middle Tennessee Electric</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>$561,000.00</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,248.97</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Salem Creek Dr</td>
<td>Salem Creek Partnership</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>$796,200.00</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,248.97</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2525 Salem Creek Ct</td>
<td>Americana New Homes Mfcsion at Salem Creek</td>
<td>114°F“A”</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,248.97</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2525 Salem Creek Dr</td>
<td>Salem Creek Church of Christ</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>$373,300.00</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>34,693.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,248.97</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2433 New Salem Hwy</td>
<td>Salem Creek Commons</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>$799,700.00</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>322,079.74</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,248.97</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$1,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Properties in the green belt. Total: $39,107 | $40,850.00
Summary

Provide input on the weight to be placed on the following three categories in selecting the City’s solid waste management solution:

♦ Environmental Sustainability
♦ Public Welfare and Social Implications
♦ Financial Viability

Exhibit 1 attached to this memo details the three categories along with the various criteria staff requests the Council to assess. A blank worksheet with these same categories and criteria is provided for the Council to provide their input on expected influence of each category and criteria.

Background Information

Staff has put together a Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) An MCA approach is particularly useful for evaluating options related to the City’s future municipal solid waste management options (after the anticipated closure of Middle Point Landfill), including, drop-off/transfer, processing, materials recovery, and disposing of non-diverted MSW. The options reviewed by staff are functionally different, with different ranges of effects. For these segments of the waste management system, there is value in applying a more rigorous evaluation process to determine which ones offer greatest value to Murfreesboro.

An MCA framework has been developed to holistically assess the environmental sustainability, social implications, and financial viability of the options based on a set of nine criteria (three in each triple bottom line, or TBL, category) that reflect Council objectives and priorities. Criteria and indicators have been identified, based on staff’s technical knowledge and experience. The criteria and indicators selected for this process are those that are commonly used in similar evaluation processes. The indicators are the specific considerations or measures that are proposed to be applied where appropriate to identify the potential effects related to the respective criterion.

In general, the MCA framework is intended to:

- Facilitate and reflect meaningful collaboration through transparency in all assumptions and without the use of “black-box” processes where it is unclear how conclusions have been reached.
- Enable consideration of matters such as climate impact, social implications, health, reliability, regulatory changes, and others as determined by the overall project objectives.
• Be consistent across options;
• Be as simple as is reasonably possible (Note: too many individual criteria or indicators can result in overlap between individual criteria elements as well as making straightforward communication and understanding of outcomes more difficult. Too many individual criteria and indicators can often result in imbalance where one small consideration is treated the same as something else that is more significant. It is important to have enough to have a robust evaluation, without complicating the process; and,
• Accommodate quantification where possible.

The Council should use the attached table and fill it in based on their determination of each category and criteria meeting their expected influence on determining a highest and best solution to the City’s solid waste management challenge.

1. Assign a weight between the three major categories.
   a. One option would be an even split 33% assigned to Environmental Sustainability, 33% Public Welfare and Social Implications and 33% Financial Viability
   b. Another Option could be 25% Environmental Sustainability, 25% Public Welfare and Social Implications and 50% Financial Viability

2. Assign each criteria a score of one to five (with one being the lowest/worst and five being the highest/best). The process is kept simple and transparent so that the public and involved stakeholders can understand how the outcomes were arrived at.

Based on the Council’s determination of weight on each category and the assessment of 1 – 5 on each of the criteria attached, staff will look at each option that is available or has been presented to the City and assign a score. Staff will meet either individually or in a workshop setting to review the results and determine if the Council is satisfied with staff’s determination of a highest and best solution for the City moving forward.

Currently, there are four (4) options. They can be described in the graphic below:

Staff will score each of the options based on the weight of each category and priority assessment provided by the Council. Staff will also review the aggregate or average of weight and assessment values of each City Council member.
Please note that the 40% diversion option that does not require curbside recycling has not been thoroughly vetted by staff at this point. Staff is awaiting additional information to analyze this option more thoroughly in order to determine how it compares to all of the other options identified.

**Council Priorities Served**

*Establish strong City brand*

The Middle Point Landfill has been a blight to the citizens of Murfreesboro and diminished their quality of life through continued noxious odors, traffic, and other environmental concerns. A future solid waste management solution for the City should consider not only the financial impacts to solid waste customers, but also the social and environmental impacts to Murfreesboro residents.

**Fiscal Impact**

There are no immediate fiscal impacts associated with providing weighting factors for the various future solid waste management solutions. There are long-term fiscal impacts associated with managing solid waste differently in lieu of receiving free tipping fees at Middle Point Landfill after it closes. Future Council meetings or workshops will provide the costs, revenues and expenses associated with all viable solid waste management solutions.

**Attachments**

MCA Categories and Criteria for Weighting Diagram and Worksheet
City of Murfreesboro, TN Solid Waste Management Multi-criteria Analysis (MCA)

Categories and Criteria for Weighting

**Environmental Sustainability**
- Resource Efficiency
  - Potential to reuse & recycle waste
  - Potential to increase diversion
  - Potential to recover marketable materials
- Climate Impact
  - Potential to reduce green house gas (GHG) emissions
- Local Environmental Impact
  - Impact on land, air and water quality resources
  - Impact on roadway capacity and increased traffic

**Public Welfare and Social Implications**
- Safety & Health Impact
  - Potential impacts to public and staff safety
  - Potential impacts on odor, noise, vectors, litter
- Public Perception
  - Public acceptance to receive outside region trash
  - Risk of community interruption due to traffic, odor or noise
- Economic Development
  - Potential for new local jobs
  - Potential to support economic growth and innovation

**Financial Viability**
- Direct Cost
  - Initial and future replacement capital costs
  - Annual operating & maintenance expenses
  - Potential to generate revenue from recovered materials
- Revenue & Savings Potential
  - Potential costs savings to other City services
- Risk & Reliability
  - Risk of reliability of vendors / technology
  - Risk of system complexity and maintenance requirements
  - Risk of contractual issues and liability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 lowest; 5 highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Efficiency</td>
<td>Potential to avoid/reduce/reuse/recycle waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to increase diversion of materials from landfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to recover additional marketable materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Impact</td>
<td>Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (from facility operations &amp; material transportation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to reduce energy consumption (fuel, power, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Environmental Impact</td>
<td>Impact on land, air and water quality resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on transportation resources / roadway capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Welfare and Social Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Health Impact</td>
<td>Potential for impacts to public and staff safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for impacts to public health from water/air contaminant emissions, odor, noise, vector/vermin, increased litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Perception</td>
<td>Public acceptance of Murfreesboro receiving outside region trash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of community interruption from increased traffic, odor and noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Potential for new local jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to support economic growth and innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Viability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td>Initial and Future replacement capital costs for City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual operating and maintenance costs for City (including contracted costs &amp; any additional staffing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue and Savings Potential</td>
<td>Potential cost savings to other components of City services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to generate revenue from sale of recovered materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and Reliability</td>
<td>Risk of issues with reliability or availability of facilities / vendors / technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of system complexity and maintenance requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of contractual issues and liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL COMMUNICATION
Meeting Date: 07/13/2022

Item Title: Overview of Traffic Planning for Economic Development Projects
Department: Administration
Presented by: Administration

Summary
Information for Council regarding the traffic planning efforts associated with major economic development projects.

Background Information
Staff consistently engages a process that is intended to address traffic as the City and the surrounding area continues to grow. As part of that project, traffic consideration associated with major economic development projects are included in that process. Because roadway development is a major capital investment, the process informs the Community Investment Plan and Budget.

Council Priorities Served

   Improve Economic Development

Traffic is considered as a part of every economic development project; major projects require extensive consideration that begins well before the usual process for addressing traffic resulting from new development, which occurs during the planning process.
Summary
May 2022 Dashboard packet

Background Information
Dashboard information includes relevant Financial, Building & Codes, Risk Management and Construction data.

Council Priorities Served
   Responsible budgeting
Providing Council with assessable financial information on a regular basis assists in critical decision-making about the fiscal affairs of the City.

Fiscal Impacts
None

Attachments:
1. May 2022 Dashboard
2. City Schools May Dashboard
Property Tax notices were mailed in early October. While the FY22 budget reflects a 3.08% increase over FY21, actual results show a 4% increase over FY21.

FY22 Local Sales Tax collections continue to outpace FY21. Through May, collections are trending over FY21 and over budget by 17.8%. This revenue stream will be closely monitored for major fluctuations.
State Sales Tax collections continue to outpace FY21 and budget by 30.5% through May. This revenue stream will be closely monitored for major fluctuations.
Gross Receipts (Business Tax) made up nearly 52% of the State Shared collections for May while Sales Tax followed at 33%. State Street Aid Gas Tax (restricted to road improvements) made up an additional 10%. The remaining 5% was made up with mixed drink, beer and other miscellaneous taxes.
Overall, State Shared Revenue collections showed 28% growth for May as compared to FY21 and reflect a 17% increase cumulatively for the year. Sales Taxes receipts are showing a 25% increase as compared to May 2021. Mixed Drink taxes continue to increase over last year, reflecting an 11% increase for the month and 29% cumulatively compared to FY21, bringing this revenue over and above pre-pandemic levels. State Street Aid Gas Tax has also bounced back to pre-pandemic levels with a 34% increase over May 2021 and overall, 20% cumulatively - these revenues are restricted and can only be spent on eligible roadway maintenance and construction projects.
FY21 Hotel/Motel tax results indicated fewer receipts than previous years, therefore, the FY22 budget was conservatively budgeted. However, FY22 results indicate an increase over pre-pandemic tax collections and an increase over budget by 60% for the month and 38% for the year. Results also show an increase over last year through May of 60%. This upward trend is expected to continue.
Salaries & Benefits make up 45% of General Fund’s budget. The FY22 budget included 23 additional full-time positions, increasing full-time approved positions from 1,018 to 1,041 positions.

As of 5/31/22, there were 992 filled full-time positions and 49 vacancies, compared to 54 vacancies in April. Police had 41 open positions at the end of May, including 34 sworn officer positions. Salaries & Benefits are running 8% under budget for the month and 6% under budget for the year.

Transfers to City Schools makes up 4% of General Fund’s budget. Budgeted Transfers to City Schools is budgeted at $7.885M. This transfer is made in monthly increments evenly distributed throughout the year.
Budgeted Debt Service makes up 18% of General Fund’s budget. The budgeted Debt Service Transfer increased by $990k in FY22. This is due to the 2021 Bond issuance.

Repairs & Maintenance make up 7% of General Fund budgeted expenses and are up 5% as compared to FY21 budget. This includes maintenance of software ($1.5M), fleet services ($3.5M), and Police R&M for radios, mobile data terminals, etc. ($1.28M). State Street Aid R&M of streets, markings and right of way totals $4.3M. These expenses are seasonal and fluctuate depending on contract timing and timing of repairs. This was trending over budget by 9% and 53% over FY21 through May, primarily due to differences in timing of State Street Aid paving projects.
Utilities make up 2% of General Fund’s budget. Results are up 1% as compared to FY21 and are running 6% under budget through May.
Fixed Assets make up 13% of General Fund’s budget, totaling $28M. These items include:

- $6.9M in Infrastructure for grant funded road construction
- $4.0M – Transit Facility
- $2.0M – Police Equipment
- $4.65M – Police Vehicles (from CIP)
- $3.0M – Community West Park
- $860k – Skate Park
- $1.5M – Siegel Soccer Park building
- $1.4M – Transit Buses
- $600k – Parks & Recreation equipment
- $500k – Fire equipment

Timing on spending in Fixed Assets is also seasonal and can fluctuate based on the construction schedules and delivery of equipment. Through May, fixed asset spending was up 36% as compared to last year. This includes the $650,000 purchase of the Church Street property for Economic Development purposes and the grant funded portion of the Infrastructure road projects totaling $1.47M. As compared to budget, actual results are under budget by 79% - mainly due to delays in several large projects, including the purchase of police vehicles, community west park construction and the skate park construction.
Safety incidents are reflected on a calendar vs. fiscal year basis. Overall, for the City, total incidents for 2022 are down by 2 incidents or 3% from 2021.
Number of PEP Claims as of May

- **Fire**
- **Police**
- **P&R**
- **Water**
- **Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fire</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>P&amp;R</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulatively, FY22 dwelling permits are up 9% from FY21 and show a decrease for the month of May of 63%. Due to rising interest rates, the department expects fluctuations like this to occur as new residential building tapers off.

Total permits were trending down from last year by 13% in May. This is mainly due to the higher-than-average commercial permits and residential pool and fence permits from last summer.
Revenues are up 2.7% as compared to last year due to a large commercial permit issued in September for an existing facility improvement and a large warehouse permit in November. However, May revenues are down 19% as compared to last May.
### Project Tracking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Project Cost (including approved Change Orders)</th>
<th>Billed to Date (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Project Days (including approved Change Orders)</th>
<th>Days Used</th>
<th>Percent Days</th>
<th>Estimated Substantial Completion</th>
<th>N.T.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradyville Pike</td>
<td>SE Broad Street</td>
<td>5 Rutherford Blvd</td>
<td>2.10 Miles</td>
<td>$10,570,000 (Est Cost)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Phase II</td>
<td>Siegel Soccer Park</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs Road</td>
<td>1.73 Miles</td>
<td>$13,800,000 (Est Cost)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Phase III</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Memorial Blvd (231)</td>
<td>1.10 Miles</td>
<td>$46,000,000 (Est Cost)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martin Luther King Blvd Sidewalks</td>
<td>SE Broad Street</td>
<td>Middle TN Blvd</td>
<td>.70 Miles</td>
<td>$1,300,292</td>
<td>$683,119.80</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>5/25/2022</td>
<td>5/17/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucker Lane Phase I</td>
<td>Muirwood Blvd</td>
<td>Veterans Parkway</td>
<td>.75 Miles</td>
<td>$2,399,947.00</td>
<td>$1,969,983.33</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1/9/2022</td>
<td>5/10/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinkley Road Phase 1</td>
<td>Timber Creek</td>
<td>Blaze Drive</td>
<td>.3 Miles</td>
<td>$5,839,997</td>
<td>$149,515.75</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7/10/2023</td>
<td>4/4/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>Robert Rose</td>
<td>.1 Miles</td>
<td>$1,432,842 (Est Cost)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front/Vine Intersection</td>
<td>Front Street</td>
<td>Vine Street</td>
<td>.1 Miles</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,042,078</td>
<td>$2,800,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pareto Chart

Pareto Chart for Cumulative Percent of Annual Costs across all Cost Centers is in cells B2 through E3.

---

**Engineering Construction Update**

**JUNE 9, 2022**

**City of MURFREESBORO, TENNESSEE**
## Project Status / Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brinkley Road Phase I</td>
<td>Contractor has completed clearing and grubbing. Stream diversion and EPSC measures installed. Contractor has completed concrete pours on one of the two piers along west side of bridge and has started foundation of second pier along the same side. They have also begun adding fill to the northwest side of the existing bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffin Place</td>
<td>City is finalizing right of way acquisition. Construction scheduled to begin within the next month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Phase II</td>
<td>Corps of Engineers requested additional information concerning the environmental and right of way impacts of the proposed Cherry Lane alignment on 5/26/22. Consultant is finalizing response and is scheduled to send response to the Corps this week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Phase III</td>
<td>Right-of-way consultant (Volkert) continuing to work on second batch of appraisals for right of way acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front / Vine Street Intersection</td>
<td>Transportation Planning Report was submitted TDOT for their review. City staff and consultant working with TDOT to address their comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Blvd Extension</td>
<td>Two out of three appraisals complete. Consultant finalizing plans for construction. City beginning right of way acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martin Luther King Blvd Sidewalks</td>
<td>Work was complete on 5/25/2022. Contractor working on punch list items. Final TDOT walkthrough scheduled for 6/14/2022. Staff working on project closeout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucker Lane Phase I</td>
<td>Final change order approved by Council on 3/17/2022. Staff working on project close out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ROW Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ROW Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradyville Pike</td>
<td>75% of ROW Acquisition completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinkley Road</td>
<td>95% ROW acquired. 100% agreed upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffin Place</td>
<td>Right of way agreed upon. Finalizing documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Phase III</td>
<td>Volkert continuing ROW acquisition. Appraisals in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>Appraisal services 66% complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

Meeting Date:   7/13/2022

Item Title:       May 2022 MCS Cash Flow Statement and Revenue and Expenditure Budget Comparison Reports

Department:       Murfreesboro City Schools

Presented by:     Kim Williams

Requested Council Action:

- Ordinance ☐
- Resolution ☐
- Motion ☐
- Direction ☐
- Information ☒

Summary

FY22 Cash Flow Statement (May 2022)
FY22 Revenue and Expenditure Budget Comparison Reports (May 2022)

Background Information

The State has recommended the Schools provide a Cash Flow Statement to the City Council on a monthly basis to indicate enough cash reserves are forecasted to be available to pay monthly expenses. We also will be including Revenue and Expenditure Budget Comparison Reports, that is provided to the Murfreesboro City School Board each month. This information will be included in the Wednesday agenda each month. A formal presentation will not be made each month, however there will be an opportunity for questions and comments.

Council Priorities Served

Strong and Sustainable Financial and Economic Health

Fiscal Impact

None

Attachments

May 2022 MCS Cash Flow Statement
May 2022 MCS Revenue and Expenditure Budget Comparison Reports
# FY22 GENERAL PURPOSE CITY SCHOOL FUND

## Cash Flow Forecast Schedule

**FY 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Purpose School Fund</th>
<th>JUL (Actual)</th>
<th>AUG (Actual)</th>
<th>SEP (Actual)</th>
<th>OCT (Actual)</th>
<th>NOV (Actual)</th>
<th>DEC (Actual)</th>
<th>JAN (Actual)</th>
<th>FEB (Actual)</th>
<th>MAR (Actual)</th>
<th>APR (Actual)</th>
<th>MAY (Actual)</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts</td>
<td>$ 5,770,154</td>
<td>$ 7,316,777</td>
<td>$ 7,990,992</td>
<td>$ 8,772,388</td>
<td>$10,040,071</td>
<td>$ 9,450,198</td>
<td>$14,379,036</td>
<td>$ 9,646,126</td>
<td>$12,674,677</td>
<td>$ 9,410,388</td>
<td>$4,379,928</td>
<td>$11,373,247</td>
<td>$111,203,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Proceeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Inflows</td>
<td>5,770,154</td>
<td>7,316,777</td>
<td>7,990,992</td>
<td>8,772,388</td>
<td>10,040,071</td>
<td>9,450,198</td>
<td>14,379,036</td>
<td>9,646,126</td>
<td>12,674,677</td>
<td>9,410,388</td>
<td>4,379,928</td>
<td>11,373,247</td>
<td>111,203,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg Cash Bal</td>
<td>12,802,019</td>
<td>9,689,596</td>
<td>8,800,340</td>
<td>8,801,496</td>
<td>8,991,048</td>
<td>9,440,826</td>
<td>10,411,602</td>
<td>16,516,633</td>
<td>17,022,854</td>
<td>22,392,034</td>
<td>24,198,199</td>
<td>18,818,172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Payments</td>
<td>$ 8,850,597</td>
<td>$ 8,174,055</td>
<td>$ 7,957,857</td>
<td>$ 9,450,756</td>
<td>$ 8,658,273</td>
<td>$ 8,455,775</td>
<td>$ 8,250,358</td>
<td>$ 8,216,238</td>
<td>$ 8,181,809</td>
<td>$ 7,580,575</td>
<td>$ 9,710,879</td>
<td>$12,475,362</td>
<td>105,962,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>31,980</td>
<td>31,980</td>
<td>31,980</td>
<td>31,980</td>
<td>32,020</td>
<td>23,647</td>
<td>23,647</td>
<td>23,647</td>
<td>23,647</td>
<td>23,647</td>
<td>49,076</td>
<td>23,647</td>
<td>359,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Outflows</td>
<td>8,882,577</td>
<td>8,206,033</td>
<td>7,989,837</td>
<td>9,482,736</td>
<td>8,690,293</td>
<td>8,479,422</td>
<td>8,274,005</td>
<td>8,239,905</td>
<td>8,205,456</td>
<td>7,664,224</td>
<td>9,759,255</td>
<td>12,499,069</td>
<td>106,313,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>9,689,596</td>
<td>8,800,340</td>
<td>8,801,496</td>
<td>8,091,048</td>
<td>9,440,826</td>
<td>10,411,602</td>
<td>16,516,633</td>
<td>17,022,854</td>
<td>22,392,035</td>
<td>24,198,199</td>
<td>18,818,172</td>
<td>17,692,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Inflows - Outflows</td>
<td>($3,112,423)</td>
<td>($889,256)</td>
<td>$1,155</td>
<td>($710,448)</td>
<td>$1,345,779</td>
<td>$970,775</td>
<td>$6,105,032</td>
<td>$1,406,221</td>
<td>$4,469,181</td>
<td>$1,806,164</td>
<td>($5,380,027)</td>
<td>($1,125,761)</td>
<td>4,890,392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Amounts are estimated and taken from prior year amounts unless otherwise indicated.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7/1/21 - 5/31/22</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOME</td>
<td>$82,317,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$76,449,068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET INCOME 5/31/22</td>
<td>$5,868,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Year-to-Date Revenue Comparison

**MAY 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Class</th>
<th>2020-21 Budget</th>
<th>2020-21 YTD Rev.</th>
<th>2020-21 OVR/(UNDR) Budget</th>
<th>2020-21 %</th>
<th>2021-22 Budget</th>
<th>2021-22 YTD Rev.</th>
<th>2021-22 OVR/(UNDR) Budget</th>
<th>2021-22 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40110-Current Prop. Tax</td>
<td>15,312,150</td>
<td>15,651,252</td>
<td>339,102</td>
<td>102.2%</td>
<td>15,700,000</td>
<td>15,987,306</td>
<td>287,306</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40210-Local Option Sales Tax</td>
<td>12,330,550</td>
<td>9,209,109</td>
<td>(3,121,441)</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>13,021,844</td>
<td>12,040,567</td>
<td>(981,277)</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40000-41110-Other County Rev</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>1,488,687</td>
<td>(361,313)</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>1,705,000</td>
<td>1,427,245</td>
<td>(277,755)</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43300-44000-Other Local Revenue</td>
<td>698,941</td>
<td>605,601</td>
<td>(93,340)</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>1,792,500</td>
<td>508,363</td>
<td>(1,284,137)</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46511-Basic Educ. Program</td>
<td>48,350,000</td>
<td>42,486,300</td>
<td>(5,863,700)</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>48,115,000</td>
<td>43,356,600</td>
<td>(4,758,400)</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46515-Early Childhood Ed.</td>
<td>1,072,125</td>
<td>900,393</td>
<td>(171,732)</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>1,063,812</td>
<td>871,447</td>
<td>(192,365)</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46530-Energy Efficient Sch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46590-Other State Education</td>
<td>1,976,159</td>
<td>60,886</td>
<td>(1,915,273)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1,689,401</td>
<td>358,442</td>
<td>(1,330,959)</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46610-Career Ladder Program</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>108,474</td>
<td>20,474</td>
<td>123.3%</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>85,903</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>104.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46615-Ext. Contract-ARRA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46591-Coordinated School Health</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>94,216</td>
<td>(5,784)</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>92,772</td>
<td>(7,228)</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46595-Family Resource</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>27,144</td>
<td>(2,456)</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>26,836</td>
<td>(2,764)</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46800-46990-Other State Revenue</td>
<td>262,503</td>
<td>169,278</td>
<td>(93,225)</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>227,419</td>
<td>89,917</td>
<td>(137,502)</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47000- Federal Funds</td>
<td>283,653</td>
<td>7,459</td>
<td>(276,194)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>945,179</td>
<td>225,323</td>
<td>(719,856)</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49100-49800 Bond &amp; City Transfers</td>
<td>3,244,831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,244,831)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>18,506</td>
<td>(431,495)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49810-Approp./City Gen. Fund</td>
<td>7,885,103</td>
<td>7,228,011</td>
<td>(657,092)</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8,748,241</td>
<td>7,228,011</td>
<td>(1,520,230)</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49820-Operating Transfers</td>
<td>78,413</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>(57,913)</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,562,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78,057,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(15,504,718)</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,669,996.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$82,317,238</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(11,352,758)</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YEAR-TO-DATE EXPENDITURE COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET CLASS.</th>
<th>2020-21 BUDGET</th>
<th>2020-21 YTD EXP.</th>
<th>2020-21 OVR/(UNDR) BUDGET</th>
<th>2020-21 %</th>
<th>2021-22 BUDGET</th>
<th>2021-22 YTD EXP.</th>
<th>2021-22 OVR/(UNDR) BUDGET</th>
<th>2021-22 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71100-Reg. Instruction</td>
<td>50,568,178</td>
<td>40,678,498</td>
<td>(9,889,680)</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>53,405,843</td>
<td>$41,956,834.90</td>
<td>(11,449,008)</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71200-Sp. Ed. Instruction</td>
<td>9,646,900</td>
<td>7,847,641</td>
<td>(1,799,259)</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>10,430,890</td>
<td>8,435,818</td>
<td>(1,995,072)</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71400-Student Body Ed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72110-Attendance</td>
<td>157,489</td>
<td>135,367</td>
<td>(22,122)</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>101,955</td>
<td>91,255</td>
<td>(10,700)</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72120-Health Services</td>
<td>948,039</td>
<td>837,473</td>
<td>(110,566)</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>350,470</td>
<td>164,383</td>
<td>(186,087)</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72130-Guidance</td>
<td>2,743,401</td>
<td>2,098,907</td>
<td>(644,494)</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>2,664,745</td>
<td>2,132,815</td>
<td>(531,930)</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72210-Reg. Instr. Support</td>
<td>2,315,361</td>
<td>1,954,021</td>
<td>(361,340)</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>2,337,484</td>
<td>1,851,128</td>
<td>(486,356)</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72220-Sp. Ed. Support</td>
<td>1,841,650</td>
<td>1,423,241</td>
<td>(418,409)</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>1,763,075</td>
<td>1,426,550</td>
<td>(336,525)</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72250-Technology</td>
<td>1,954,363</td>
<td>1,623,554</td>
<td>(330,809)</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>2,092,276</td>
<td>1,760,349</td>
<td>(331,927)</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72310-Bd. Of Education</td>
<td>1,646,370</td>
<td>1,389,891</td>
<td>(256,479)</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>1,739,801</td>
<td>1,183,017</td>
<td>(556,784)</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72320-Office of Supt.</td>
<td>388,039</td>
<td>235,680</td>
<td>(152,359)</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>433,002</td>
<td>337,107</td>
<td>(95,895)</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72410-Office of Principal</td>
<td>4,739,039</td>
<td>4,042,609</td>
<td>(696,430)</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>4,987,241</td>
<td>4,336,916</td>
<td>(650,325)</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72510-Fiscal Services</td>
<td>470,480</td>
<td>420,761</td>
<td>(49,719)</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>528,790</td>
<td>497,115</td>
<td>(31,675)</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72520-Personnel Services</td>
<td>587,033</td>
<td>468,924</td>
<td>(118,109)</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>497,494</td>
<td>425,918</td>
<td>(71,576)</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72610-Oper. Of Plant</td>
<td>6,304,017</td>
<td>4,750,998</td>
<td>(1,553,019)</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>6,534,981</td>
<td>5,314,255</td>
<td>(1,220,726)</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72620-Maint. Of Plant</td>
<td>2,809,034</td>
<td>1,875,238</td>
<td>(933,796)</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>2,938,194</td>
<td>1,773,985</td>
<td>(1,164,209)</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72710-Pupil Transp.</td>
<td>3,883,591</td>
<td>2,802,205</td>
<td>(1,081,386)</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>4,087,128</td>
<td>2,993,579</td>
<td>(1,093,549)</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73300-Community Service</td>
<td>557,708</td>
<td>384,784</td>
<td>(172,924)</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>587,955</td>
<td>403,771</td>
<td>(184,184)</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73400-Early Childhood Educ.</td>
<td>1,249,350</td>
<td>982,974</td>
<td>(266,376)</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>1,240,007</td>
<td>951,203</td>
<td>(288,804)</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76100-Reg. Cap. Outlay</td>
<td>150,500</td>
<td>101,352</td>
<td>(49,148)</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>65,817</td>
<td>(44,184)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82130-Education Debt Serv.</td>
<td>3,244,831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,244,831)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99100-Operating Transfers</td>
<td>409,200</td>
<td>377,220</td>
<td>(31,980)</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>350,900</td>
<td>327,251</td>
<td>(23,649)</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,614,573</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,431,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>(22,183,235)</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,202,231</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,449,068</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20,753,163)</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>