



SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
SFCJPA.ORG

**Notice of Regular Meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
City of Menlo Park Council Chambers
701 Laurel Steet, Menlo Park, California
April 28, 2016 at 4:00 p.m.**

AGENDA

- 1) ROLL CALL
- 2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- 3) APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – March 24, 2016 and April 14, 2016 Board meetings
- 4) PUBLIC COMMENT – *Individuals may speak on any topic for up to three minutes; during any other Agenda item, individuals may speak for up to three minutes on the subject of that item.*
- 5) REGULAR BUSINESS – Executive Director’s Report
 - a) Approve the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget
 - b) S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project funding and construction planning
- 6) ADJOURNMENT

PLEASE NOTE: This Board meeting Agenda can be viewed online by 4:00 p.m. on April 25, 2016 at sfcjpa.org -- click on the “Meetings” tab near the top. Supporting documents related to the Agenda items listed above will be available at the same online location by 10:00 a.m. on April 27, 2016.

NEXT MEETING: Regular Board meeting, May 26, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., East Palo Alto City Council Chambers.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority

April 28, 2016 Regular Board Meeting

Agenda Item 3

March 24, 2016 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Pine called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. at the City of Palo Alto, City Council Chambers, Palo Alto, CA.

DRAFT

1) ROLL CALL

Members Present: Director Keith, City of Menlo Park
Director Pine, San Mateo County Flood Control District
Director Burt, City of Palo Alto

Alterantes present: Director Gauthier, City of East Palo Alto

Members Absent: Director Abrica, City of East Palo Alto
Director Kremen, Santa Clara Valley Water District

JPA Staff Present: Len Materman, Executive Director
Kevin Murray, Staff
Miyko Harris-Parker, Staff

Others Present: Jerry Hearn, Portola Valley resident; Dennis Parker, East Palo Alto resident; Joe Teresi, City of Palo Alto; Justin Murphy, City of Menlo Park; Ann Stillman, San Mateo County Flood Control District; Eileen McLaughlin, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge (CCCR)

2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Director Keith made a motion to approve the agenda. Director Burt seconded. Agenda approved 3-0. Director Abrica and Director Kremen not present.

3) APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES-February 25, 2016 Board Meeting

Director Keith made a motion to approve the February 25, 2016 Board meeting minutes. Director Burt seconded. Motion to approve the February 25, 2016 Board meeting minutes approved 3-0. Director Abrica and Director Kremen not present.

4) PUBLIC COMMENT

None

5) REGULAR BUSINESS

Review of storms thus far this year

Mr. Materman provided a brief review of the storms from this winter season, and what we learned from the new Flood Early Warning System.

Director Gauthier arrived at 4:15 pm.

S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project construction planning

Mr. Materman provided an update on planning for construction of the S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project, including the major upcoming milestones between now and June. Mr. Materman thanked Bill Springer, SCVWD, for hosting the well attended onsite meeting for prospective bidders.

Director Keith asked if there were areas where work could begin prior to June 15. Mr. Murray responded saying that there are areas that we anticipate can be worked on prior to June 15, and that the contractor will develop the final schedule of activities after the bid is awarded.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority

April 28, 2016 Regular Board Meeting

Agenda Item 3

March 24, 2016 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Bill Springer, SCVWD project manager for the SFCJPA's Bay-Highway 101 project, spoke briefly about the process that must be followed after a contract is awarded. Director Keith asked what is the mandated date to stop construction each year. Mr. Springer replied that the construction stop date within our permits is October 15.

Director Gauthier asked if there are any foreseeable problems resulting from the Public Storage property ownership change. Mr. Materman responded, explaining that we are in negotiation with the owner, Public Storage, for an easement along the lines of a letter of intent that Mr. Murray has been working on with the owner.

Authorize the Executive Director to execute Contract Amendment #6 with HDR, Inc. to provide support to the Santa Clara Valley Water District during the Bay-Highway 101 project bidding process.

Mr. Materman asked the Board for authorization to execute Contract Amendment #6 with HDR, Inc. so that HDR may provide support to the Santa Clara Valley Water District during the Bay-Highway 101 project bidding process. The amendment's not-to-exceed amount is \$58,736.

Director Burt made a motion to authorize the Executive Director to execute Contract Amendment #6 with HDR, Inc. to provide support to the Santa Clara Valley Water District during the Bay-Highway 101 project bidding process. Director Gauthier seconded. Motion to authorize the Executive Director to execute Contract Amendment #6 with HDR, Inc. to provide support to the Santa Clara Valley Water District during the Bay-Highway 101 project bidding process Approved 4-0. Director Kremen not present.

Authorize the Executive Director to sign an Actual Cost Contract with Pacific Gas & Electric that commits the SFCJPA to reimburse PG&E for the cost to modify an electrical tower to accommodate the S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project

Mr. Materman asked the Board for authorization to sign an Actual Cost Contract with Pacific Gas & Electric that commits the SFCJPA to reimburse PG&E for the cost to modify an electrical tower to accommodate the S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project. Mr. Materman noted the total cost of the electrical tower modification is \$1,407,000 minus \$150,00 that the SFCJPA has already paid to PG&E; leaving \$1,257,000 to be paid by the SFCJPA from grant funding.

Director Keith asked if there is a realistic number for the betterment expense. Scott Hart, PG&E, replied saying that the betterment discussion is more robust with the gas line project rather than the electrical tower project. Mr. Hart explained that raising the tower and placing it on a new foundation is required because of the SFCJPA project, and there is no betterment. Director Keith said it is not clear if PG&E would be using the same tower or if the existing tower would be replaced. She continued asking if within item nine in the contract it is anticipated that more money will need to be given to PG&E. Mr. Hart replied saying if something unforeseen happens, the estimated budget for item nine is intended to cover it.

Chairperson Pine asked about the anticipated timeline for the electrical project. Mr. Hart replied saying the project is estimated to take three months from the date the contract is signed.

Director Burt asked for clarification on how the lines in Palo Alto will be affected. Barry Shepherd, PG&E, noted that there are three lines running into Palo Alto, one from Cooley and two from Ravenswood substation. Mr. Shepherd explained that the Cooley line will not be touched and that PG&E will start with the first Ravenswood line, switch service to another line, then start on the second Ravenswood line after completion of line number one. Mr. Shepherd stated that there will always be two lines running into Palo Alto.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority

April 28, 2016 Regular Board Meeting

Agenda Item 3

March 24, 2016 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Director Keith made a motion to Authorize the Executive Director to sign an Actual Cost Contract with Pacific Gas & Electric that commits the SFCJPA to reimburse PG&E for the cost to modify an electrical tower to accommodate the S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project. Director Burt seconded. Motion to Authorize the Executive Director to sign an Actual Cost Contract with Pacific Gas & Electric that commits the SFCJPA to reimburse PG&E for the cost to modify an electrical tower to accommodate the S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project approved 4-0. Director Abrica and Director Kremen not present.

Approve a new General Counsel Services Agreement with Richards, Watson & Gershon

Mr. Materman presented a new General Counsel Services Agreement with Richards, Watson & Gershon for approval.

Director Keith made a motion to approve the General Counsel services agreement with Richards, Watson, Gershon. Director Gauthier seconded. Motion to approve the new General Counsel Services agreement with Richards, Watson & Gershon approved 4-0. Director Abrica and Director Kremen not present.

Chairperson Pine directed staff to schedule a special meeting of the Board on April 14, 2016 to discuss PG&E and project funding and construction planning issues.

Director Keith congratulated Mrs. Mulvey on her life time achievement award.

Director Keith asked about the handling of the homeless on the project sites and if the levees will be open. Mr. Murray replied saying that the local police would handle any issues with homeless and that the trails are expected to be open.

Dennis Parker, East Palo Alto resident, informed the Board that Michelle Daher is working on the homeless issue on behalf of the City of East Palo Alto as well as on a personal level.

Jim Wiley, Menlo Park resident, asked for an update on the East Palo Alto floodwall permit. Mr. Materman responded saying that an update had been given by East Palo Alto staff at the last Board meeting and is referenced in the minutes from that meeting.

6) ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Pine adjourned the meeting at 5:19 pm.

Minutes Prepared by Clerk of the Board: Miyko Harris-Parker.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
April 28, 2016 Regular Board Meeting
Agenda Item 3
April 14, 2016 Special Board Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Pine called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. at the City of Menlo Park, City Council Chambers, Menlo Park, CA.

DRAFT

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Director Pine, San Mateo County Flood Control District
Director Burt, City of Palo Alto
Director Kremen, Santa Clara Valley Water District
Diretor Abrica, City of East Palo Alto

Alternates Present: Lisa Gauthier, City of East Palo Alto (in audience)

Members Absent: Director Keith, City of Menlo Park

JPA Staff Present: Len Materman, Executive Director
Kevin Murray, Staff
Miyko Harris-Parker, Staff
Tess Byler, Staff

Others Present: Jerry Hearn, Portola Valley resident; Melanie Richardson, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Saied Hosseini, Santa Clara Valley Water Distrcit; Christian Roa, PG&E; Jose Quintero, PG&E; Eileen McLaughlin, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge (CCCR); Justin Murphy, City of Menlo Park; Matthew Krupp, City of Palo Alto; Ann Stillman, San Mateo County Flood Control District; Kamal Fallaha, City of East Palo Alto

REGULAR BUSINESS

S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project construction planning

Mr. Materman provided a schedule update and a breakdown of the revenues and expenses for the Bay-Highway 101 project construsction to date. Mr. Materman reported that as of April 14, 2016 the schedule antiapiptes that there will be a construction bid awarded by May 10, 2016 and that construction in the creek and with PG&E can begin in June 2016. Mr. Materman reported that as of April 14, 2016 the reveunes associated with the project total \$38,603,000 and anticipated project expenses total \$39,645,000 including \$3,021,000 in contingency funds, and he provided details on these total figures.

Chairperson Pine questioned why the HDR bidding support was not included in the budget originally. Mr. Materman noted that it was a much smaller amount two years ago and was not raised as an issue back then.

Director Burt asked what percentage of the new PG&E line distance is represented by our project needs and what percentage of the project cost is PG&E offering to pay for. Mr. Materman replied saying that the length of our project is about 45% of the entire length of PG&E's preferred project and that the latest reiteration of the budget and the actual cost contract have the SFCJPA paying 44.3% of the cost and PG&E paying 55.7% of the cost.

Director Burt noted that cost breakdown is roughly proportionate to the proportionality of the length it's attributable to and he asked for clarification on who requested the pipe diameter to go from 20 to 24 inches. Mr. Materman replied saying that the decision to change the diameter size was PG&E's. Director Burt commented that when we think of pipe diameter difference it's not the 20% increase in diameter that matters it's actually the approximately 45% increase in volume that is in that pipe and he questioned if PG&E has explained why they want the larger pipe.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
April 28, 2016 Regular Board Meeting
Agenda Item 3
April 14, 2016 Special Board Meeting Minutes

Scott Hart, PG&E Government Relations Representative, introduced Christian Roa, PG&E Senior Project Manager for gas pipelines, who explained that in general the 24-inch pipe is a more common size and PG&E has a big effort right now to increase their ability to inspect the pipeline. He continued that having the 24-inch pipe allows PG&E to send more tools easily through the pipeline. Director Burt asked if this process is part of the increase in inspection that PG&E is now doing throughout their system. Mr. Roa replied yes.

Director Burt asked for clarification if all of the existing pipe is the 1959 pipe and what PG&E would normally have as an amortization of their pipes. Mr. Roa replied saying yes, he believes that all of the existing pipeline was from 1959 and that the amortization of a PG&E pipe would depend on when a pipe was installed and what the use has been on the pipe. Director Burt asked if it is affected by the environment where the pipe exists. Mr. Roa replied saying yes. Director Burt commented that presumably a brine area is more corrosive than other situations. Mr. Roa replied saying yes. Director Burt asked if there is a depreciation schedule on the new pipe. Mr. Roa responded saying there is a depreciation schedule on the new pipe and on the old pipe included in the estimate. Director Burt asked how many years of depreciation are on the schedules. Mr. Roa said that he would have to check with their capital accounting. Director Burt commented that presumably the schedules would be several decades but not more than sixty years.

Director Burt asked for clarification on the difference in maintenance that would occur from the old pipe to the new pipe, questioning if it was currently in the channel. Mr. Roa responded saying that the pipe is in, but mostly outside of, the channel. Director Burt asked if there would be a difference between the maintenance of the old pipe and the new pipe. Mr. Roa responded saying there is not much difference.

Director Burt asked if the SFCJPA did not pursue this project and PG&E at some point has to replace this line that is now at least fifty-seven years old, would PG&E have to go through the same permitting process that the SCJPA has had to go through and is PG&E aware of how difficult that process has been. Mr. Roa replied saying yes, PG&E would have to go through the same permitting process and they are aware of how difficult the permitting process has been.

Director Burt commented that the proportional shared expenses is roughly related to the distance in the line, but PG&E is getting a pipe that is almost 50% greater in capacity, replacing a pipe that is fifty-seven years old, avoiding the future costs of having to go through permitting and the new pipe is going to be more accessible for maintenance – all significant betterments for PG&E that don't appear to be reflected in the shared cost proposal.

Director Burt would like to understand how the PG&E cost proposal reflects these betterments, because as we see the shortfall of our project is principally due to an increase in this particular line item. Mr. Roa, responded saying that the main betterment is the increase in diameter and the accessibility of the new pipe and that the additional scope that PG&E is installing that is above and beyond the minimal requirements of the creek widening project is all factored in. Director Burt responded asking what about the betterment of replacing a fifty-seven-year-old pipe with a new pipe. Mr. Roa replied saying that PG&E does have an integrity management schedule to prioritize replacements and to his knowledge this pipe was not set to be replaced within the next several years or so. Director Burt responded saying that he is willing to accept that but that does not mean PG&E is not getting a betterment; if you replace a fifty-seven-year-old pipe a new pipe, the fact that you were not going to replace it for another 15-20 years does not mean you are not increasing the value of that asset according to what proportion of its useful life has already occurred.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
April 28, 2016 Regular Board Meeting
Agenda Item 3
April 14, 2016 Special Board Meeting Minutes

Director Kremen concurred with Director Burt's comments noting that there are additional benefits for PG&E such as the line being moved away from the neighborhood and being able to use easier tools when conducting tests on the new line. Director Kremen questioned if the California PUC has standards for cost recovery, and he asked if it would be helpful for the SFCJPA to write a letter outlining the points made at this Board meeting. Mr. Hart stated that he would take back all of the comments and questions from the Board to his colleagues. Mr. Hart ensured the Board that PG&E is a willing partner with the SFCJPA in this project.

Director Abrica concurred with Director Burt's comments expressing his appreciation for Director Burt's analysis.

Chairperson Pine requested that PG&E take a hard look at the cost breakdown and the betterments. Chairperson Pine voiced his appreciation that PG&E is at the table and that the SFCJPA considers PG&E a partner as well. Mr. Materman expressed his agreement with Chairperson Pine's comments.

Director Burt left at 5:04 pm.

Director Kremen asked about the having to have a modified schedule. Mr. Materman responded explaining we are working towards having a signed contract with PG&E soon and that in order for the SCVWD to award contract on May 10 funding for this effort needs to be secure.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Pine adjourned the meeting at 5:11 pm.

Minutes Prepared by Clerk of the Board: Miyko Harris-Parker.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
April 28, 2016 Board Meeting
Agenda Item 5
Executive Director's Report

With the help of Kevin Murray, Miyko Harris-Parker, and Tess Byler, I am pleased to submit the following:

a. Approve the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget

At the February 25, 2016 Board meeting, we discussed the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget under development, and following that discussion, the Board Finance Committee met to discuss a specific budget document. At this Board meeting, I propose the attached budget that includes the following key items:

- No change to the current amount of \$152,000 contributed towards the SFCJPA Operating Budget by each of our five member agencies; thus the collective revenue from this source will remain at \$760,000 for the upcoming fiscal year.
- These member agency contributions, combined with a plan to access \$132,500 in grant administration funds, would result in an Operating Budget with a very small surplus. Barring major unforeseen circumstances, this level of member agency contribution and our currently available grant funding can sustain the agency for the upcoming 2016-17 fiscal year and for FY2017-18. Beginning in FY2018-19, the SFCJPA would have to increase revenue or run an operating deficit.
- The addition of the recently filled Project Manager position, removal of costs associated with the part-time grant finance administrator position, and increases to the salaries and CalPERS contribution rates of our Senior Project Manager and Finance and Administration Manager to bring their salaries and share of retirement costs more closely in line with positions at member agencies and at a level commensurate with their responsibilities. At the June 23 Board meeting, I intend to ask the Board to update the SFCJPA Salary Schedule to reflect salary adjustments approved within this budget.

With this level of financial and staff resources, and substantial assistance from Member Agency staff and our consultants, we intend to focus on the following key efforts during the next fiscal year:

- Launch construction for the Bay-Highway 101 project, including the major utilities and mitigation work under SFCJPA contracts and the construction of the levees and floodwalls managed by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD);
- Move forward with an EIR and design of a project upstream of Highway 101, in collaboration with the Corps of Engineers Feasibility Study;
- Move forward with the SAFER Bay project design and EIR of tidal flood protection for East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, and Palo Alto;
- Improve our collective preparations for winter flooding and our new Flood Early Warning System;
- Communicate with the public, elected officials and the media about all of these activities;
- Seek funding opportunities for SFCJPA projects and operations; and
- Effectively manage the administration, finances, and human resources of the agency.

Attached is the proposed Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget that I seek Board approval for so that we may send it to staff at our Member Agencies, who must incorporate our formal request for an annual contribution into their FY2016-17 budget proposals.

Proposed Board Action: Approve the Proposed Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget (attached).

b. S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project funding and construction planning

At Board meetings for the past few years we have discussed efforts to prepare for construction of a project to improve public safety and recreation, and increase marsh habitat, between the Bay and Highway 101. At this Board meeting, we will provide an update on our efforts on the following items in the two weeks since the last Board meeting on April 14.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
April 28, 2016 Board Meeting
Agenda Item 5
Executive Director's Report

Following up on an item that was discussed at the March 24 Board meeting, on April 26 the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors approved a resolution authorizing the signing of an easement agreement with Public Storage, and shortly thereafter Public Storage signed the agreement. This agreement provides for the new permanent easement to install and maintain the floodwall and adjacent maintenance road, and a temporary construction easement to modify utilities and install a new fence after the SFCJPA project is completed. Additionally, County staff are preparing a letter to be sent to all of the properties along the creek that possess an existing flood protection easement held by San Mateo County, informing the owners that the County intends to extend its rights to the Santa Clara Valley Water District to construct the project.

As discussed at the previous Board meeting, in early April a bird survey for the first time detected the presence of the endangered Ridgeway's Rail (formerly Clapper Rail) upstream of the Friendship Bridge. On April 20, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) determined that this information compels them to amend their Biological Opinion for the Corps of Engineers permit in order to allow the project to impact the Rail. Over the past two weeks, SFCJPA and SCVWD staff have worked together and with USFWS staff to minimize the impact of this finding and complete the Biological Opinion amendment as soon as possible. The result of this amendment, the draft of which was completed on April 26, will be to reduce the available time windows where work may occur within several hundred feet of where the Rail where detected. Combined with the constraints imposed by our permits relative to steelhead migration, this new restriction likely means that construction will extend to a third season, ending December 31, 2018. At the Board meeting we will discuss the impact of this finding and the steps we are taking to minimize that impact.

At the April 14 meeting, I also updated the Board on project revenues and expenses, including costs associated with relocating the PG&E gas pipeline, and Board members asked PG&E representatives about the benefits to the company (referred to as "betterment") from the portion of the pipeline work funded by the SFCJPA. Since then, I sent a letter to PG&E leadership signed by Directors Abrica and Burt that described the case for betterment credit and PG&E indicated that they would soon respond to the questions posed at the April 14 Board meeting and in the SFCJPA letter. At the Board meeting, we will discuss new information gathered before or during the meeting regarding project revenues and costs.

Submitted by:



Len Materman
Executive Director

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority Operating Budget

FY2015-16 Approved and Estimated Year-End, and FY2016-17 Proposed

		Approved FY15-16	Est. FY15-16 Year-End	Proposed FY16-17
REVENUES				
	Member Agency contributions (\$152,000 x 5)	760,000	760,000	760,000
	Grant funding administration: S.F. Bay-Hwy. 101 project	35,000	12,000	70,000
	Grant funding administration: SAFER Bay project	37,500	6,000	37,500
	Upstream of Highway 101 EIR legal	20,000	0	15,000
	Flood Control 2.0 regional project	25,000	15,000	10,000
	Interest	1,000	242	400
	Total Revenues	\$878,500	\$793,242	\$892,900
EXPENSES				
Acct.	Description			
Personnel				
1	Executive Director Salary	138,000	169,197*	160,000
2	E.D. Transportation Allowance	5,000	5,000	5,000
3	Finance & Administration Manager (FAM) Salary	80,250	84,880*	80,250
4	Senior Project Manager (SPM) Salary	92,900	98,239*	92,900
5	Project Manager Salary	85,000	22,500	90,000
6	Salaries Adjustments	0	0	22,683**
7	COLA	0	0	0
8	Employee Benefits	200,000	143,000	200,000
9	Membership Dues	4,700	4,700	4,900
10	Payroll Administration/Fees	2,500	2,500	2,900
11	Employer Taxes	32,000	28,000	40,000
	Subtotal Personnel	640,350	558,016	698,633
Contract Services				
12	Legal Counsel	45,000	40,000	44,000
13	Auditor	15,000	39,000	15,000
14	Grant Finance Administrator: Bay-Hwy. 101 project	29,000	12,000	0
15	Grant Finance Administrator:SAFER Bay project	14,000	6,000	0
16	Project Consultants	40,000	40,000	40,000
	Subtotal Contract Services	143,000	137,000	99,000
Administrative				
17	Computers/Software	3,000	3,000	3,000
18	Meeting Supplies	1,200	1,000	1,000
19	Travel/Training	3,500	2,800	3,200
20	Office Supplies	1,200	1,200	1,200
21	Telecommunication	2,000	2,300	2,300
22	Postage	300	200	200
23	Printing/Design	400	350	350
24	Website	3,000	2,300	2,300
25	Liability Insurance	5,000	5,724	5,800
26	Office Lease	32,000	29,500	33,000
27	Utilities	6,500	6,500	6,500
28	Office furniture/maintenance	500	1,000	1,000
	Subtotal Administrative	58,600	55,874	59,850
General Contingency				
29	General Contingency	35,000	35,000	35,000
	Total Expenses	\$876,950	\$785,890	\$892,483

* Includes a one-time per FY cash out of accrued vacation leave.

** Increase to SPM and FAM salary and CalPERS contributions to bring these more in line with JPA Member Agencies and to a level commensurate with their responsibilities.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
Proposed Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget

REVENUES

Member Agency contributions (\$152,000 x 5)	760,000
Grant funding administration: S.F. Bay-Hwy. 101 project	70,000
Grant funding administration: SAFER Bay project	37,500
Upstream of Highway 101 EIR legal	15,000
Flood Control 2.0 regional project	10,000
Interest	400
Total Revenues	\$892,900

EXPENSES

Acct. Description	Amount
Personnel	
1 Executive Director Salary	160,000
2 Executive Director Transportation Allowance	5,000
3 Finance & Administration Manager Salary	90,763
4 Senior Project Manager Salary	105,070
5 Project Manager Salary	90,000
6 Salaries Adjustments	0
7 COLA	0
8 Employee Benefits	200,000
9 Membership Dues	4,900
10 Payroll Administration/Fees	2,900
11 Employer Taxes	40,000
Subtotal Personnel	698,633
Contract Services	
12 Legal Counsel	44,000
13 Auditor	15,000
14 Grant Finance Administrator: Bay-Hwy. 101 project	0
15 Grant Finance Administrator:SAFER Bay project	0
16 Project Consultants	40,000
Subtotal Contract Services	99,000
Administrative	
17 Computers/Software/Support	3,000
18 Meeting Supplies	1,000
19 Travel/Training	3,200
20 Office Supplies	1,200
21 Telecommunication	2,300
22 Postage	200
23 Printing/Design	350
24 Website	2,300
25 Liability Insurance	5,800
26 Office Lease	33,000
27 Utilities	6,500
28 Office furniture/maintenance	1,000
Subtotal Administrative	59,850
General Contingency	
29 General Contingency	35,000
Total Expenses	\$892,483