





Yosemite Community College District

District Fiscal Advisory Council (DFAC)

Thursday, September 19, 2019

1:00 p.m.

District Office Building, Conference Room A & Manzanita Building, President's Conference Room

Agenda

1:00 p.m. to 1:10 p.m.

Roll call

Approval of the minutes from the June 20, 2019 meeting

1:10 p.m. to 1:25 p.m.

2018-2019 Budget

1:25 p.m. to 1:50 p.m.

2019-2020 Budget

1:50 p.m. to 2:10 p.m.

Fund Balance

2:10 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Resource Allocation Model

Next Meeting: October 17, 2019

UNAPPROVED MINUTES Yosemite Community College District District Fiscal Advisory Council (DFAC) June 20, 2019

Present: Iris Carroll, Elissa Creighton, Josh Hash, Crista Noakes (Recorder), Melissa Raby, Brian Sanders, Trevor Stewart, Susan Yeager, Henry Yong, Jennifer Zellet

Council Members Absent: Jenni Abbott, Shelley Akiona, Kevin Alavezos, Flerida Arias, Coni Chavez, Doralyn Foletti, Ashley Griffith, Pam Guerra-Schmidt, Judy Lanchester, Amy Lovett, Sarah Schrader, Sherri Suarez, ASMJC Student Designee, ASCC Student Designee

 Acceptance of the Minutes of the May 16, 2019, District Fiscal Advisory Council

Consensus was met to approve the minutes. The minutes are approved.

2. Monthly Financial Status Update

Dr. Susan Yeager, Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services, provided the monthly financial report to the Council. The report displays revenue and expenditures for the month ending May 31, 2019. In regards to revenue, she noted, the interest income line item is higher. Modesto Junior College (MJC) and Columbia College (CC) expenditures are trending slightly higher. Dr. Brian Sanders, Vice President of Instruction at CC, asked why the Non-Resident Tuition line item is higher than usual. Dr. Yeager explained it could be due to the fee increase. She will look into it and get back to the Council. Dr. Sanders asked why the Interest Income line item is higher than usual. Dr. Yeager explained the increase is due to the interest rates increasing as well as higher cash balances.

3. 2019-2020 Tentative Budget

Dr. Yeager provided copies of slides 17-24 from the 2019-2020 Tentative Budget presentation that was presented to the Board of Trustees on June 12, 2019. She reviewed the General Unrestricted Fund 11 expenditures and general fund balances for MJC, CC, and Central Services (CS). Trevor Stewart, Vice President of College & Administrative Services at CC, asked what the apportionment is based on. Dr. Yeager stated we are still working off of our original budget amount; however, there was also an amended budget. She stated we will know the final budget numbers once the Governor approves the State budget.

Dr. Yeager explained the importance of creating a plan for the Fund Balance. She expressed she would like to see a required fund balance of 15%. The

current Board required reserve is 10%. The PERS/STRS line item on slide 18 is one-time funds. Dr. Yeager explained the PERS/STRS increases are substantial each year. She would like to develop a plan for the fund balance with the Council to present to the Board of Trustees. Dr. Yeager explained planned deficit spending and how it differs from revenue not meeting expenditures. She warned the State will potentially send a letter to the Board of Trustees stating the YCCD is at moderate risk if they proceed with a deficit spending plan. Dr. Yeager expressed she would like to suggest a line item be added to the Fund Balance for the Facilities and Information Technology Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) plans. Trevor Stewart suggested a one-time revenue expense line item for CalSTRS On-Behalf Revenue to distinguish one-time revenue from one-time expenditures. Dr. Yeager will discuss the suggestion with the Controller.

Dr. Yeager explained the majority of the District's unrestricted expenditures are used in salaries and benefits. Moving forward, she would like the percentage of salaries and benefits to decrease district-wide to allow the Colleges to pursue programs and initiatives they would like to implement. She also explained Enrollment Management will be discussed at the July DFAC meeting. She asked the DFAC Council members to email a list of those who should be included in the special discussion in July.

4. Consultant Resumes for the new Resource Allocation Model (RAM)
Dr. Yeager provided two resumes to the Council for review. The consultant will be hired to assist with developing a new RAM. Some of the criteria required to be considered as the new consultant included being from a multi-college district and being familiar with the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF). Dr. Yeager explained both candidates are very qualified and have developed RAM's at previous districts. The consultant will be paid from the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Grant funds. The grant amount is \$75k. Any fees over that amount will be the responsibility of the District.

Trevor Stewart proposed the successful consultant be asked to attend three meetings; one at the District, one at MJC and one at CC to familiarize him/herself with who they are representing.

Consensus was met to proceed with Kathryn L. Blackwood as the RAM consultant due to her state-wide experience and connections with other consultants.

5. Potential Bond

Dr. Yeager explained the District is exploring the idea of a new bond. No decision has been made at this time to proceed. She briefly explained the process of initiating a bond including a Bond Survey to help determine if a Bond will pass. The majority of the Measure E Bond was spent at MJC for new

facilities and small remodels. A few new facilities were also added to the CC campus along with a few small remodels. The idea of the new bond is to add a few new facilities that were leftover as part of the Measure E Bond, remodel and upgrade existing facilities and set aside funds for small capital projects (scheduled maintenance). Dr. Yeager will provide a presentation to the Board of Trustees to explain the structure of the potential bond and request permission to proceed with exploration of the bond via formation of the Bond Team and a Bond Survey.

6. General Discussion

Dr. Yeager requested the Council send her office names of people who should be invited to the special Enrollment Management discussion at the July DFAC meeting. Dr. Yeager would like to determine the scope of the action plan and how to best proceed in a timely manner. Dr. Jennifer Zellet, Vice President of Instruction at MJC, suggested a ninety-day action plan.

Dr. Yeager invited the Council to provide topic suggestions via email to discuss at future DFAC meetings. The topics will be discussed in ten minute sessions and will serve as informational learning topics for the Council.

7. Close/Next Meeting

The next District Fiscal Advisory Council meeting will be held on **Thursday**, **July 18**, **2019**, **at 1:00 p.m.** in the YCCD District Office, Meeting Room A, located at 2201 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto, CA and Columbia College Manzanita Building, President's Conference Room located at 11600 Columbia College Drive, Sonora, CA.

Summary of Total Computational Revenue (TCR)

Item		Actuals		Budgeted
2017-18 TCR (@ Recal)	\$	95,628,458		
2018-19 TCR				
2017-18 TCR Plus 2.71% Cola	\$	98,219,989	2.71%	
2018-19 TCR per SCFF	\$	105,738,707		
Constrained 2018-19 TCR - May 2017-18 TCR + 8.2%	\$	103,403,051	8.1%	
P2 Apportionment - June Reflecting Available Revenue	\$	102,763,182	7.46%	\$ 104,415,243
Difference between SCFF TCR and P2 Apportionment	\$	(2,975,525)	-2.81%	
2019/20 TCR				
2019/20 TCR per SCFF simulations	\$	110,213,007		
2019/20 Advance Apportionment Game as 2018/19 Constrained TCR	\$	103,403,051	6.2% 0.6%	
2019/20 Budget				
entative Budget				\$ 108,154,520
inal Budget				\$ 103,403,051
oifference between Final & Tentative	Budget			\$ (4,751,469)

Resource Allocation Models 9/19/2019

Every multi-college district has some sort of resource allocation model that allocates the resources received by the district to the colleges and to the district office. Some also note district-wide, central services or institutional costs that are taken off the top. A few college districts are now working on a resource allocation model that reflects the SCFF formula. Los Rios, San Diego and San Mateo also allocate an amount of resources for compensation in agreements that have been negotiated with the collective bargaining units. The amount set aside for compensation may cover increases in salaries (movement on column and step) and benefits (including increases in PERS and STRS) as well as necessary increases in staffing due to growth (both classified and faculty, including as a result of the increase in the Faculty Obligation Number or FON.) The use of what is remaining is usually determined by the collective bargaining units.

Most of the resource allocation models use a calculation of the state-determined revenue for each college. For SCFF, this involves a lot of data and may or may not be better than using Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) as the base. 70% of the SCFF allocation is based on the old formula, SB361. This includes a base amount per district that includes a base amount derived from the total FTES and number of colleges; and a rate per FTES (with different rates for Career Development/College Prep or CDCP FTES, Dual Enrollment and Non-Credit FTES). 20% of the SCFF allocation is based on metrics such as the number of Pell awards and the remaining 10% is based on outcomes metrics such as degrees, transfers, etc.

Other revenues are typically allocated to the colleges based on a flat percentage, with the remainder going to the district office. Some districts allocate <u>all</u> of the resources to the colleges, and then charge back the amounts needed for institutional costs and the district office.

Another way that resources are allocated is to allocate amounts needed for "fixed costs" up front. Many districts allocate amounts for permanent staffing costs (salaries and benefits) to each site, and then have a formula for the remaining funds. Some colleges also allocate amounts for adjunct faculty in order to reach the FTES goals set in the budget, but they also set productivity goals. Colleges that exceed the productivity goals and the FTES goals (ensuring that there is revenue backing this allocation up!) are allowed to keep the resulting savings.

Districts that allocate the revenues typically do not determine the allocation of the budget within the sites. That means that the colleges will have to determine the best allocation to both cover their fixed costs and reach their agreed-upon goals. Each site will have to cover any overspending, often out of the succeeding year's budget.

Other Issues

Reserves: Each district will set its own policy for maintaining adequate reserves. There is no regulation or law that governs community college reserve levels, but both the Chancellor's Office and the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regularly review each district's review and will require a district to respond if the trend is negative or the reserve drops below 5% of expenditures. Any allocation method needs to account for maintaining the reserves specified in the policy. This will include augmentations to the reserves as the budget grows from year to year. Reserves may be used to stabilize funds in a dropping economy or for other reasons, but there must be a plan to replenish them.

Carryovers: Some districts sweep unused budget at the end of the year and reallocate those funds for one-time purposes. Others believe that this promotes a use-it-or-lose-it behavior that is not healthy, and allows some or all of the unused funds to be retained at each site. Other districts allow savings in unspent adjunct funds only if certain goals are achieved. Some districts tightly control the savings from vacant permanent positions (known as float), and require permission to use the funds for other purposes.

Goals: Most districts set goals for FTES and productivity. With the new SCFF formula, districts are having to project increases in the SCFF metrics such as Pell awards, degrees, transfers, etc. It is essential that the goals set have budgets attached whether in the resource allocation or in the site budget process. In addition, these goals are usually tied to metrics identified in the college and district strategic plans. As plans are updated, especially to reflect the SCFF, funds will need to be diverted from other activities in order to achieve these goals, as districts seldom if ever have the funds to add all new activities without ceasing any of the old ones.

Institutional Costs: Institutional costs are ones that are for the entire district, or often are not controllable by the district office. These may include: retiree benefits, utilities, trustee elections, interest expense, districtwide shared software, negotiated or agreed upon released time and professional development, audit expenses, legal expenses, general liability and other insurance, banking costs, etc. There needs to be agreement on what the costs are that fall into this group, how the budgets are determined, and how new costs are added.

Small College/Center: The old SB361 formula included an amount in the base allocation for rural colleges and for small colleges. Some resource allocation models also include an additional allocation to a smaller site to account for economies of scale. This may be a consideration when colleges differ by a significant amount in size.

Versions to Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) and Major Changes



SCFF #5 2019-20 Midyear	SCFF #4 2019-20 Final State Budget	SCFF #3 2018-19 P2	SCFF #2 2019-20 May Revise	SCFF #1 2018-19 Adopted Original	Version
 Exclusion of Non-Resident Students from Success and Supplemental Counts Adjust special admit and correctional facilities student into base allocation Potential recommendations from SCFF Oversight Committee Rates will be adjusted so total owed falls within available revenue 	 Recalculated Rates; Maintain 70/20/10 split 2020-21 rates will be 2019-20 adjusted by COLA Highest award for Success counts; 3 yr. average for Success allocation Transfer Definition – 12 units completion in the prior year Additional 4th HH Year Continuation – Constrained TCR from 2018-19 	 Temporary Transfer definition – UC/CSU Data Basic Allocation correction; other rate adjustments 	 Hold 2019-20 Allocations to 70/20/10 split Cap annual Success allocation growth to 10% Deficit-Constrained Total Computational Revenue (TCR) no greater than 2017-18 TCR times 8.13% (3x 17-18 COLA of 2.71%) 	 Allocations for 2018-19 began at 70/20/10, 2019-20 to 65/20/15 and 2020-21 to 60/20/20. Three years Hold-Harmless Provision (HH) 	Types of Changes to Allocations and Metrics

2018-19 Student Centered Funding Formula Calculation versus Actual Funding Received



Report	Value
2018-19 Advance Apportionment (2018-19 YCCD Budget) (July 2018)	\$104,415,243
2018-19 First Principal Apportionment Report (P1) (March 2019)	SCFF Calculation - \$106,956,466 TCR To Be Funded - \$101,552,344
2018-19 Revised First Principal Apportionment Report (P1) (April 2019)	SCFF Calculation - \$106,210,048 Constrained TCR to be Funded - \$103,403,051 TCR Reflecting Available Revenues - \$99,222,861
2018-19 Second Principal Apportionment Report (P2) (June 2019)	SCFF Calculation - \$105,738,707 Constrained TCR - \$103,403,051 TCR To Be Funded - \$102,763,182*
2019-20 YCCD Tentative Budget (June 2019)	SCFF Calculation - \$108,154,000
2019-20 Advance Apportionment (2019-20 YCCD Budget) (July 2019)	\$103,403,051**

^{*} Anticipated revenue to be received is actually \$102,514,633 due to final FTES reported being less than reported at P2.

** Anticipated revenue to be received is less than a 1% increase in revenue over prior year.

2019-20 State Budget and District Budget Assumptions (Yage 4 of Final Budget Book)



State Budget:

- Changes to Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF)
- success allocation. supplemental allocation (student need), and 10% student Allocations remain at 70% base allocation (FTES), 20%
- Only highest award for success counts
- Student success allocation will be a three year average
- Change in definition of transfer student
- Hold harmless extended to 2020-21

2019-20 State Budget and District Budget Assumptions (Page 5 of Final Budget Book)



District Budget Assumptions (Revenue):

12)	11)	10)	9)	8)	7)	6)	5)	4	3)	2)					1)	
Total Revenue	Transfer in from Pension Rate Stabilization Trust	CalSTRS On-Behalf Payment	Other Local Revenue	Enrollment Fee - Baccalaureate	Interest Income	Non-Resident Tuition	Lottery	Enrollment Administration Fee	Part-Time Faculty Allocation	State Mandated Block Grant	SCFF calculation	the data submitted and used in the 2018-19	 Flat student success metrics compared to 	 FTES Target of 16,315 	Total Computational Revenue	
\$ 112,366,241	718,190	2,900,000	250,000	40,000	450,000	720,000	2,800,000	270,000	340,000	475,000					\$ 103,403,051	Final Budget
\$ 116,334,520	0	3,375,000	160,000	40,000	300,000	775,000	2,380,000	360,000	320,000	470,000					\$ 108,154,520	Tentative Budget

2019-20 State Budget and District Budget Assumptions (Y(()))



District Budget Assumptions (Expenditures):

9)	8	7	6)	5)	4	3)	2)		1)	
Cover increased estimate for the CalSTRS On-Behalf payment	3 new faculty positions at MJC	Cover increased insurance costs, reassigned time for negotiations, return to work program and other operational costs	Cost of District initiated classification review	Fringe benefits rate changes	PERS and STRS rate increases	Cover longevity and step and column movement	Negotiated salary and benefit increases	On-Going Augmentation to the Base Budget	Base Budget	
186,132	330,000	410,175	194,774	274,469	718,190	1,018,573	2,150,155		\$ 105,887,724	Final Budget
875,000	330,000	0	0	139,348	976,102	1,018,573	0		\$ 105,725,553	Tentative Budget

2019-20 State Budget and District Budget Assumptions (Page 6 of Final Budget Book)



District Budget Assumptions (Expenditures) (cont.):

\$ 116,334,520	\$ 112,366,241	Total Expenditures	18)
500,000	0	Information Technology Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)	17)
1,000,000	0	Facilities Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)	16)
4,954,944	12,684	Contingency for one-time initiative	15)
0	150,417	Encumbrances	14)
0	16,338	Supplement grant for Compliance/Investigator training	13)
40,000	40,000	Earmarking baccalaureate enrollment fee revenue for MJC	12)
775,000	720,000	Earmarking all non-resident tuition revenue for the colleges	11)
0	256,610	Negotiated salary increases	10)
		One-Time Augmentations to the Base Budget	
Tentative Budget	Final Budget		

2018-19 Actuals and YCCD 2019-20 Final Budget (YCCI) Unrestricted General Fund (Page 8)



14)	13)	[2]	E	10)	9	2 &	2 7	EX	6	5)	£	رد د	2 0) <u>1</u>	Re		
Total Expenditures	Other Outgo	Capital Outlay	Other Operating Expenses and Services	Supplies and Materials	Employee Benefits	Classified and Other Nonacademic Salaries	Academic Salaries	Expenditures	Total Revenue	Transfers In	rederal Kevenue	Local Revenue	state Revenue	General Apportionment	Revenue		
45							s		*					₩.		1	<u> </u>
\$ 106,364,465 \$	364,857	686,610	8,970,185	1,211,427	27,565,155	23,389,330	44,176,901		111,377,243 \$	•	•	955,000	6,007,000	104,415,243		Budget	2018-19 Final Amended
\$							\$		45					s			
105,630,604 \$ 109,412,057	455,974	756,079	7,640,764	1,203,618	26,393,764	23,463,996	45,716,409		111,778,733 \$		12,128	1,599,785	7,532,661	102,634,159		Actuals	2018-19
\$							\$		*					4		ĮΞ	
109,412,057	1,367,388	559,003	8,242,221	1,049,256	29,536,564	25,547,168	43,110,457		112,366,241	718,190		1,460,000	6,785,000	103,403,051		Final Budget	2019-2020

2018-19 Actuals and YCCD 2019-20 Final Budget Unrestricted General Fund (Page 8)



23) Increase/Decrease in Fund Balance	22) Total Expenditures and Contingencies/Transfers	21) Total Contingencies/Transfers Out	19) Interfund Transfers Out	Logish Fund Transfer	Capital Outlay Transfer (TCO)	17) Cal-STRS On-Behalf Payment		Contingencies/Transfers Out 15) One-Time Initiatives			
\$	÷	45						ئ		Fin	
(1,964,030) \$	113,341,273 \$	6,976,808 \$		6,500	1,522,000	2,500,000	975,000	1,973,308	Budget	Final Amended	2018-19
\$	\$	S						\$			
484,576 \$	111,294,157	5,663,553 \$	446,185	6,500	1,522,000	2,713,868	975,000	ı	Actuals		2018-19
S	\$	\$						\$	17.		
	111,294,157 \$ 112,366,241	2,954,184	35,000	6,500		2,900,000	•	12,684	Final Budget		2019-2020

2018-19 Actuals and YCCD 2019-20 Final Budget (YCCI) Unrestricted General Fund (Page 8)



33) Total Ending Fund Balance	32)	31)	30)	29)	28)	27)	26)	25)	24) Beginning Fund Balance		
und Balance	Undesignated	Reserve for One-Time Initiative Projects	Reserve for Integrated Plans	Reserve for Information Technology TCO	Reserve for Facilities TCO	Reserve for PERS & STRS Rate Increases	Required Reserve (Board Policy 6305)	Reserve for Encumbrances, Prepaids, Inventory	nd Balance		
S									*	15	!
15,410,150 \$	1,270,150				7-10	3,000,000	10,640,000	500,000	17,374,180 \$	Final Amended	2018-19
\$ 15,410,150 \$ 17,858,756 \$ 17,858,756	2,078,756		300,000	500,000	1,000,000	3,000,000	10,560,000	420,000	17,374,180 \$		2018-19
\$ 17,858,756	1,968,756			500,000	1,000,000	3,000,000	10,940,000	450,000	Final Budget \$ 17,858,756	The state of the s	2019-2020

2018-19 Actuals and YCCD 2019-20 Final Budget Unrestricted General Fund – Modesto Junior College (Page 9)



14) Total Expenditures	Academic Salaries 8) Classified and Other Nonacademic Salaries 9) Employee Benefits 10) Supplies and Materials 11) Other Operating Expenses and Services 12) Capital Outlay	5) Total Revenue	Revenue General Apportionment State Revenue Local Revenue Federal Revenue	
\$	w	v	•	Fina
60,465,923 \$	35,767,260 \$ 7,381,476 15,781,963 86,184 974,150 77,226 397,664	40,000 \$	40,000	2018-19 Final Amended Budget
				Ac 203
62,417,129 \$	37,718,466 7,381,476 15,781,963 86,184 974,150 77,226 397,664	43,428 \$	43,428	2018-19 Actuals
❖	· v	S	•	III
61,673,474	35,476,534 8,077,045 16,726,970 186,825 1,098,350 97,250 10,500	650,000	650,000	2019-2020 Final Budget

2018-19 Actuals and YCCD 2019-20 Final Budget Unrestricted General Fund - Columbia College (Page 10)



141	į	1 5	1 1	11 5	į s	9 9	2 2		6	5	4	ω	.2	ھر			
roun expenditures	The Francisco	Capital Outlay	Control Operating Expenses and Services	Othor County of	Cimplify and Market	Employee Bonefits	Academic Salaries	Expenditures	Total Revenue	Transfers In	Federal Revenue	Local Revenue	State Revenue	General Apportionment	Revenue		
\$	1						s		\$					·s			121
14,266,951 \$	17,416	153,147	414,013	37,850	3,544,963	2,261,886	7,837,676		,	•				•		Budget	2018-19 Final Amended
₩.							*		ts.					v			
13,731,058 \$	17,416	41,863	414,013	37,850	3,544,963	2,261,886	7,413,067									Actuals	2018-19
\$							·s		1/1				1	^			
14,605,717	796,447	20,568	590,183	64,392	3,679,882	2,497,362	6,956,883		110,000			110 000				Final Budget	2019-2020

2018-19 Actuals and YCCD 2019-20 Final Budget Unrestricted General Fund – Central Services (Page 11)



14)	12)	12)	11)	10)	9)	8)	7	Exper	6) 1	5)	4)	<u>e</u>	2)	1)	Revenue		
Total Expenditures	Other Outgo	Capital Outlay	Other Operating Expenses and Services	Supplies and Materials	Employee Benefits	Classified and Other Nonacademic Salaries	Academic Salaries	Expenditures	Total Revenue	Transfers In	Federal Revenue	Local Revenue	State Revenue	General Apportionment	ue .		
·s							v		-01	-				v			E.
31,631,591 \$	(50,223)	456,23/	1,582,022	1,087,393	6,236,229	00C,C#1,CT	5/1,965 \$		108,837,243 \$			915,000	3,507,000	104,415,243		Budget	Final Amended
٠,							v	>	v	•				v			
29,482,417 \$	40,894	636,990	700,200	1,079,364	7,000,000	20,020,03 0	12 930 634		109,021,43/ 5		12,128	1,556,357	4,818,793	102,634,139		Actuals	
4							v	>	v	-				v	1	l TD	
33,132,866	560,441	441,185	0,333,000	750,005	21,621,6	0 170 717	14 977 761		107,886,101	י י	,	/00,000	3,885,000	103,403,051		Final Budget	

2018-19 Actuals and YCCD 2019-20 Final Budget Unrestricted General Fund – Contingency (Page 12)



(22	77 (77	19)	16) 17)	15)	9	5)	4	3)	2)	1)	20		
ioual expenditures and Contingencies/Transfers	The Francisco Vitansiers Out	Capital Outlay Transfer (TCO) Health Fund Transfer Interfund Transfers Out	Unfunded Retiree Liability Cal-STRS On-Behalf Payment	One-Time Initiatives	oral Revenue	Transfers In	Federal Revenue	Local Revenue	State Revenue	General Apportionment	Revenue		
45	45			₹	·s	1			•	^			Eir
6,976,808 \$	6,976,808 \$	1,522,000	975,000	1,973,308	2,500,000 \$			-	2 500 000			Budget	2018-19 Final Amended
₩.	s			v.	\$					^			
5,217,368 \$	5,217,368 \$	2,713,868 1,522,000 6,500	975,000		2,713,868 \$	1	•	2,/13,808	717 000			Actuals	2018-19
*	\$		4	^	\$				v	7		II.	
2,919,184	2,919,184	2,900,000 - 6,500	,	17 684	3,618,190	718,190	•	2,900,000				Final Budget	2019-2020