

**MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

FINANCE COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Claude Hoover, Chair
Ken Ekelund

David Hart
John Huerta

TIME: 10:00 a.m.
DATE: Friday, March 11, 2016
PLACE: Monterey County Water Resources Agency
893 Blanco Circle
Salinas, CA 93901

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Public Comment**
(Limited to three (3) minutes per speaker on matters within the jurisdiction of the Agency not listed on this agenda. The public will have the opportunity to ask questions and make statements on agenda items as the Committee considers them.)
3. **Consider approving the Minutes of the Finance Committee meeting on February 19, 2016.**
The Committee will consider approval of the Minutes of the above-mentioned meeting (Page 3).
4. **Consider receiving the February 2016 Financials for the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project/Salinas Valley Reclamation Project, and the Salinas River Diversion Facility.**
Mark Foxworthy, Associate Water Resources Engineer, will review the Financials for the CSIP/SVRP/SRDF (Page 19).
5. **Consider receiving the February 2016 Financials for all Agency Funds.**
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, will review the October 2015 Financials for all Agency Funds (Page 25).
6. **Consider approving Purchase Orders/Contracts/Credit Card Purchases in excess of \$500.**
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, will review purchase orders/contracts/credit card purchases in excess of \$500 (Page 47).
7. **Consider receiving the February 2016 Consultants Report**
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, will review the report (Page 49).

8. **Consider receiving an update on the FY 2016-17 DRAFT Budget and Inter-Lake Tunnel and Spillway Modification Costs.**
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, will review the update (Page 53).
9. **Set next meeting date and discuss future agenda items.**
The Committee will discuss and determine details for its next meeting.
10. **Adjournment**

**MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FINANCE COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Claude Hoover (Chair)
David Hart

Ken Ekelund
John Huerta

TIME: 10:00 a.m.
DATE: Friday, February 19, 2016
**PLACE: Monterey County Water Resources Agency
893 Blanco Circle
Salinas, CA 93901**

MINUTES

1. **Call Meeting to Order @ 10:00 a.m. by Committee Chair, Claude Hoover**
Members Present: Claude Hoover, David Hart, Ken Ekelund
John Huerta arrived at 10:05 a.m.
Members Absent: None

A quorum was established.

2. **Public Comment: None**
3. **Approve the Minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting held on January 15, 2016.**

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Hart and Ekelund approved the Minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on January 15, 2016.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

4. **Consider receiving the January 2016 Financials for the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project/Salinas Valley Reclamation Project, and the Salinas River Diversion Facility.**
Mark Foxworthy, Associate Water Resources Engineer, reviewed the Financials for the CSIP/SVRP/SRDF.

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Ekelund and Huerta, received the January 2016 Financials for the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project/Salinas Valley Reclamation Project, and the Salinas River Diversion Facility.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

5. Consider receiving the November 2015 Financials for all Agency Funds.
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, presented this item for consideration.

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Huerta and Hart, received the January 2016 Financials for all Agency Funds.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

6. Consider approving Purchase Orders/Contracts/Credit Card Purchases in excess of \$500.
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, presented this item for consideration.

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Ekelund and Huerta, approved the Purchase Orders/Credit Card Purchases in excess of \$500.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

7. Consider receiving the July 2015 through December 2015 Board of Directors Fees and Mileage report.
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, provided information regarding this item.

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Hart and Huerta, received the report.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

8. Consider receiving and recommending that the full Board of Directors accept the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA) Second Quarter Financial Status report through December 31, 2015.
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, provided information regarding this item.

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Ekelund and Huerta, received the report and recommended that the full Board of Directors accept the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA) Second Quarter Financial Status report through December 31, 2015.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

9. Consider receiving the report and recommending that the full Board of Directors recommend that the Monterey County Water Resources Agency Board of Supervisors approve a Professional Services Agreement with Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc. in the amount of \$110,360 to provide financial consulting to conduct a cost of service analysis and prepare a five-year financial plan in conjunction with a review of the Agency's current assessments and water rate structure; and, authorize the General Manager to execute the Agreement.
Cathy Paladini, Finance Manager, provided information regarding this item.

A letter from the Law Offices of Patrick J. Maloney to Claude Hoover, Chair of the Board of Directors, was introduced into the Minutes at this time.

Public Comment: Tom Virsik, John Baillie

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Ekelund and Hart, received the report and recommended that the full Board of Directors recommend that the Monterey County Water Resources Agency Board of Supervisors approve a Professional Services Agreement with Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc. in the amount of \$110,360 to provide financial consulting to conduct a cost of service analysis and prepare a five-year financial plan in conjunction with a review of the Agency's current assessments and water rate structure; and, authorize the General Manager to execute the Agreement.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

10. Consider receiving the report and recommending that the full Board of Directors approve the purchase of a Ford F250 pickup in accordance with the approved Light Vehicle Replacement Plan for FY 2015-16 at a cost of \$30,205; and, authorize the General Manager to execute the Agreement.

Mark Foxworthy, Associate Water Resources Engineer, provided information regarding this item.

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Ekelund and Hart, received the report and recommended that the full Board of Directors approve the purchase of a Ford F250 pickup in accordance with the approved Light Vehicle Replacement Plan for FY 2015-16 at a cost of \$30,205; and, authorize the General Manager to execute the Agreement.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

11. Consider receiving the report on the Salinas River Lagoon, including necessary tasks to pursue permits for sandbar management activities for 2016-2021; and, consider providing direction regarding funding those activities to Staff.

Elizabeth Krafft, Senior Water Resources Hydrologist, provided information regarding this item.

Committee Action:

Upon Motion and Second by Directors Ekelund and Hart, received the report on the Salinas River Lagoon including necessary tasks to pursue permits for sandbar management activities for 2016-2021.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously by those members present.

12. Set next meeting date and discuss future agenda items.

The next meeting will be held on March 11, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

13. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Attachment: Letter dated February 18, 2016 from the Law Office of Patrick J. Maloney to Claude Hoover, Chair of the Board of Directors re February 19, 2016 Finance Committee, Agenda Item 9 Raftelis Financial Consultant, Inc. (RFC) proposal re rate study

Submitted by: Alice Henault

Approved on:

LAW OFFICES OF
PATRICK J. MALONEY

2425 WEBB AVENUE, SUITE 100
ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA 94501-2922

PATRICK J. "MIKE" MALONEY

(510) 521-4575
FAX (510) 521-4623
e-mail: PJMLAW@pacbell.net

THOMAS S. VIRSIK

Via email ChamblissWS@co.monterey.ca.us and U.S. Mail
18 February 2016

Claude Hoover, Chair Board of Directors
c/o Winifred Chambliss, Clerk of the Board
Monterey County Water Resources Agency
893 Blanco Circle
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: February 19, 2016 Finance Committee, Agenda Item 9
Raftelis Financial Consultant, Inc. (RFC) proposal re rate study

Chair Hoover:

These comments are made on behalf of the Orradres, Delicato Family Vineyards, and similarly situated southern (Upper Valley and Forebay) landowners. The RFP as presently structured suffers from several flaws or omissions, identified below.

The so-called Orradre settlement is improperly omitted

Neither the staff memo, the RFP, the proposal, nor the addendum reflect that either the Agency or the consultant will consider the so-called Orradre settlement when analyzing either (1) past benefits or (2) potential future rates based on anticipated future benefits. Orradre and others have brought to the Agency's specific attention the settlement since at least October 2015.

As stated in our recent letter in connection with the on-going SGMA process, the 2003 and 2004¹ validation judgments were the product of substantial long-term negotiations and compromises looking both backwards and to the future.

In addition to the hydrological reality, there is also a separate legal reality for the Upper Valley and Forebay stemming from a broad validation judgment from 2003 and 2004. This judgment reflects a settlement reached after over a decade of hard-fought litigation that, at its core, turned the traditional Gloria Road line of

¹ There is but one agreement, but there were two hearings some months apart and two Court approvals of the stipulated judgments in the half-dozen validation lawsuits then outstanding. The Monterey County Superior Court Case numbers are: 115777, 115431, M55891, M46013 (in 2004), M45589 and one appeal. See also the November 11, 2015 letter from Thomas Virsik to Consortium Members on SGMA Facilitation and Comprehensive Adjudication Act (AB1390 and SB226).

division between the southern and northern parts of the Monterey County portion of the Salinas Valley into a legal boundary. . . . The settlement process established that the reservoirs had little, if any, impact on water availability in the southern sub basins. The settlement places limits on the southern valley's relationship to the seawater intrusion issues at the coast, which was the result of substantial settlement efforts by Hon. Richard Silver.

As a validation judgment, approved by a court in the context of multiple validation actions that over the course of some years obtained jurisdiction over all agricultural lands in the Monterey County part of the Salinas Valley, no single party or even collection of parties has the legal ability to undo or modify the settlement. Unlike a lawsuit between landowners and a government agency that those specific parties can control, waive the benefits of, or modify via consensus, a validation judgment binds the relevant "world" forever (unless a court is asked to make changes, but only through a similar comprehensive process bereft of objection by an affected party).

February 5, 2016 letter from Patrick Maloney to Gina Bartlett, Senior Mediator at CBI on Monterey County Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) process. The settlement is akin to a partial adjudication – of various purposes and responsibility for long-term water projects rather than individual water use -- which any analysis of benefits past or future must take into account. The validation judgments protect to a notable degree lands south of Gloria Road from paying towards further projects for addressing seawater intrusion, aka supplying alternate water to the northern areas. As the RFP addendum put it: "As we move forward with *projects that expand the CSIP and SVWP*, our constituents would like an analysis performed on the existing Zones before moving forward with *future projects that may require a Proposition 218* process that may overlap the existing Zones 2C, 2B 2Y and 2Z." Agenda packet at 74 (emphasis added).

New mandatory water reporting is not addressed

Another factor in the rate study, unrelated to the settlement, is that under recent law, all water diverters in excess of 10 AF are required to publically report their water use. The Bill that imposes this new requirement is SB 88. While the timing of the diverters subject to specific deadlines and details of reporting methodology varies, there is no room left to argue that agriculture in the Salinas Valley is entitled to keep its water use private. Notably, certain interests north and south have publically reported their water use for years – now the rest must catch up.

Because of the major changes in State law, while the "looking to the past" analysis may not be particularly affected, any analysis of future benefits and projects will be based on more detailed and public arrays of data than in the past. In addition, a portion of the Agency's responsibilities may be decreased if the State reporting will obviate the need for some parts of the local water use reporting.

SGMA reality not addressed

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act is nowhere to be found in any discussion of the “forward looking” analysis. While no one can predict with certainty what role(s) and duties the Agency may play in the end, the fair assumption is that the Agency will play a major role in applying SGMA locally. The Agency’s entire purpose and role may be redefined before the SGMA process is over, not to mention the relevant interests (by geography or otherwise) that will be paying for SGMA management and tasks. Will the results of a RFC “looking forward” study remain applicable once the (formation part of the) SGMA process concludes?

Separate from any change to the Agency’s role under SGMA, a Groundwater Plan may contemplate different reservoir operations and potentially a change to existing or planned projects, resulting in a different set of benefits flowing to potentially different sets of interest. Will the analysis allow for such flexibility in this uncertain state of things?

Environmental reality may not be sufficiently addressed

The RFP and associated documents may not sufficiently reflect project operation for environmental purposes. The broad impact of the federal National Marine Fisheries (NMFS) on California’s water law is described in the recent Light case. Light v. SWRCB (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 1463, 1474, 1496-97 (NMFS urged SWRCB to enact regulation). For example, NMFS plays a key role in managing the local reservoirs for fish purposes under the Biological Opinion for the SVWP. Those parameters may affect Agency hydroelectric revenue. If the reservoirs must be operated in a certain fashion for fish purposes, then the benefits of any reservoir project may likewise change. Will the analysis take into consideration both for (1) revenue and (2) benefits the likely environmental restrictions on operations?

Conclusion

An honest and comprehensive analysis of the Agency’s likely fiscal needs, opportunities, and limitations may be useful, but such an inquiry needs to take into account far more – past and anticipated – than the current proposal appears to contemplate.

Very truly yours,

Thomas S. Virsik

Thomas S. Virsik

- c. Dave Chardavoine, General Manager via email ChardavoineDE@co.monterey.ca.us
Jesse Avila, Deputy General Counsel via email AvilaJJ@co.monterey.ca.us

Encl.

February 5, 2016 letter from Patrick Maloney to Gina Bartlett, Senior Mediator at CBI on Monterey County Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) process (w/o attachments)

November 11, 2015 letter from Thomas Virsik to Consortium Member on SGMA facilitation and Comprehensive Adjudication act (AB1390 and SB226) (w/o attachments)

LAW OFFICES OF
PATRICK J. MALONEY

2425 WEBB AVENUE, SUITE 100
ALAMEDA ISLAND, CALIFORNIA 94501-2922

PATRICK J. "MIKE" MALONEY

(510) 521-4575
FAX (510) 521-4623
e-mail: PJMLAW@pacbell.net

THOMAS S. VIRSIK

Via email gina@cbuilding.org
February 5, 2016

Gina Bartlett
Senior Mediator
Consensus Building Institute

Re: Monterey County Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) process

Dear Ms. Bartlett:

This letter is in response to your request for comments on clarifications and omissions in the materials provided on January 21, 2016 (and later posted). The document referenced below is the DRAFT Salinas Valley Groundwater Stakeholder Issue Assessment report dated January 18, 2016. Page references will be to that document unless otherwise indicated. The common acronym "SGMA" is used, which includes the statutes enacted through the past legislative session, e.g., the Comprehensive Adjudication Act. Other common SGMA acronyms are also used. These comments follow up on earlier comments contained in a November 11, 2105 letter sent to the so-called "consortium," which initiated the SGMA facilitation process.

Groundwater, surface water, or underflow? (page 6)

The water diverted in the Upper Valley portion of the Salinas Valley may not be groundwater at all, and thus not necessarily within the ambit of SGMA (recognizing that SGMA contemplates the inclusion of surface waters under certain circumstances where groundwater planning is not possible in their absence). In litigation presently occurring among various private landowners and a collection of water agencies in San Luis Obispo County, some of those water entities seek a court ruling about certain aspects of the Atascadero sub basin. The argument and analysis proffered advances a view that the waters of the Upper Valley are "underflow" of the Salinas River, not groundwater. Steinbeck Vineyards #1, LLC, et al. v County of San Luis Obispo, et al., Phase 2 Trial Brief of Atascadero Mutual Water Company and Templeton Community Services District, Santa Clara County Case No. 1-14-CV-265039 consolidated with Case No. 1-14-CV-269212 (the Steinbeck lawsuit was transferred to Santa Clara County from San Luis Obispo County). The hydrogeology of the Forebay is similar to that of the Upper Valley, i.e., shallow wells drawing underflow.

The attorneys involved in the Atascadero sub basin controversy (all sides) are well known and reputable. While a judgment in the Steinbeck lawsuit may not be binding on landowners in

Monterey County, the analyses and factual predicates of the Atascadero sub basin controversy suggest that the Upper Valley (and presumably the Forebay) may require separate hydrogeological analysis and possibly a GSP that conforms to its different water management reality. Accordingly, a single GSA or a GSA that does not recognize the hydrological differences between the southern and northern ends of the Monterey County portion of the Salinas Valley may not be feasible.

Not a tabula rasa – consensus ineffective to change certain default realities (pages 5 and 10)

In addition to the hydrological reality, there is also a separate legal reality for the Upper Valley and Forebay stemming from a broad validation judgment from 2003 and 2004. This judgment reflects a settlement reached after over a decade of hard-fought litigation that, at its core, turned the traditional Gloria Road line of division between the southern and northern parts of the Monterey County portion of the Salinas Valley into a legal boundary. The south-of-Gloria Road sub basins per Bulletin 118 are not “critically overdrafted.” The settlement process established that the reservoirs had little, if any, impact on water availability in the southern sub basins. The settlement places limits on the southern valley’s relationship to the seawater intrusion issues at the coast, which was the result of substantial settlement efforts by Hon. Richard Silver.

As a validation judgment, approved by a court in the context of multiple validation actions that over the course of some years obtained jurisdiction over all agricultural lands in the Monterey County part of the Salinas Valley, no single party or even collection of parties has the legal ability to undo or modify the settlement. Unlike a lawsuit between landowners and a government agency that those specific parties can control, waive the benefits of, or modify via consensus, a validation judgment binds the relevant “world” forever (unless a court is asked to make changes, but only through a similar comprehensive process bereft of objection by an affected party). The recent SGMA additions (the Comprehensive Adjudication Act) closely track the broad scope and procedural posture of the lawsuits that led to the settlement binding the Valley’s agricultural lands. See November 11, 2105 letter to the Consortium. It would be counter-productive to pursue a procedure that would undermine the efforts made in response to Judge Silver’s process.

Bluntly stated, no “consensus” can change any part of the settlement and judgment(s). Negotiation and consensus within the existing stricture of the settlement are feasible, but any path that ignores or seeks to change the settlement is counterproductive from the outset. A process under the Comprehensive Adjudication Act is the only SGMA path to change the settlement, which has its own risks and advantages.

Data disclosure necessary both as policy and now as a matter of law (page 5)

Transparency and hiding water use cannot coexist. The Monterey County Water Resources Agency collects a great deal of water use data by ordinance, which it makes available in summary form in its annual reports. Certain landowners and farmers (both north and south) have filed statements of water diversion with the State for years, which makes those interests’ individual water data already public. Recently, SB 88 was enacted, which will soon require nearly all diversions – surface water and ground if it is in lieu of surface – to be reported

publically. See December 14, 2015 comment letter from Thomas Virsik to Felicia Marcus, SWRCB Chair on the Emergency Regulation for Measuring and Reporting the Diversion of Water. Policy and legal arguments about a “right” to hide how a public resource is used can no longer be taken seriously and any recalcitrance may justifiably be viewed as an absence of good faith.

Full-scale disclosure is not only necessary, it is beneficial to the process and outcome. Real world data will assist in model calibration, for example. The more and better the data, the more likely the technical studies will fit the ground reality. More, rather than less, data should be collected and verified publically so that all parties can better understand how basin water levels, reservoir operations, environmental values, and so on, are affected under various circumstances. Given that the purpose of SGMA is to plan for multiple decades, the stakeholders need reliable engineering and modeling, which reliability can only increase with greater and more detailed real-world data, i.e., individualized water data.

Part of suggested approach may be unlawfully conflicted (page 9)

The present suggested DRAFT approach appears to ignore the conflict of interest laws such as Government Code section 1090. (In contrast, the Fair Political Practices Act is more concerned with disclosure rather than the prohibition of conflicts. Section 1090 allows the public to “invalidate” results achieved where conflict is legally present and a violation of section 1090 may be subject to criminal liability, not just fines or corrective action.)

In the public presentation at the January 21, 2016 workshop, the facilitator discussed the work that will be required by the members of the committees. The danger is that the work of “committee members” may creep towards that of an advisory committee or similar and thereby qualify such citizen member as a “public official” for purposes of conflict analysis. If those standards apply, the test is for conflict is liberal.

“[W]here public officials on behalf of a public entity participate in making a contract with a second entity for which they work, the scenario poses at least the risk that the official will be compromised by serving ‘two masters.’ ” (Lexin, supra, 47 Cal.4th at p. 1075, 103 Cal.Rptr.3d 767, 222 P.3d 214.) Because “the making of a contract ‘[encompasses] the planning, preliminary discussion [and] compromises ... that le[a]d up to the formal making of [a] contract,’ ” (Quantification Settlement Agreement Cases, supra, 201 Cal.App.4th at p. 819, 134 Cal.Rptr.3d 274 , quoting Honig, supra, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 315, 55 Cal.Rptr.2d 555)

Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment v. Abercrombie (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 300, 311. Unlike the Santa Clarita case, there is no exemption in SGMA to section 1090 to protect these committee members from potential liability.

The best path to avoid those dangers is to prophylactically treat committees as subject to section 1090 and the Political Reform Act at the outset and require full disclosures. In addition, keeping

the committees open and public so that stakeholders can attend, provide input, analysis, advocacy and suggestion as a stakeholder rather than as a “member” of anything allows a fuller and more transparent process.

Federal agencies stakeholders are seemingly absent (page 6)

It does not appear that the “fish” regulators or other federal agencies were included among the stakeholders, so far. Specifically, NMFS plays a key role in managing the local reservoirs for fish purposes, which reservoir management must be a major focus of any GSP. While NMFS is not entitled to any special “veto” of any GSP selection, its “buy in” of the nature or identity of the GSA would be useful, if not highly desired. The impact of NMFS on California’s water law is described in the recent Light case. Light v. SWRCB (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 1463, 1474, 1496-97 (NMFS urged SWRCB to enact regulation).

USGS and BOR are actively involved in examining the modeling efforts as they relate to water issues in Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties, and with respect to SGMA. The description of its plan at a recent public meeting is attached. See Salinas River Groundwater Basin Investigation and Model Development – Stakeholder Meeting Agenda December 16, 2015 and the Salinas and Carmel River Carmel Basins Study Proposal (April 2015, Bureau of Reclamation). This USGS and other modeling work has to be incorporated into any planning for a GSP.

We were informed that the mediators had requested input from the federal agencies but had not received cooperation. Until there is cooperation and involvement by those key players, any work towards a GSP – such as choosing one or more GSA’s – will be of questionable value.

Water Resources Agency must be given proper role (page 3)

The Monterey County Water Resources Agency appears to have been placed in a diminishing role, whether by happenstance or design. While the WRA may not be ideal as the sole entity comprising a or the GSA, it should be allowed a major role and responsibility. The rationale is simple: the WRA includes capable engineers and others with hydrologic and hydrogeological training and substantial local experience. That knowledge and experience should be used and respected, in addition to whatever other consultants or professionals may be employed by stakeholders.

SGMA boundary request is a late-addition unknown variable

It appears that the WRA will be addressing several potential boundary requests per the latest postings on its website (a BMP subcommittee meeting set for February 10, 2016 includes an agenda item on a SGMA boundary adjustment request for the Paso Robles basin, among others). The nature of the contemplated adjustment to the Paso Robles basin is not stated, but whatever its goal, it is not a product of the current mediated or consensus process. Accordingly, one can only speculate whether any adjustment will honor or undermine the operations of the reservoirs, the settlement agreement noted above, and/or the overall management of water in the (Monterey County portion of the) Salinas Valley.

Conclusion

Our clients hope that the mediation process can work and work well, as quickly as possible. But efforts on a process that is unlikely to result in a quality long-term outcome may be better spent on other avenues towards a GSP.

Sincerely,

/s/ Patrick J. Maloney

Patrick J. Maloney

c.

Bennett Brooks, (bbrooks@cbuilding.org)

Simon Salinas, Chair Monterey County Board of Supervisors

David Chardavoyne, General Manager MCWRA (ChardavoyneDE@co.monterey.ca.us)

Norm Groot, Executive Director Monterey County Farm Bureau (norm@montereycfb.com)

Nancy Isakson, Govt Affairs Consultant Salinas Valley Water Coalition (nisakson@mbay.net)

Ray E. Corpuz, Jr., City Manager City of Salinas

Grower-Shipper Association (darlene@growershipper.com)

Les Girard, Monterey County Counsel (girardlj@co.monterey.ca.us)

Enclosures.

Settlement and Release Agreement dated February 18, 2013

Steinbeck Vineyards #1, LLC, et al. v County of San Luis Obispo, et al., Phase 2 Trial Brief of Atascadero Mutual Water Company and Templeton Community Services District, Santa Clara County Case No. 1-14-CV-265039 consolidated with Case No. 1-14-CV-269212

November 11, 2015 letter from Thomas Virsik to Consortium Member on SGMA facilitation and Comprehensive Adjudication act (AB1390 and SB226)

December 14, 2015 comment letter from Thomas Virsik to Felicia Marcus, SWRCB Chair on the Emergency Regulation for Measuring and Reporting the Diversion of Water

Salinas River Groundwater Basin Investigation and Model Development – Stakeholder Meeting Agenda December 16, 2015

Salinas and Carmel River Carmel Basins Study Proposal, April 2015, Bureau of Reclamation

LAW OFFICES OF
PATRICK J. MALONEY

2425 WEBB AVENUE, SUITE 100
ALAMEDA ISLAND, CALIFORNIA 94501-2922

PATRICK J. "MIKE" MALONEY

(510) 521-4575
FAX (510) 521-4623
e-mail: PJMLAW@pacbell.net

THOMAS S. VIRSIK

November 11, 2015

Simon Salinas, Chair
Monterey County Board of Supervisors
168 W. Alisal, 3rd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

David Chardavoyne, General Manager
Monterey County Water Resources Agency
893 Blanco Circle, Board Room
Salinas, CA 93901

Norm Groot, Executive Director
Monterey County Farm Bureau
1140 Abbott Street, Suite C
Salinas, CA 93901

Nancy Isakson, Government Affairs Consultant
Salinas Valley Water Coalition
P.O. Drawer 2670
Greenfield, CA 93927

Ray E. Corpuz, Jr., City Manager
City of Salinas
200 Lincoln Avenue
Salinas, CA 93901

Grower-Shipper Association
512 Pajaro Street
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: SGMA facilitation and Comprehensive Adjudication act (AB1390 and SB226)

Dear Consortium members:

This letter is directed to the so-called Consortium that selected a facilitator for crafting an appropriate Groundwater Sustainability Agency or GSA under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). We are aware that the Consensus Building Institute (CBI) was chosen and as our comments of October 5, 2015 to the Board of Supervisors stated, no objection is made to the selection. While this letter specifically concerns Salinas Valley water issues, the interaction between the voluntary and newly enacted judicial forms of SGMA is of potential statewide importance and for that reason copies have been sent to the responsible state agencies as reflected below.

Our purpose is to steer the facilitation process towards one or more outcomes that take into account the newly enacted above SGMA statutes, in light of (at least) two factors affecting long-term groundwater management in the Salinas Valley: (1) a certain settlement agreement

addressing especially southern Valley lands and (2) the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin partially within Monterey County.

The Comprehensive Adjudication Act

In October the Governor signed the Comprehensive Adjudication act. Those bills (now statutes) are noted above. Instead of summarizing those provisions ourselves, we have enclosed an entry from the “Official blog of the State of California’s Sustainable Groundwater Management Act website.” (Ms. Bartlett of CBI posted to that same blog a month or two ago.) The Monterey Herald recently published an article that noted the bills’ enactment, along with comments by several Consortium members.

As the enclosed State explanation reflects, the new adjudication¹ statutes are in not designed to thwart, slow down, or undermine SGMA. In fact, the Comprehensive Adjudication statutes are supposed to work with and either create an equivalent or supplement to the ultimate SGMA plans. With the new statutes, an adjudication procedure may become a viable option for long-term water management in the Salinas Valley consistent with SGMA. In some respects, adjudication may have advantages over a facilitated process, e.g., adjudication requires early and comprehensive factual disclosures while voluntary facilitation does not and a judgment may have finer “resolution” of water entitlements (e.g., up to a parcel by parcel basis) than a SGMA plan based on sub-basin boundaries. Adjudication is no longer expected to be a multi-decades process. As for public agency (civic, county, or otherwise) involvement, both paths provide for participation.

Monterey County (through its water resources agency or WRA) is in a unique and advantageous position should adjudication arise. Before the Salinas Valley Water Project and its larger financing Zone was approved in a Proposition 218 election, the WRA and many stakeholders cooperated in a complex study and negotiation process that centered on so-called “economic study units” or ESU’s. While the analysis did not cover the entire groundwater basin, it reached all of what became Zone 2C, and could be expanded to cover the rest of the basin. The detailed analysis by ESU’s would assist the WRA in its role in an adjudication, which generally results in a finer water entitlement or water budget than a sub-basin approach. Given the 50-year outlook SGMA requires, a comprehensive understanding of water entitlements (legal, physical, historical, etc.) for all acres through an ESU matrix can aid a public agency considering if and which new projects may solve basin imbalances before it commits to a project.

Comprehensive Adjudication as Competition to Facilitation

An obvious challenge for facilitating a GSA formation process is reaching a result that matches or exceeds what may be seen as the strengths of the competing adjudication process (e.g., a “finer” outcome up to an acre-by-acre determination, factual disclosures at the outset, and more delineated rights and obligations for landowners, public agencies, and public interests when balancing the basin). There is a genuine danger that the facilitation process may proceed for months and make significant progress, yet come to naught should any interest avail itself of the

¹ While legally precise, the term “adjudication” may be causing confusion and concern, given its history. Perhaps a more neutral term – like “judicially supervised SGMA alternative” -- would have been better.

new statutes². There is no “drop dead” statutory deadline for filing a Comprehensive Adjudication, so a party may commence the process at nearly any point in time, e.g., even after interests both public and private have invested substantial time and money in GSA facilitation. Thus, the GSA facilitation process should work towards a structure for groundwater management that includes the strongest aspects of the adjudication option, so that if an interest concludes genuine benefit lies in the adjudication process, the substantial investments (knowledge, work-products, disclosures, etc.) in the facilitation process will be available for informing the adjudication.

Other factors that militate strongly in favor of immediately grappling in the facilitation process with the strengths found in the adjudication path include the hydrological, politically, and legal realities of the Paso Robles basin. Hydrologically, it is connected to the Salinas River watershed. Politically, it partially lies within southern Monterey County. Legally, certain San Luis Obispo County landowners in that basin have already commenced a “quiet title” adjudication (known as the Steinbeck action) of their claimed water rights ahead of the SGMA deadlines.

As our comments around SGMA to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (its staff, Directors, Supervisors) have emphasized, our focus has been and remains on the overall solutions and long-term outlook. To that end, decades before SGMA, our office advocated for what could today be called a GSP. In 2003 our office succeeded in obtaining a settlement with the WRA on behalf of a number of major southern Salinas Valley interests (e.g., Orradre, Delicato Family Vineyards, Margaret Duflock and others, which interests include Monterey County lands arguably within the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin) arising out of a suite of litigation that was procedurally as close³ to the current Comprehensive Adjudication statutes as possible at that time, i.e., using the validation statutes with specific notice provided to all discoverable water users. Several coalitions, associations, and agricultural interests chose to participate in the litigations to varying degrees (including through the judicial approval of the settlement agreement). The compromises in the settlement agreement do not include lump-sum payments of money nor is all benefit for only specific client interests. Rather, they address a series of basin management issues around existing and new projects, limits on financial contributions from southern Valley lands, and water entitlements. Like SGMA and the present Comprehensive Adjudication statutes, the judicially accepted settlement agreement is binding on all interests and has no “expiration” date. The settlement agreement is – in current terminology – the rudiments of a GSP as to certain basin management facets.

² While the new statutes allow a court to stay an adjudication to allow parties to develop technical information and studies or adopt a plan that resolves the issues in the adjudication, the statutes provide no authority for a stay simply to pursue further GSA formation efforts.

³ SGMA and the recent Comprehensive Adjudication statutes follow this office’s consistent suggestions and experience fairly well, e.g., due process modeled on the validation statutes, relying on hydrogeological (not legal) boundaries for planning, greater public disclosures, a 50 year outlook, etc. Whether the Legislature was (1) aware of this office’s advocacy and experiences or (2) came to similar conclusions via independent analyses, is not critical.

That the settlement agreement addresses basin management is no happenstance. Our office has – well before SGMA and the current adjudication statutes – sought out and/or developed tools that may assist with a long-term determination of water entitlement on an acre-by-acre basis in the Salinas Valley. Some of those efforts are described in a certain letter dated April 2, 2002, to Paul Murphey, Division of Water Rights, SWRCB. With respect to the Salinas Valley, this office had many productive conversations on various occasions with the late Bob Antle of the Salinas Valley based Tanimura & Antle companies about a more rigorous (and less “political”) approach to water entitlements. We assume that other like-minded agriculture and other interests took a similar long-term approach and (1) developed resources to aid in reaching an acre-by-acre water entitlement outcome for the Valley and (2) protected their legal bases for such entitlements, e.g., filings statements of water diversion under the Water Code or through litigation outcomes. The GSA selected must have the ability and duty to adhere to the terms of the 2003 settlement agreement about basin management (including Monterey County lands within the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin⁴), as well as the other SGMA factors such as safe and reliable water for residents and environmental purposes.⁵ If the GSA(s) selected do not have the ability and duty to so adhere, then adjudication becomes necessary.

Conclusion

In the words of the State (via its blog): “The [adjudication] legislation gives parties incentives to align the outcome of an adjudication with SGMA.” The facilitation process in the Salinas Valley (as well as elsewhere) should do the same: align the to-be-negotiated GSA qualities with the qualities available in adjudication so the outcomes of both paths align as the Legislature intended.

Sincerely,

Thomas S. Virsik

Thomas S. Virsik

cc: Gina Bartlett (via email Gina@cbuilding.org)
Felecia Marcus, Chair SWRCB
Mark Nordberg, GSA Project Manager (DWR)
Wade Horton, Director San Luis Obispo County Public Works Department
Alecia Van Atta, Acting Assistant Regional Administrator, NOAA, NMFS

Encl. GAB - The Groundwater Act Blog 10-12-15
Alejo touts record legislation, work on Salinas Valley water Monterey Herald 10-13-15
PJM comments to Paul Murphey, SWRCB Workshop Professor Sax’s Report 4-2-2002

⁴ Accordingly, a copy of this letter is being sent to San Luis Obispo County, given the SGMA requirement of intra-basin coordination (albeit no regulations have yet been promulgated on that aspect of SGMA).

⁵ We note that on October 22, 2015 NOAA wrote to Monterey County as a stakeholder in SGMA because it has concerns with reservoir operations and releases for certain fish purposes. A copy of this letter is being provided to NOAA.

**FY 2015-2016
SUMMARY OF CSIP, SVRP AND SRDF
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
EXPENDITURE REPORTS**

**FROM JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2016
7 MONTHS = 58% OF THE BUDGET CYCLE**

	<u>TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND COMMITMENTS</u>	<u>FY 15-16 Budget</u>	<u>% USED</u>
CSIP			
MCWRA	560,112	1,380,029	41%
MRWPCA	720,324	1,501,203	48%
Total	<u>1,280,436</u>	<u>2,881,232</u>	<u>44%</u>
SVRP			
MCWRA	-	255	0%
MRWPCA	1,106,332	2,466,133	45%
Total	<u>1,106,332</u>	<u>2,466,388</u>	<u>45%</u>
SRDF			
MCWRA	114,288	636,616	18%
MRWPCA	20,852	75,808	28%
Total	<u>135,140</u>	<u>712,424</u>	<u>19%</u>

		<u>Budget</u>	<u>% Used</u>
CSIP Supplemental Well Water Produced this FY	3,485 acre-feet	6,058	58%
SVRP Recycled Water Produced this Fiscal Year	6,588 acre-feet	16,692	39%
SRDF River Water Produced this Fiscal Year	<u>0 acre-feet</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total Water Production	10,073 acre-feet	22,750	44%

FUND 131

**Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP) O&M Expenditure Report
FY 2015-2016**

FROM JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2016

Description	January, 2016 Current Period Expenditures	Year-to-Date Expenditures	Year-to-Date Encumbered	Total Year-to-Date Expenditures & Commitments	FY 2014 - 2015(a) Expenditures & Commitments thru January, 2015	Approved FY 2015-2016 Budgeted Amount	FY 2015-2016 Percent of Budget Used
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H

MCWRA O&M

1	Communication Charges - External	0	0	0	0	0	0%	
2.1	Earthquake Insurance	0	16,161	0	16,161	17,153	40%	
2.2	Project Insurance	0	249,596	0	249,596	0	118%	
3	Insurance reimbursement from MRWPCA	0	0	0	0	(75,000)	0%	
4.1	Maintenance Svc. & Suppl. External	0	1,463	1,069	2,532	1,000	81%	
4.2	Maintenance Svc. & Suppl. Internal	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	
5	Equipment Maintenance	0	7,233	0	7,233	0	1391%	
6	Memberships/Publications	0	228	0	228	215	85%	
7	Non-Capital Equipment	0	2,237	0	2,237	0	143%	
8	Miscellaneous Services	0	2,037	0	2,037	1,996	n/a	
9	Miscellaneous Supplies	0	0	0	0	409	n/a	
10	Books/Periodicals and Other Subscriptions	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	
11	Courier Service (external)	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	
12	Lab Services	1,030	2,293	0	2,293	626	n/a	
13	Outside Legal Counsel	0	0	0	0	1,107	n/a	
14	County Counsel	1,843	3,776	0	3,776	0	349%	
15	Consultants/Contractors	0	0	0	0	59,466	0%	
16	MRWPCA-Prior year O&M adjustment	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	
17	Publications and legal Notices	0	0	0	0	0	255	n/a
18	Equipment Rental	0	41,000	0	41,000	536	n/a	
19	MCWRA Labor Charges	18,910	193,267	0	193,267	215,056	803,894	24%
20	Equipment	0	39,753	0	39,753	0	n/a	
20	Infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	
21	TOTAL O&M CSIP (MCWRA)	21,783	559,043	1,069	560,112	222,565	1,380,029	41%

MRWPCA O&M

22	MRWPCA Salaries/Benefits	34,765	269,364	0	269,364	265,604	559,112	48%
23	Office Expense	-49	576	0	576	1,677	2,125	27%
24	Outside Professional Services	3,238	4,556	432	4,988	4,057	25,000	20%
25	Operating Supplies	158	5,775	160	5,935	7,155	12,550	47%
26	Contract Services - Lab Services, Equip Rent	1,315	8,729	12,529	21,258	22,909	39,300	54%
27	Chemicals	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
28	Utilities	10,733	359,694	0	359,694	376,377	684,588	53%
29	PM/Repairs	1,180	10,646	60	10,707	20,830	64,150	17%
30	Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
31	Equipment Replacement Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
32	Vehicle Costs	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0%
33	Indirect	4,628	47,802	0	47,802	49,772	112,378	43%
34	TOTAL O&M CSIP (MRWPCA)	55,967	707,143	13,181	720,324	748,381	1,501,203	48%
35	CSIP PCA Capital Outlay (from Reserves)	0	0	0	0	25,225	160,000	0.0%

36	TOTAL CSIP O&M	77,750	1,266,186	14,250	1,280,436	996,171	3,041,232	42%
----	---------------------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	------------------	----------------	------------------	------------

(a) Prior year has been added to provide a comparative reference

FUND 132

**Salinas Valley Reclamation Project (SVRP) O&M Expenditure Report
FY 2015-2016**

FROM JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2016

Description	January, 2016 Current Period Expenditures	Year-to-Date Expenditures	Year-to-Date Encumbered	Total Year-to-Date Expenditures & Commitments	FY 2014 - 2015(a) Expenditures & Commitments thru January, 2015	Approved FY 2015-2016 Budgeted Amount	FY 2015-2016 Percent of Budget Used
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
MCWRA O&M							
1 Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
2 Publications & Legal Notices	0	0	0	0	0	255	0%
3 TOTAL O&M SVRP (MCWRA)	0	0	0	0	0	255	0%
MRWPCA O&M							
4 MRWPCA Salaries/Benefits	22,374	253,337	0	253,337	305,231	619,264	41%
5 Office Expense	87	132	0	132	569	3,000	4%
6 Contractors	4,447	18,383	15,113	33,496	20,568	27,000	124%
7 Operating Supplies	131	15,325	232	15,558	18,534	24,000	65%
8 Contract Services - Rodent Control, Equip Rent	2,926	4,981	2,880	7,861	16,626	27,000	29%
9 Chemicals	0	246,278	7,771	254,049	237,563	506,146	50%
10 Utilities	15,231	191,143	0	191,143	261,721	552,078	35%
11 PM/Repairs	41,339	168,423	114,445	282,867	254,777	267,500	106%
12 Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
13 Equipment Replacement Funds	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
14 Indirect Costs	7,892	67,889	0	67,889	80,546	168,145	40%
15 TOTAL O&M SVRP (MRWPCA)	94,427	965,890	140,442	1,106,332	1,196,136	2,194,133	50%
16 SVRP Capital Outlay (Transferred from reserves)	0	64,623	0	64,623	166,071	272,000	n/a
17 TOTAL SVRP O&M	94,427	1,030,513	140,442	1,170,955	1,362,207	2,466,388	47%

(a) Prior year has been added to provide a comparative reference

FUND 134

**Salinas River Diversion Facility (SRDF) O&M Expenditure Report
FY 2015-2016**

FROM JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2016

Preliminary	January, 2016	Year-to-Date	Year-to-Date	Total Year-to-Date	FY 2014 - 2015(a)	Approved	FY 2015-2016
Description	Current Period	Expenditures	Encumbered	Expenditures	Expenditures & Commitments	Budgeted Amount	Percent of
	Expenditures			& Commitments	thru January, 2015		Budget Used
A	B	C		C	D	E	F

MCWRA O&M

1	Communication Charges - External	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
2.1	Earthquake Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
2.2	Project Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
3	Maintenance Svc. & Suppl. External	0	8,500	8,500	1,000	15,300	56%
4	Maintenance Svc. & Suppl. Internal	0	4,272	0	4,272	2,040	209%
5	Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	822	6,120	0%
6	Non-Capital Equipment	0	0	0	0	3,570	0%
7	Miscellaneous Services	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
8.1	Miscellaneous Supplies	0	0	0	0	2,080	0%
8.2	Books & Periodicals	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
9	Minor Equip. & Furnishings	0	0	0	1,289	0	n/a
10	Postage and Shipping	0	0	0	49	0	n/a
11	Outside Legal Counsel	0	11,862	8,498	20,360	20,400	100%
12	County Counsel	618	3,944	0	3,944	3,060	129%
13	Contractors/Consultants	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
14	Equipment Rental	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
15	MCWRA Labor Charges	2,755	48,248	0	48,248	582,531	8%
16	Water Rights & Dam Fees	0	0	0	0	1,515	0%
15b	Claims, Judgements & Damages	0	28,963	0	28,963	241,940	n/a
17	Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
18	Infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
19	TOTAL O&M SRDF (MCWRA)	3,373	97,289	16,998	114,288	705,822	18%

MRWPCA O&M

20	MRWPCA Salaries/Benefits	1,768	12,972	0	12,972	22,251	49%	
21	Office Expense	0	0	0	0	22	590	0%
22	Contractors/Consultants	0	0	0	0	1,600	12,500	0%
23	Operating Supplies	0	81	0	81	0	3,250	3%
24	Contract Services - Lab Services, Equip Rent	42	203	0	203	6,808	6,000	3%
25	Chemicals (chlorine)	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
26	Utilities	329	4,854	0	4,854	2,633	6,000	81%
27	PM/Repairs	1,074	1,074	0	1,074	0	13,500	8%
28	Equipment Replacement	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
29	Sludge Disposal Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
30	Vehicle Mileage Charges	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0%
31	Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
32	Indirect Costs	305	1,668	0	1,668	2,378	6,056	28%
33	TOTAL O&M SRDF (MRWPCA)	3,517	20,852	0	20,852	35,692	75,808	28%

34	TOTAL SRDF O&M	6,890	118,142	16,998	135,140	741,514	712,424	19%
----	---------------------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	------------

(a) Prior year has been added to provide a comparative reference

Utility Cost Summary

FROM JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2016
7 MONTHS = 58% OF THE BUDGET CYCLE

FY 2015-2016 - Utility Budgets

	Fiscal Year Budget Amount	Water Budget (Acre-Feet)	Calculated Unit Cost (\$ / Ac-Ft)
CSIP	\$ 684,588	6,058	\$ 113.01
SVRP	\$ 552,078	16,692	\$ 33.07
SRDF	\$ 6,000	0	\$ -
		22,750	

FY 2015-2016 - Actual Utility Expenditures

	Utility Expenditures Thru January, 2016	Delivered Water (Acre-Feet)	Calculated Unit Cost (\$ / Ac-Ft)	Percent Budget Expended
CSIP	\$ 359,694	3,485	\$ 103.21	53%
SVRP	\$ 191,143	6,588	\$ 29.01	35%
SRDF	\$ 4,854	0	\$ -	81%
		10,073		

Comparison with Prior Fiscal Year (2014-2015)

	Utility Expenditures Thru January, 2015	Delivered Water (Acre-Feet)	Calculated Unit Cost (\$ / Ac-Ft)
CSIP	\$ 376,377	3,722	\$ 101.12
SVRP	\$ 261,721	7,399	\$ 35.37
SRDF	\$ 2,633	0	\$ -
		11,121	

MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
 FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016
 FUND 111 ADMINISTRATION - MONTHLY BUDGET REVIEW
 THROUGH JANUARY, 2016

58%

Account	Current Year Approved Budget	Current Year Adopted Budget	Current Month Expenditures	Current Year PO Balances	Current Year YTD Expenditures	Total YTD Obligations	Prior year YTD Expenditures	Current Year vs. Prior year Expenditures
Salaries and Benefits								
1 Regular Employees 6111	4,120,050	4,120,050	249,274	0	1,861,102	1,861,102	1,966,874	(105,773)
2 County Temporary Employees 6112	0	0	1,920	0	20,421	20,421	2,418	18,003
3 Emergency Overtime 6113	10,200	10,200	428	0	11,274	11,274	4,232	7,043
4 Pers 6121	390,796	390,796	40,596	0	284,004	284,004	231,600	52,404
5 Other Post Retirement Benefits 6122	30,562	30,562	2,068	0	14,478	14,478	12,901	1,577
6 Social Security - FICA 6131	131,351	131,351	7,510	0	46,211	46,211	47,236	(1,026)
7 Social Security - Medicare 6132	59,537	59,537	3,681	0	27,217	27,217	27,782	(565)
8 Life Insurance 6142	4,272	4,272	276	0	1,586	1,586	1,753	(167)
9 Long Term/Short Term Disability Insurance 6143/44	6,912	6,912	348	0	2,618	2,618	2,504	114
10 Unemployment Insurance 6148	6,758	6,758	563	0	3,942	3,942	2,448	1,494
11 Workers Compensation Insurance 6161	60,284	60,284	5,024	0	35,166	35,166	36,674	(1,509)
12 Employee Assistance Program 6171	1,104	1,104	56	0	362	362	419	(56)
13 Special Benefits 6174	175,509	175,509	10,221	0	22,570	22,570	18,415	4,155
14 Wellness Plan 6175	3,396	3,396	479	0	1,453	1,453	921	532
15 Flex Benefit:(Medical, Dental, Vision) 6141/45/47 & 6173	710,226	710,226	53,937	0	338,112	338,112	351,093	(12,981)
16 Salaries and Benefits TOTAL	5,710,957	5,710,957	376,381	0	2,670,515	2,670,515	2,707,268	(36,753)
Services and Supplies								
17 Uniforms & Safety Equipment 6222	1,040	1,040	0	0	177	177	423	(245)
18 Communication Charges - External 6231	7,283	7,283	477	0	3,069	3,069	2,635	433
19 Communication Charges - Internal 6232	36,516	36,516	0	0	1,956	1,956	13,246	(11,290)
20 Food Refreshments 6241	3,396	3,396	363	387	2,249	2,636	1,279	970
21 Janitorial Supplies & Services 6251	16,151	16,151	1,091	7,608	8,484	16,092	6,209	2,275
22 Laundry Supplies and Service 6252	3,183	3,183	37	663	412	1,075	459	(47)
23 General Liability Insurance 6261/62	560,824	560,824	46,735	0	327,148	327,148	267,309	59,838
24 Property Insurance 6266	4,052	4,052	0	0	1,636	1,636	1,731	(95)
25 Insurance Unit Allocation 6268	3,117	3,117	260	0	1,818	1,818	1,469	349
26 Benefits Indirect Costs Allocation 6268	1,757	1,757	0	0	0	0	0	0
27 Bldg & Improvements Maint - External 6311	24,970	24,970	253	3,242	36,015	39,257	12,632	23,382
28 Bldg & Improvements Maint - Internal 6312	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
29 Equipment Maintenance 6321	30,775	30,775	188	7,701	6,188	13,889	13,149	(6,961)
30 Membership Fees 6351	6,446	6,446	0	0	300	300	40	260
31 Non-Capital Equipment 6361	9,364	9,364	0	0	872	872	0	872
32 Advertising 6381	1,040	1,040	0	0	0	0	0	0
33 Miscellaneous Services 6383	520	520	0	0	210	210	19	191
34 Miscellaneous Supplies 6384	520	520	0	0	0	0	414	(414)
35 Books and Periodicals 6401	2,497	2,497	0	0	322	322	0	322
36 Bottled Water 6402	1,405	1,405	51	789	536	1,325	486	50
37 Courier Service & Mail - External 6404	3,121	3,121	27	4,438	562	5,000	540	21
38 Courier Service & Mail - Internal 6405/06	8,393	8,393	0	0	4,068	4,068	4,125	(56)
39 Minor Computer Hardware 6407	10,200	10,200	0	0	867	867	173	694
40 Minor Computer Software 6408	24,100	24,100	4,220	1,303	19,122	20,425	21,226	(2,105)
41 Minor Equipment and Furnishings 6409	5,202	5,202	617	817	1,117	1,935	2,736	(1,619)
42 Office Supplies 6410	26,010	26,010	705	7,107	5,417	12,524	6,327	(910)
43 Postage and Shipping 6411	9,364	9,364	0	0	411	411	4,464	(4,053)
44 Printing, Graphics & Binding - External 6412	1,353	1,353	0	0	714	714	441	273

P25

MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016
FUND 111 ADMINISTRATION - MONTHLY BUDGET REVIEW
THROUGH JANUARY, 2016

58%

	Account	Current Year Approved Budget	Current Year Adopted Budget	Current Month Expenditures	Current Year PO Balances	Current Year YTD Expenditures	Total YTD Obligations	Prior year YTD Expenditures	Current Year vs. Prior year Expenditures		
45	Printing, Graphics & Binding - Internal	6413	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	
46	Other Office Expense	6414	1,040	1,040	0	55	55	0	55	46	
47	County Records Retention Charge	6415	512	512	0	0	0	256	(256)	47	
48	County Accounting & Auditing charges	6601	13,637	13,637	0	0	0	0	0	48	
49	Data Processing Charges - Internal	6603	250,465	250,465	27,613	0	95,110	81,877	13,233	49	
50	Legal Services - External	6606	255,000	255,000	0	197,481	2,519	200,000	90	2,429	50
51	Legal Services - Internal	6607	67,422	67,422	8,134	0	13,956	13,956	23,877	(9,921)	51
52	Other Medical Services	6608	520	520	0	0	0	185	(185)	52	
53	Other Personnel Costs (Recruitment)	6609	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	
54	Temporary Help Services	6612	5,202	5,202	0	0	0	0	0	54	
55	Other Prof & Spec Svcs - Consultants	6613	7,650	99,650	0	14,973	1,927	16,900	17,777	(15,850)	55
55	Other Prof & Spec Svcs - GM	6613	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
56	Other Prof & Spec Services-BOD Fees, etc.	6613	24,866	24,866	0	0	5,850	5,850	8,200	(2,350)	56
57	Publications and Legal Notices	6801	1,561	1,561	0	0	0	3,295	(3,295)	57	
58	Rents & Leases - Buildings	6811	273,640	273,640	22,826	0	159,782	159,782	156,644	3,138	58
59	Rents & Leases-Equip- Data Processing	6821	12,331	12,331	776	27,853	6,334	34,187	7,210	(876)	59
60	Rents & Leases-Equip- Copy machines	6821	24,000	24,000	3,588	11,355	11,778	23,133	11,186	593	60
61	Rents & Leases - Equip - General	6821	1,400	1,400	0	-	-	0	5,236	(5,236)	61
62	Other Special Dept Expense	6835	3,916	3,916	45	0	15,920	15,920	586	15,334	62
63	Conference/Lodging/Meals/Travel	6861/62	12,485	12,485	0	0	4,356	4,356	1,633	2,722	63
64	Employee Training	6861/11	10,822	10,822	0	0	894	894	0	894	64
65	County Training Charge	6611	5,494	5,494	561	0	3,927	3,927	4,265	(338)	65
66	Employee moving expense	6863	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
67	Fleet Service Charge (Fuel & misc maint)	6864	72,240	72,240	10,550	0	23,903	23,903	22,130	1,773	67
68	Vehicle Maint - Outside Vendor	6866	54,291	54,291	0	8,800	16,091	24,891	17,335	(1,244)	68
69	Utilities	6881	6,630	6,630	423	338	3,664	4,002	5,318	(1,654)	69
70	Canyon Del Rey Master Drainage Plan	7013	0	0	0	0	0	0	35,270	(35,270)	70
71	Other Debt Retirement (Capital Leases)	7051	38,714	38,714	0	0	18,418	18,418	18,180	238	71
72	Interest (Capital Leases)	7071	10,070	10,070	0	0	9,501	9,501	2,110	7,391	72
73	Rights of Way	7101	3,315	3,315	0	0	3,250	3,250	0	3,250	73
74	Taxes & Assessments	7121	582	582	0	0	883	883	611	273	74
75	Cost Plan Charges (Adjusted Budget)	7301	375,000	375,000	0	0	157,920	157,920	59,108	98,813	75
76	Balance still in budget for higher Cost Plan amount	6835	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
77	Services & Supplies	TOTAL	2,335,404	2,427,404	129,540	294,854	979,709	1,274,562	843,913	135,796	77
	Fixed Assets										
72	Equipment	7531	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
73	Capital Leases - Equipment	7561	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
74	Fixed Assets	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
75	Operating Transfers Out	7614	0	0	0	0	0	550,000	(550,000)	75	
76	GRAND TOTAL EXPENSES		8,046,361	8,138,361	505,922	294,854	3,650,224	3,945,078	4,101,182	(450,958)	76

(Before inter-fund expense reimbursement)

MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
FY 2015-2016 Budget
Expenditure Report by Fund
Through January, 2016
58%

LN #	Program Name	Zone	Fund	Prog	Approved Budget	Adopted Budget	Current Month Expenditures	Current Year PO Balances	Current Year YTD Expenditures	Total Obligations	Prior Year YTD Expenditures	Current Year vs. Prior Year Expenditures
Countywide												
1	County Wide Hydrology & Water Quality Program	CW	113	9010	0	0	2,257.55	0	24,804	24,804	38,991	(14,187)
2	Flood Plain Management & Land Use Planning	CW	113	9030	237,273	464,387	5,347.12	0	127,677	127,677	102,576	25,101
3	ALERT Syst Operation & Maint/Flood Monitoring	CW	113	9035	41,407	45,127	(57,721.75)	2,475	32,237	34,712	38,474	(6,237)
4	County Wide Water Resources Review-Reimburse	CW	113	9041	332,309	332,309	20,936.95	0	169,125	169,125	183,001	(13,876)
6	Special Projects	CW	113	9050	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
7	Special Projects - County General Plan	CW	113	9051	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
8	Water Rights	CW	113	9053	0	0	1,995.54	0	2,826	2,826	0	2,826
9	Total				610,989	841,823	(27,184.59)	2,475	356,669	359,144	363,041	(6,373)
Pajaro Levee												
10	Pajaro River Levee	1	112	9100	406,829	406,829	13,216.43	1,500	191,911	193,411	269,618	(77,707)
11	Environmental Compliance	1	112	9100	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
12	Prop 218	1	112	9100	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
13	Total				406,829	406,829	13,216.43	1,500	191,911	193,411	269,618	(77,707)
Zone 2 Nacimiento Non - O&M												
14	Nacimiento Taxes & Reimbursement	2	114	9211	54,193	54,193	0.00	0	27,870	27,870	26,143	1,727
15	Hydrology & Water Quality Program	2	114	9245	324,164	448,038	23,309.38	0	212,930	212,930	243,741	(30,811)
16	Lake Nacimiento Dock Registration	2	114	9260	12,576	12,576	622.27	0	622	622	0	622
17	Transfer to to other funds	2	114	9265	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
18	Special Projects	2	114	9270	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
19	Special Projects - Urban Water Solutions	2	114	9271	32,724	32,724	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
20	Environmental Compliance	2	114	9272	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
21	Total				423,657	547,531	23,931.65	0	241,422	241,422	269,883	(28,461)
Zone 2A San Antonio Non - O &M												
22	Hydrology & Water Quality Program	2A	115	9530	355,010	482,209	22,612.99	0	181,667	181,667	73,778	107,888
23	Well Permits/Well Logs	2A	115	9540	32,300	32,300	8,178.38	0	58,433	58,433	48,629	9,803
24	Salinas Valley Water Quality/Nitrate TAC	2A	115	9559	71,154	71,154	0.00	0	0	0	9,210	(9,210)
25	Environmental Compliance	2A	115	9561	29,440	29,440	2,833.64	0	2,834	2,834	0	2,834
26	Transfer to to other funds	2A	115	9596	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
27	Special Projects - Fish Monitoring consultant	2A	115	9597	34,054	34,054	3,692.48	29,668	49,396	79,064	77,399	(28,003)
28	Special Projects	2A	115	9597	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
29	Special Projects	2A	115	9599	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
30	Total				521,958	649,157	37,317.49	29,668	292,329	321,997	209,016	83,313

P27

MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
FY 2015-2016 Budget
Expenditure Report by Fund
Through January, 2016
58%

LN #	Program Name	Zone	Fund	Prog	Approved Budget	Adopted Budget	Current Month Expenditures	Current Year PO Balances	Current Year YTD Expenditures	Total Obligations	Prior Year YTD Expenditures	Current Year vs. Prior Year Expenditures
Zone 2C Operations												
31	Nacimiento Dam Operation & Maintenance	2C	116	9910	856,790	923,194	(69,487.25)	59,109	277,456	336,566	672,755	(395,299)
32	Nacimiento Administration	2C	116	9915	19,197	19,197	5,357.11	0	29,795	29,795	1,845	27,951
33	San Antonio Dam Operation & Maintenance	2C	116	9920	364,336	364,336	547,318.69	98,820	1,271,283	1,370,103	307,494	963,788
34	San Antonio Administration	2C	116	9925	19,197	19,197	3,831.35	0	23,765	23,765	0	23,765
35	Salinas River Channel	2C	116	9935	192,692	248,809	35,480.38	13,391	321,776	335,167	369,487	(47,710)
36	Salinas River Mouth	2C	116	9940	86,636	88,661	5,295.48	0	38,918	38,918	43,938	(5,021)
37	Reservoir Oper Hydrology & Water Quality Prog.	2C	116	9945	1,308,356	1,308,356	23,540.09	29,038	292,625	321,663	343,873	(51,248)
38	ALERT Transfer Out	2C	116	9950	226,895	226,895	64,590.00	0	93,897	93,897	83,401	10,496
39	Transfer to to other funds	2C	116		0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
40	Ground Water Extraction/Data Collection	2C	116	9955	106,501	106,501	11,152.40	0	64,535	64,535	65,006	(471)
41	Total				3,180,600	3,305,146	627,078.25	200,358	2,414,050	2,614,408	1,887,800	526,251
Zone 2C Administration												
42	Zone 2C Administration Assessment Roll	2C	116	9970	8,684	8,684	0.00	0	4,263	4,263	88,319	(84,056)
43	Zone 2C Administration Other	2C	116	9975	337,523	337,523	2,117.30	55,000	72,527	127,527	67,118	5,409
44	Total				346,207	346,207	2,117.30	55,000	76,790	131,790	155,436	(78,646)
45	SVWP Bond Revenue Fund	2C	133	9987	2,142,694	2,142,694	0.00	0	1,414,429	1,414,429	1,344,631	69,798
	Total											
46	Salinas River Diversion Facility O&M	3	134	9988	333,117	465,611	3,404.01	16,998	118,134	135,133	1,015,767	(897,632)
47	Fish Monitoring	3	134	9989	363,536	363,536	(29.11)	0	15,993	15,993	91,658	(75,666)
48	Flow Monitoring	3	134	9990	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
49	Water Quality Monitoring	3	134	9991	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
50	Invasive Species	3	134	9992	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
51	Environmental Compliance	3	134	9993	15,771	15,771	(2.01)	0	1,067	1,067	692	375
52	Total				712,424	844,918	3,372.89	16,998	135,193	152,192	1,108,117	(972,923)
53	Lower Salinas River Channel	3	117	9620	34,087	54,424	0.00	0	0	0	22,275	(22,275)
54	Merritt Lake	5	118	9630	40,220	40,220	2,364.52	0	9,885	9,885	35,376	(25,491)
55	CSIP Transfer & Water Conservation Update	6	119	9660	767,328	767,328	3,648.73	0	17,761	17,761	16,660	1,102
56	CSIP Operation & Maintenance	2Y	131	9643	2,799,068	3,041,232	21,783.16	1,069	1,469,644	1,470,713	1,520,030	(50,386)

P 28

MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
FY 2015-2016 Budget
Expenditure Report by Fund
Through January, 2016
58%

LN #	Program Name	Zone	Fund	Prog	Approved Budget	Adopted Budget	Current Month Expenditures	Current Year PO Balances	Current Year YTD Expenditures	Total Obligations	Prior Year YTD Expenditures	Current Year vs. Prior Year Expenditures
57	SVRP Operation & Maintenance	2Z	132	9644	4,285,263	4,285,263	0.00	0	1,233,067	1,233,067	1,902,779	(669,713)
58	CSIP/SVRP Debt Service	2B	303	9666	1,859,657	2,359,657	0.00	0	250,000	250,000	0	250,000
59	North Monterey County	7	120	9690	3,705	3,705	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
60	Soledad Storm Drain - Bryant Canyon Project	8	121	9700	71,277	171,365	701.01	0	29,533	29,533	43,977	(14,444)
61	Prop 218 (With City of Soledad)	8	121	9700	0		0.00	0	0	0	0	0
62	Total				71,277	171,365	701.01	0	29,533	29,533	43,977	(14,444)
63	Reclamation Ditch Operation & Maintenance	9	122	9720	1,205,998	1,295,891	121,034.42	11,008	691,849	702,857	815,738	(123,889)
64	Environmental Compliance / EIR	9	122	9723	142,784	142,784	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
65	Prop 218	9	122	9724	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
66	Easements/Acquisition	9	122	9725	0	0	1,386.49	0	2,465	2,465	0	2,465
67	Total				1,348,782	1,438,675	122,420.91	11,008	694,314	705,322	815,738	(121,424)
68	Monterey Peninsula (Carmel Valley)	11	123	9750	28,375	28,375	8,007.44	0	22,274	22,274	11,658	10,616
69	San Lorenzo Creek	12	124	9760	34,079	74,079	3,393.72	0	5,549	5,549	8,109	(2,559)
70	Arroyo Seco Area	14	125	9765	1,560	1,560	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
71	Carnation Subdivision (Alisal-Spence Roads)	15	126	9770	5,506	5,506	0.00	0	0	0	16,053	(16,053)
72	Moro Cojo Slough (Castroville/Moss Landing)	17	127	9780	381,059	381,059	28,046.80	2,238	101,104	103,342	33,157	67,948
73	Storm Drain Maint. District # 2 (Blanco Drain)	S2	128	9860	20,240	20,240	20.25	0	2,710	2,710	1,448	1,263
74	Gonzales Slough Maintenance District	GS	129	9870	4,308	5,223	0.00	0	521	521	4,968	(4,447)
75	Nacimiento Hydroelectric Plant	HY	130	9890	286,343	420,262	6,663.29	24,339	49,960	74,299	64,539	(14,579)

P 29

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget**

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$1,983,692	\$1,983,692
Assessments	13,511,482	13,511,482
Development & Other fees	454,979	454,979
Annexation Fees	0	0
Water Delivery Revenue	1,670,988	1,670,988
Royalties	200,271	200,271
Grants	0	0
Reimbursement from County	0	0
Hydroelectric Revenue	85,000	85,000
Settlement Revenue	0	0
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Insurance reimbursement	\$0	\$0
Interest, Rent, & Other	2,335,507	2,335,507
Inter-fund transfer revenue	600,000	600,000
Total Revenue	\$20,841,919	\$20,841,919

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$1,228,501	\$1,147,767	\$755,191	Taxes are received Dec & Apr
8,450,435	8,345,122	5,061,047	Assessments are received Dec & Apr
208,431	245,475	246,548	
0	0	0	
674,777	1,089,939	996,211	
0	0	200,271	
34,674	26,017	(34,674)	
0	236,849	0	
36,612	38,455	48,388	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
275,260	1,013,849	(275,260)	
1,959,648	1,632,070	375,859	
0	550,000	600,000	
\$12,868,338	\$14,325,543	\$7,973,581	

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	<u>FY 2015-16 Approved Budget</u>	<u>FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget</u>	<u>YTD PO Balances</u>	<u>YTD Expenses</u>	<u>Prior Year YTD Expenses</u>	<u>Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Salaries & Benefits	\$5,710,957	5,710,957	\$0	\$2,670,515	\$2,707,268	\$3,040,442	
Consultants	5,239,824	7,198,087	477,881	3,314,253	4,312,818	1,925,571	
Services & Supplies	3,199,971	3,202,971	161,627	1,666,074	1,448,172	1,533,897	
Fixed Assets	334,984	334,984	0	105,912	47,705	229,073	
Debt payments	8,021,939	8,021,939		2,825,061	2,737,560	5,196,879	
Settlement costs	66,621	66,621		66,621	66,621	(0)	
Inter-fund transfer expenditures	600,000	600,000		0	550,000	600,000	
Labor cost charges from Fund 111 & ALERT charges from Fund 113 charged to various funds	7,593,347	7,593,347		3,535,327	3,830,226	4,058,020	
Inter-fund reimbursement of expenses in Fund 111 & fund 113	(8,243,087)	(8,243,087)		(3,557,543)	(3,863,939)	(4,685,545)	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$22,524,555	24,485,819	\$639,507	\$10,626,220	\$11,836,432	\$11,898,335	

Revenue less Expenses	(\$1,682,636)	(\$3,643,900)		\$2,242,118	\$2,489,111	(\$3,924,754)	
------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--	--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--

Beginning Fund Balance 7/1/15	12,878,175	18,125,918		\$18,125,918			
Ending Fund Balance	11,195,539	14,482,018		\$19,728,728			

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
313 SVWP Debt Service - Appropriation WRA026
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Interest, Rent, & Other	2,138,313	2,138,313
Total Revenue	\$2,138,313	\$2,138,313

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
1,412,671	1,417,784	725,642	
\$1,412,671	\$1,417,784	\$725,642	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Consultants	0	0	0	1,500	1,500	(1,500)	
Debt Payments	2,138,313	2,138,313	0	1,412,531	1,395,331	725,782	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$2,138,313	\$2,138,313	\$0	\$1,414,031	\$1,396,831	\$724,282	

Revenue less Expenses	\$0	\$0	(\$1,361)	\$20,952	\$1,361
------------------------------	------------	------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------

P 33

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Administration Fund 111 - Appropriation Unit WRA001
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget**

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Reimbursement From County	\$0	\$0
Interest, Rent, & Other	0	0
Total Revenue	\$0	\$0

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$0	\$38,192	\$0	
2,515	2,325	(2,515)	
\$2,515	\$40,516	(\$2,515)	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Salaries & Benefits	\$5,710,957	\$5,710,957		\$2,670,515	\$2,707,268	\$3,040,442	
Consultants	262,650	354,650	212,453	4,447	17,867	258,203	
Services & Supplies	2,023,970	2,023,970	82,401	947,343	805,756	1,076,628	
Fixed Assets	48,784	48,784	0	27,919	20,290	20,865	
Sub-total before charges to Funds	8,046,361	8,138,361	294,854	3,650,224	3,551,182	4,396,137	
Labor cost charges from other funds	(\$7,976,333)	(\$7,976,333)		(3,447,150)	(3,765,887)	(4,529,184)	
Transfer from hydro stabilization reserve	\$0	\$0		0	550,000	0	
Net Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$70,028	\$162,028	\$294,854	\$203,074	\$335,295	(\$133,046)	
Revenue less Expenses	(\$70,028)	(\$162,028)		(\$200,559)	(\$294,778)	\$130,531	

P 34

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 112 - Zones 1 & 1A - Pajaro Levee - Appropriation Unit WRA002
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$15,295	\$15,295
Assessments	395,914	395,914
Grants	0	0
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	1,148	1,148
Total Revenue	\$412,357	\$412,357

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$9,826	\$8,429	\$5,469	Taxes are received Dec & Apr
289,543	272,385	106,371	Assessments are received Dec & Apr
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
7	43	1,141	
\$299,377	\$280,857	\$112,980	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$296,371	\$296,371		\$183,360	\$257,453	\$113,011	
Consultants	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Services & Supplies	36,258	36,258	1,500	8,550	12,165	27,708	
Fixed Assets	7,200	7,200	0	0	0	7,200	
Debt payments	67,000	67,000		0	0	67,000	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$406,829	\$406,829	\$1,500	\$191,911	\$269,618	\$214,918	

Revenue less Expenses	\$5,528	\$5,528	\$107,466	\$11,240	(\$101,938)
------------------------------	----------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------

P35

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 113 - Countywide - Appropriation Unit WRA003
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$193,039	\$193,039
Development & Other fees	374,000	374,000
Grants	0	0
Hydroelectric Revenue	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	3,000	3,000
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Insurance Reimbursement	0	0
Inter-fund transfer revenue	0	0
Total Revenue	\$570,039	\$570,039

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$193,039	\$288,307	\$0	
194,748	222,708	179,252	
34,674	26,017	(34,674)	
0	0	0	
1,512	683	1,488	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	210,282	0	
\$423,974	\$747,997	\$146,065	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$801,405	\$801,405		\$440,324	\$429,920	\$361,081	
Consultants	10,200	241,034	2,155	8,325	7,890	1,875	
Services & Supplies	66,138	66,138	320	18,412	23,283	47,725	
ALERT charges from Fund 113	(266,754)	(266,754)		(110,393)	(98,052)	(156,361)	Additional ALERT transfer to be made in April
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$610,989	\$841,823	\$2,475	\$356,669	\$363,041	\$254,320	

Revenue less Expenses	(\$40,950)	(\$271,784)	\$67,305	\$384,956	(\$108,254)
------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-----------------	------------------	--------------------

P 36

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 114 - Zone 2 - Nacimiento Non-O&M - Appropriation Unit WRA004
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$216,854	\$216,854
Development & Other fees	45,979	45,979
Hydroelectric Revenue	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	68,060	68,060
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Insurance Reimbursement	0	0
Interfund Transfer Revenue	0	0
Total Revenue	\$330,893	\$330,893

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$216,854	\$328,105	\$0	Taxes are received Dec & Apr
1,483	8,885	44,496	
0	0	0	
54,450	64,882	13,610	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	237,980	0	
\$272,787	\$639,851	\$58,106	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$359,774	\$359,774		\$213,552	\$243,741	\$146,222	
Consultants	0	123,874		0	0	0	
Services & Supplies	63,883	63,883	0	27,870	26,143	36,013	
Operating Transfers Out	0	0		0	0	0	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$423,657	\$547,531	\$0	\$241,422	\$269,883	\$182,235	

Revenue less Expenses
 August 2014 Fiscal YTD

(\$92,764)	(\$216,638)
-------------------	--------------------

\$31,365	\$369,968	(\$124,129)
-----------------	------------------	--------------------

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 115 - Zone 2A - San Antonio Non-O&M - Appropriation Unit WRA005
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$92,107	\$92,107
Development & Other fees	35,000	35,000
Royalties	200,271	200,271
Hydroelectric Revenue	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	66,575	66,575
Inter-fund transfer revenue	0	0
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Insurance Reimbursement	0	0
Total Revenue	\$393,953	\$393,953

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$92,107	\$139,417	\$0	Taxes are received Dec & Apr
12,200	13,882	22,800	
0	0	200,271	Royalties to be received in June
0	0	0	
49,061	27,896	17,514	
0	101,738	0	
0	0	0	
275,260	0	(275,260)	
\$428,628	\$282,933	(\$34,675)	\$0

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$489,052	\$489,052		\$280,969	\$207,487	\$208,083	
Consultants	20,400	147,599	29,668	10,332	0	10,068	
Services & Supplies	12,506	12,506	0	1,028	1,529	11,478	
Operating Transfers Out	0	0		0	0	0	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$521,958	\$649,157	\$29,668	\$292,329	\$209,016	\$229,629	

August 2014 Fiscal YTD	(\$128,005)	(\$255,204)	\$136,299	\$73,918	(\$264,304)
-------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------

P 38

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 116-OPTN - Zone 2C - Dam Operations - Appropriation Unit WRA006
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Assessments	\$2,931,478	\$2,931,478
Annexation Fes	0	0
Grants	0	0
Reimbursement from County	0	0
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	4,500	4,500
Inter-fund transfer revenue	0	0
Total Revenue	\$2,935,978	\$2,935,978

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$1,950,390	\$1,920,598	\$981,088	Assessments are received Dec & Apr
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	198,657	0	
0	0	0	
3,555	1,188	945	
0	0	0	
\$1,953,945	\$2,120,442	\$982,033	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$2,057,918	\$2,057,918		\$1,424,841	\$1,322,589	\$633,077	
Consultants	307,500	432,046	152,708	839,519	310,576	(532,019)	
Services & Supplies	318,287	321,287	47,650	55,794	171,234	262,493	
ALERT charges from Fund 113	226,895	226,895		93,897	83,401	132,998	
Fixed Assets	270,000	270,000	0	0	0	270,000	
Operating Transfers Out	0	0		0	0	0	
August 2014 Fiscal YTD	\$3,180,600	\$3,308,146	\$200,358	\$2,414,050	\$1,887,800	\$766,549	

Revenue less Expenses	(\$244,622)	(\$372,168)	(\$460,105)	\$232,642	\$215,484
------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	------------------	------------------

P 39

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 116-ADMN - Zone 2C Administration - Appropriation Unit WRA006
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Assessments	\$345,556	\$345,556
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Total Revenue	\$345,556	\$345,556

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$223,558	\$222,846	\$121,998	Assessments are received Dec & Apr
0	0	0	
\$223,558	\$222,846	\$121,998	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$49,586	\$49,586		\$4,263	\$88,319	\$45,323	
Consultants	225,000	225,000	55,000	0	0	225,000	
Services & Supplies	5,000	5,000	0	5,906	497	(906)	
Settlement costs	66,621	66,621		66,621	66,621	(0)	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$346,207	\$346,207	\$55,000	\$76,790	\$155,436	\$269,417	

Revenue less Expenses	(\$651)	(\$651)	\$146,768	\$67,409	(\$147,419)
------------------------------	----------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------

P 40

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 122 - Zone 9 - Reclamation Ditch - Appropriation Unit WRA012
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
Ad Valorem taxes	\$291,327	\$291,327	\$181,505	\$173,969	\$109,822	Taxes are received Dec & Apr
Assessments	1,058,852	1,058,852	669,926	644,521	388,926	Assessments are received Dec & Apr
Impact fee	0	0	0	0	0	
Interest, Rent, & Other	5,500	5,500	3,662	2,241	1,838	
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Revenue	\$1,355,679	\$1,355,679	\$855,094	\$820,732	\$500,585	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$951,889	\$951,889		\$478,749	\$650,327	\$473,140	
Consultants	18,000	107,893	0	50	32,627	17,950	
Services & Supplies	360,695	360,695	11,008	173,468	129,403	187,227	
ALERT charges from Fund 113	9,198	9,198		3,807	3,381	5,391	
Fixed Assets	9,000	9,000	0	38,240	0	(29,240)	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$1,348,782	\$1,438,675	\$11,008	\$694,314	\$815,738	\$654,469	

Revenue less Expenses	\$6,897	(\$82,996)	\$160,780	\$4,994	(\$153,883)
------------------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------	----------------	--------------------

P41

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 130 - Hydroelectric Plant O&M - Appropriation Unit WRA022
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
Hydroelectric Revenue	\$85,000	\$85,000	\$34,146	\$24,089	\$50,854	
Interest, Rent, & Other	1,000	1,000	1,709	1,624	(709)	
Operating Transfers In	0	0	0	0	0	
Insurance Reimbursement	0	0	0	1,013,849	0	
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Revenue	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$35,856	\$1,039,563	\$50,144	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$218,068	\$218,068		\$8,539	\$33,111	\$209,529	
Consultants	21,000	154,919	17,398	6,647	5,907	14,353	
Services & Supplies	47,275	47,275	6,941	34,773	25,521	12,502	
Fixed Assets	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$286,343	\$420,262	\$24,339	\$49,960	\$64,539	\$236,383	

Revenue less Expenses	(\$200,343)	(\$334,262)	(\$14,104)	\$975,024	(\$186,239)
------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------	------------------	--------------------

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 133 - SVWP Debt Revenue Fund - Appropriation Unit WRA027
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$992,859	\$992,859
Assessments	1,130,145	1,130,145
Hydroelectric Revenue	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	11,200	11,200
Total Revenue	\$2,134,204	\$2,134,204

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$426,803	\$105,596	\$566,056	Taxes are received Dec & Apr
724,010	728,953	406,135	Assessments are received Dec & Apr
2,465	14,365	(2,465)	
77,482	97,030	(66,282)	
\$1,230,761	\$945,944	\$903,443	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	
Services & Supplies	\$4,600	\$4,600		\$1,900	\$2,402	\$2,700	
Debt payments	2,138,094	2,138,094		1,412,529	1,342,229	725,565	Transfer of funds to JPA for SVWP bond pmt
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$2,142,694	\$2,142,694	\$0	\$1,414,429	\$1,344,631	\$728,265	
Revenue less Expenses	(\$8,490)	(\$8,490)		(\$183,669)	(\$398,687)	\$175,178	

P 43

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fund 134 - Salinas River Diversion Facility O&M - Appropriation Unit WRA028
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Water Delivery Revenue	\$1,542,905	\$1,542,905
Grants	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	0	0
Operating Transfers In	0	0
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Total Revenue	\$1,542,905	\$1,542,905

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$623,539	\$864,273	\$919,366	Now being received by WRA. - 1st quarter reconciliation received by MRWPCA and awaiting payment
0	0	0	
329,587	3,874	(329,587)	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
\$953,126	\$868,147	\$589,779	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$582,531	\$582,531		\$48,248	\$143,772	\$534,283	
Consultants	96,208	228,702	8,498	49,766	703,249	46,442	
Services & Supplies	33,685	33,685	8,500	37,180	261,096	(3,495)	
Fixed Assets	0	0		0	0	0	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$712,424	\$844,918	\$16,998	\$135,193	\$1,108,117	\$577,231	

Revenue less Expenses	\$830,481	\$697,987	\$817,933	(\$239,969)	\$12,548
------------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------

P 44

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Funds 119, 131,132 & 303 - Zones 2B, 2Y & 2Z - Combined CSIP/SVRP Funds
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$0	\$0
Assessments	7,455,928	7,455,928
Water Delivery Revenue	128,083	128,083
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Interest, Rent, & Other	632,380	632,380
Settlement revenue	0	0
Insurance reimbursement	0	0
Total Revenue	\$8,216,391	\$8,216,391

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Revenue	Remarks
\$0	\$0	\$0	
4,482,746	4,439,881	2,973,182	Assessments are received Dec & Apr Now being received by WRA. - 1st quarter reconciliation not received by MRWPCA
51,238	225,666	76,845	
0	0	0	
17,138	10,331	615,242	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
\$4,551,122	\$4,675,878	\$3,665,269	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD Expenses	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$968,065	\$968,065		\$211,029	\$231,716	\$757,036	
Consultants	4,277,336	5,019,500	0	2,393,668	3,233,203	1,883,668	
Services & Supplies	187,383	187,383	1,069	326,023	(52,864)	(138,640)	
Fixed Assets	0	0	0	39,753	27,414	(39,753)	
Debt payments	3,678,532	3,678,532		0	0	3,678,532	USBR loan payments will be paid in March
Operating Transfers Out	600,000	600,000		0	0	600,000	
August 2014 Fiscal YTD	\$9,711,316	\$10,453,480	\$1,069	\$2,970,472	\$3,439,469	\$6,740,844	

Revenue less Expenses	(\$1,494,925)	(\$2,237,089)	\$1,580,650	\$1,236,410	#####
------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------

P45

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Total Minor Funds
January, 2016 Fiscal YTD
Actual vs Budget**

<u>Revenue</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget
Ad Valorem taxes	\$182,211	\$182,211
Assessments	193,609	193,609
Interest, Rent, & Other	3,831	3,831
Interfund transfer	0	0
Cal-Am Reimbursement	0	0
Total Revenue	\$379,651	\$379,651

YTD Revenue	Prior Year YTD Revenue	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD	Remarks
\$108,367	\$103,944	\$73,844	Taxes are received Dec & Apr
110,261	115,928	83,348	Assessments are received Dec & Apr
6,298	2,180	(2,467)	
0	0		
0	0	0	
\$224,925.85	\$222,052	\$154,725	

<u>Expenses & Encumbrance Balances</u>	FY 2015-16 Approved Budget	FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget	YTD PO Balances	YTD Expenses	Prior Year YTD Expenses	Variance Approved Budget vs YTD	Remarks
Labor cost charges from Fund 111	\$551,934	\$551,934		\$131,060	\$123,740	\$420,874	
Consultants	1,530	162,870	0	0	0	1,530	
Services & Supplies	40,291	40,291	2,238	27,827	42,009	12,464	
ALERT charges from Fund 113	30,661	30,661		12,689	11,270	17,972	
Fixed Assets	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Expenses & encumbrance balances	\$624,416	\$785,756	\$2,238	\$171,576	\$177,019	\$452,840	

Revenue less Expenses	(\$244,765)	(\$406,105)		\$53,350	\$45,033	(\$298,115)	
------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------	--

**Purchase Orders/Contracts in Excess of \$500.00
opened for the month of February, 2016
and credit card purchases over \$500.00 in February 2016**

CONSENT

Vendor Description	PO/Contract	Zone	Amount
EPC Consultants Program Management Services for the Tunnel Project Jan-16	DO0000010801	2C	55,734.74
Armstrong Productions Reformatting of BOD meeting recordings to publish to website	DO0000010785	ADM	5,500.00
Coastal Conservation and Research Inc. Purchase Order for FY 15-16 for willow tree plantings and evaluation along the Salinas River	DO0000010836	SRDF	1,700.00
JDH Corrosion Consultants, Inc. For the testing and evaluation of CSIP and SRDF corrosion protection systems	DO0000010761	CSIP/SRDF	36,235.00
Schenberger, Taylor, McCormick and Jecker For appraisal services for property owned by the Agency at Lake Nacimiento	SC0000004917	2C	22,000.00
Don Chapin Company For temporary repairs at the Moss Landing Tide Gates	SC0000004925	17	99,000.00
	Total	6	220,169.74

**Purchase Orders/Contracts in Excess of \$500.00
opened for the month of February, 2016
and credit card purchases over \$500.00 in February 2016**

CONSENT

Vendor Description	PO/Contract	Zone	Amount
Credit Card Purchases, February 2016			
Quinn Rental Service Dump Truck Rental for the Rec Ditch		9	4,843.58
SIMMS Fishing Products Waders for employee use		CW	507.42
Fisher Scientific Calibration of Water Quality Instrument		SRDF	696.87
MY Chevrolet Vehicle Repairs and Maintenance		ADM	500.00
Orchard Supply Hardware Materials for San Antonio Project		2C	729.71
Rain for Rent 10" Pipe Rental for CSIP		CSIP	6,308.77
Elkhorn Slough Foundation GIS Training		ADM	500.00
HILTI Inc. Anchor Rods for San Antonio Dam		2C	774.38
	Total	8	14,860.73

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
FY 15-16 Consultants
Feb-16

	Fund	Zone	FY 14-15 Expenditures	FY 15-16 Budget	FY 15-16 YTD Expenditures/Obligations	Document Number
RJA	111	Administration	7,000.00	7,650.00	7,000.00	SC*4635
Legal	111	Administration	59,579.36	255,000.00	200,000.00	DO*9716
Viasyn	111	Administration	8,397.89			
Management Partners	111	Administration	7,500.00		9,900.00	SC*4856
JAMS Arbitration	111	Administration	1,660.24			
KCs reporting	111	Administration	5,096.25			
Armstrong Productions	111	Administration		7,650.00	5,500.00	DO *10785
Fund 111 Total			89,233.74	270,300.00	222,400.00	-
Bill Phillips	112	Zone 1 & 1A	6,260.48			
Fund 112 Total			6,260.48	-	-	-
One Rain	113	Countywide	6,480.00	10,200.00	6,480.00	DO*10156
Specialized Helicopters	113	Countywide	1,410.00		4,000.00	DO*10385
Fund 113 Total			7,890.00	10,200.00	10,480.00	-
FishBio	115	Zone 2A	-	20,400.00	40,000.00	DO*10468
Fund 115 Total			-	20,400.00	40,000.00	-
USGS	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M	173,525.00	118,500.00	116,150.00	SC*4687
AECOM	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M	31,059.72	38,000.00	49,450.00	
Hagar	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M	16,974.64	19,000.00		
Yoshimaru	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M		10,000.00		
Greenline	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M		2,000.00	15,940.00	DO*9730
Dam Safety Report	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M	8,814.28	20,000.00		
Low Level Outlet	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M		100,000.00		
URS	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M	29,799.42			
EPC	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M	579,620.56		265,905.54	DO*10031,*10158, 10359, 10414
LUX Environmental	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M			31,810.00	SC*4585
Obermeyer Hydro	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M			27,716.00	DO*10047
Techno Coatings, Inc	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M			544,458.30	EPO*765
Industrial Machine Shop	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M			19,101.39	DO*9660
Safety Center, Inc.	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M			9,990.00	SC*4853
Burke, Williams & Sorensen LLP	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M			20,000.00	DO*10534
Schenberger, Taylor, McCormick & Jecker	116-O&M	Zone 2C O&M			22,000.00	SC*4917
Fund 116 O&M Total			839,793.62	307,500.00	1,100,521.23	-
Assessments Consultant	116-ADMIN	Zone 2C Admin		75,000.00		

Monterey County Water Resources Agency
FY 15-16 Consultants
Feb-16

	Fund	Zone	FY 14-15 Expenditures	FY 15-16 Budget	FY 15-16 YTD Expenditures/Obligations	Document Number
Legal	116-ADMIN	Zone 2C Admin	12,540.89	150,000.00	67,540.89	DO*9716
Fund 116 Admin Total			12,540.89	225,000.00	67,540.89	-
Legal	122	Zone 9		8,000.00		
Carr Lake	122	Zone 9	50,235.94	10,000.00		
Industrial Machine Shop	122	Zone 9			7,274.84	DO*9660
Fund 122 Total			50,235.94	18,000.00	7,274.84	-
USGS	125	Zone 14		1,530.00		
Fund 125 Total			-	1,530.00	-	-
Don Chapin Company	127	Zone 17			99,000.00	SC*4925
Fund 127 Total			99,000.00	-	99,000.00	-
Viasyn	130	Naci Hydro Plant	8,296.55	21,000.00	24,253.01	DO*9507
BBMS	130	Naci Hydro Plant	3,002.75			
PowerPros	130	Naci Hydro Plant	567.00			
Fund 130 Total			110,866.30	21,000.00	123,253.01	-
Industrial Machine Shop	131	Zone 2Y			6,416.55	DO*9660
MRWPCA	131	Zone 2Y	1,311,674.00	1,661,203.00	910,601.50	
Salinas Pump	131	Zone 2Y	177,887.76	150,000.00	39,752.65	DO*10302
Rain for Rent	131	Zone 2Y			41,000.00	LPO*1553
JDH Corrosion Consultants	131	Zone 2Y			36,235.00	DO* 10761
Fund 131 Total			1,489,561.76	1,811,203.00	1,034,005.70	-
MRWPCA	132	Zone 2Z	1,902,779.00	2,466,133.00	1,233,066.50	
Fund 132 Total			1,902,779.00	2,466,133.00	1,233,066.50	-
MRWPCA	134	SRDF	599,338.00	75,808.00	37,904.00	
Willoughby - Legal	134	SRDF	399,640.00	20,400.00	120,000.00	SC*4730
Coastal Conservation Res.	134	SRDF	4,300.00	1,700.00	1,700.00	DO*10836
Obermeyer Hydro	134	SRDF			7,500.00	DO*10047
Fund 134 Total			1,003,278.00	97,908.00	167,104.00	-
Agency Total			\$ 5,512,439.73	\$ 5,249,174.00	\$ 4,104,646.17	

Document Legend:
SC (Service Contract) = award document within the system that procures professional services through an agreement that can extend more than one fiscal year.

Monterey County Water Resources Agency

FY 15-16 Consultants

Feb-16

	Fund	Zone	FY 14-15 Expenditures	FY 15-16 Budget	FY 15-16 YTD Expenditures/Obligations	Document Number
<p>DO (Delivery Order) = award document within the system for procuring professional services against a Master Agreement.</p> <p>LPO (Lease Purchase Order) = award document within the system that encumbers funds for Capital Leases (both operating and capital)</p> <p>EPO (Emergency Purchase Order) = award document within the system that encumbers funds for good associated with an identified emergency.</p>						

**MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS-FINANCE COMMITTEE**

MEETING DATE:	March 11, 2016	AGENDA ITEM:	
AGENDA TITLE:	Receive an update on the FY 2016-17 DRAFT Budget and Inter-Lake Tunnel and Spillway Modification Costs.		
Consent ()		Action ()	
Information (X)			
SUBMITTED BY:	Cathy Paladini	PREPARED BY:	Cathy Paladini
PHONE:	831-755-4860	PHONE:	831-755-4860
DEADLINE FOR BOARD ACTION:		March 11, 2016	

RECOMMENDED BOARD ACTION:

Receive an update on the FY 2016-17 DRAFT Budget and Inter-Lake Tunnel and Spillway Modification Costs.

SUMMARY/DISCUSSION:

At the February Finance Committee meeting on February 19, 2016, the Committee Board members requested an update on the FY 2016-17 DRAFT Budget. Revenue is estimated to be \$20,770,519 and estimated expenditures at \$22,443,528. The Agency is estimating hydro-electric revenues to be \$60,000 while the hydro-electric plant remains shut down due to low reservoir conditions. The Agency continues to work on grants, but amounts and receive dates have not been confirmed. With regards to expenditures, the Agency continues to work on unbudgeted mandates such as GSA/SIGMA planning, 11043 permit requirements, and Salinas River Lagoon permitting requirements. In addition, the Agency still carries the burden of unfunded work associated with the Salinas Valley Water Project such as fish monitoring and other biological opinion work associated with the Salinas River Diversion Facility permit for operations. With all these mandates and no new sources of revenue, the Agency is forced to reduce vacant funded positions from 48 funded positions to 38 funded positions leaving the total number of unfunded positions from 5 to 10. Even with these severe cuts, the Agency must still cut approximately \$1.5 million in expenditures to align with ongoing revenues. The Agency's Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund 303 is estimated to remain at \$1,200,000 assuming the \$500,000 for the Pajaro River Project is reimbursed timely and the \$800,000 for a rapid response team is spent during fiscal year 2015-16.

The Monterey Regional Pollution Control Agency's (MRWPCA) Fiscal Year 2016-17 requested budget of \$6,436,574 is a \$451,726 increase over last year's requested budget of \$5,984,848. As of last week, the two Agencies agreed to reduce the budget by approximately \$300,000 and continue to work together to find more ways to reduce it by another \$150,000 before March 28, 2016.

At the Board of Directors February 29, 2016 meeting, the Agency was requested to report on the total labor costs expended on the Inter-Lake Tunnel and Spillway Modification project. As of February 19, 2016, the Agency has spent a total of \$175,069.25 in labor – see Inter-lake Tunnel Staff Hours Summary attached to this report. In addition, I have attached a summary of the

Interlake Tunnel & Spillway Modification reimbursable costs as of February 2016.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

There were no other Agencies involved in preparing this report.

FINANCING:

There is no financial impact in receiving this report.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:	YES () NO (x)
FUNDING SOURCE:	Agency Budget Update
COMMITTEE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:	N/A
ATTACHMENTS:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FY 2016-17 DRAFT Budget Summary by Fund 2. FY 2016-17 Personnel & Salaries 3. Inter-Lake Tunnel & Spillway Modification Staff hours 4. Inter-Lake Tunnel & Spillway Modification Reimbursable Costs
APPROVED:	<hr style="width: 80%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"/> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; width: 80%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"> General Manager Date </div>

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Interlake Tunnel Staff Hours Summary
As of 02/19/16**

Employee	Reg Hrs Total Charge	
900087101 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - PRELIMINARY ENGI		
CRIOLLO GERMAN E	329.00	39,225.41
DEMERS, JASON	207.00	22,925.29
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	102.00	16,595.76
WOODROW, AMY	8.50	802.36
JUAREZ, SHAUNNA L	181.50	16,678.67
LEAL, CLAYTON C.	1.00	69.11
MOSS CHRISTOPHER M	72.50	8,980.42
QUEZADA MANUEL L	76.00	10,662.63
RAMIREZ, ELISE C	199.50	15,053.52
ROITZ, JOHN	5.00	307.44
SHEPHERD, THOMAS J	13.00	2,340.00
900087102 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - OVERSIGHT		
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	121.00	18,102.53
KRAFFT, ELIZABETH	174.00	22,606.11
SHEPHERD, THOMAS J	4.00	720.00
Total	1,494.00	175,069.25

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Interlake Tunnel Staff Hours FY 15-16 YTD**

Employee	Reg Hrs Total Charge	
900087101 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - PRELIMINARY ENGI		
JUAREZ, SHAUNNA L	28.50	3,888.67
QUEZADA MANUEL L	40.00	6,893.36
CRIOLLO GERMAN E	50.50	7,374.99
SHEPHERD, THOMAS J	13.00	2,340.00
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	16.00	2,984.17
DEMERS, JASON	2.00	248.23
RAMIREZ, ELISE C	20.50	2,385.37
900087102 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - OVERSIGHT		
KRAFFT, ELIZABETH	52.00	9,063.97
SHEPHERD, THOMAS J	4.00	720.00
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	11.00	2,018.00
<hr/> Total	237.50	37,916.76

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Interlake Tunnel Staff Hours FY 14-15**

Employee	Reg Hrs Total Charge	
900087101 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - PRELIMINARY ENGI		
JUAREZ, SHAUNNA L	153.00	12,790.00
QUEZADA MANUEL L	36.00	3,769.27
CRIOLLO GERMAN E	240.50	26,193.08
MOSS CHRISTOPHER M	70.50	8,604.21
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	66.00	9,849.51
DEMERS, JASON	133.00	13,603.92
ROITZ, JOHN	5.00	307.44
WOODROW, AMY	8.50	802.36
LEAL, CLAYTON C.	1.00	69.11
RAMIREZ, ELISE C	179.00	12,668.15
900087102 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - OVERSIGHT		
KRAFFT, ELIZABETH	115.00	12,286.94
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	98.00	13,827.28
Total	1,105.50	114,771.27

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Interlake Tunnel Staff Hours FY 13-14**

Employee	Reg Hrs	Total Charge
900087101 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - PRELIMINARY ENGI		
CRIOLLO GERMAN E	38.00	5,657.34
MOSS CHRISTOPHER M	2.00	376.21
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	20.00	3,762.08
DEMERS, JASON	72.00	9,073.14
900087102 PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - OVERSIGHT		
KRAFFT, ELIZABETH	7.00	1,255.20
FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	12.00	2,257.25
Total	151.00	22,381.22

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Revenue Breakdown**

	FY 15-16	FY 16-17
Revenues:	Total	Total
Ad Valorum Taxes	1,983,692	2,119,001
Permits & Fees	128,979	130,859
Flood Control Assessments	4,925,409	5,023,918
Recycling Project Assessments	7,455,928	7,455,928
SVWP Construcion & Bond Assessments	1,130,145	1,152,748
Development Fees	326,000	332,520
Water Delivery Charge	1,670,988	1,670,988
Royalties	200,271	200,271
Hydroelectric Power Revenue	85,000	60,000
Interest & Rent Income	186,386	179,407
Other Revenue	11,027	11,034
Operating Transfers in from Agency Funds	2,738,094	2,433,845
	20,841,919	20,770,519

PERSONNEL AND SALARIES

<u>CLASSIFICATION / DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>CODE</u>	FY 2015-16		FY 2016-17	
		<u>APPROVED BUDGET</u>	<u>PRELIMINARY BUDGET</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
<u>FUNDED POSITIONS</u>					
Accountant III	20B12	1	83,537	1	89,467
Accounting Technician	80J30	1	55,138	1	53,229
Administration Services Assistant	14C70	1	84,845	1	79,649
Assistant Water Maintenance Superintendent	74J22	2	135,228	2	135,228
Associate Water Resources Engineer	41E21	2	189,115	2	196,456
Associate Water Resources Hydrologist	41C14	2	159,758	3	303,931
Chief of Water Resources Planning	14K22	1	119,889	0	0
Department Info Systems Manager I	16F40	1	109,883	1	109,883
Deputy General Manager - Water Resources Agency	12C36	2	364,398	2	317,318
Engineering Aide II	43A21	1	51,169	1	51,169
Finance Manager II	20B93	1	112,698	1	112,698
General Manager - Water Resources Agency	11A15	1	209,126	1	209,126
Hydroelectric Technician	74F23	1	65,985	1	65,985
Office Assistant III	80E22	1	45,381	0	0
Senior Account Clerk	80J22	1	48,905	1	48,905
Senior Secretary	80A32	1	53,520	1	53,520
Senior Water Maintenance Worker	74J21	2	109,337	2	118,410
Senior Water Resources Engineer	41E30	3	374,795	2	251,872
Senior Water Resources Hydrologist	41C17	2	251,872	2	251,872
Water Maintenance Superintendent	74C01	1	26,167	1	84,315
Water Maintenance Worker I	74J01	1	48,247	1	48,247
Water Maintenance Worker II	74J11	4	178,137	2	100,967
Water Resources Biologist	41C20	1	73,147	0	0
Water Resources Engineer	41E11	3	198,815	2	177,615
Water Resources Hydrologist	41C02	6	535,599	4	354,186
Water Resources Technician	43B03	3	218,539	3	209,183
SALARIES AND PERSONNEL SUBTOTAL		46	3,903,230	38	3,423,231
 SALARY ADJUSTMENTS:					
Estimated vacation buybacks			102,000		102,000
Cell Phone Allowance			14,820		15,480
Termination Benefits			100,000		100,000
Estimated Temporarily Vacant Positions			0		0
SALARY ADJUSTMENTS SUBTOTAL			216,820		217,480
SALARIES AND PERSONNEL TOTAL		46.0	\$4,120,050	38.0	\$3,640,711
 <u>APPROVED POSITIONS NOT FUNDED</u>					
Associate Water Resources Hydrologist		1		0	
Office Assistant III		0		1	
Senior Water Maintenance Worker		1		1	
Senior Water Resources Hydrologist		1		1	
Water Maintenance Worker II		0		2	
Water Resources Biologist		0		1	
Water Resources Engineer		1		2	
Water Resources Hydrologist		0		2	
TOTAL NOT FUNDED		4.0		10.0	
TOTAL APPROVED POSITIONS		50		48	

**Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Fiscal Year 2016-17
Budget Summary by Fund**

Fund	Zone	Estimated Beginning Fund Balance	Estimated Appropriations	Estimated Revenue	Estimated Ending Fund Balance	Difference Revenue minus Appropriations
111	Admin	38,679	0	0	38,679	0
112	1	35,057	496,031	420,601	(40,373)	(75,430)
113	Cntywde	21,900	736,964	631,654	(83,410)	(105,310)
114	2	152,442	501,961	394,690	45,171	(107,271)
115	2A	158,136	1,128,672	421,434	(549,102)	(707,238)
116	2COPTN	229,643	3,091,736	2,994,608	132,515	(97,128)
116	CAMP	1,631	0	0	1,631	0
116	2CADMN	681,721	289,471	352,467	744,717	62,996
117	3	49,723	31,977	35,161	52,907	3,184
118	5	32,677	39,903	40,474	33,248	571
119	6	251,926	350,219	333,778	235,485	(16,441)
120	7	24,134	64	4,625	28,695	4,561
121	8	37,453	71,266	71,435	37,622	169
122	9	665,247	1,358,240	1,382,683	689,690	24,443
123	11	157,315	22,597	57,631	192,349	35,034
124	12	32,788	35,394	36,875	34,269	1,481
125	14	776	1,592	1,771	955	179
126	15	59,023	19,549	5,544	45,018	(14,005)
127	17	191,775	180,449	108,789	120,115	(71,660)
128	StrmDrain	155,436	9,773	20,569	166,232	10,796
129	GnzlsSlgh	1,240	8,185	4,303	(2,642)	(3,882)
130	Hydro	178,422	139,323	61,000	100,099	(78,323)
131	CSIP	1,179,000	2,821,277	2,164,412	522,135	(656,865)
132	SVRP	1,601,915	4,414,253	3,561,201	748,863	(853,052)
133	SVWP Revenue	3,528,551	2,137,845	2,137,846	3,528,552	1
134	SRDF	2,530,254	586,945	1,542,905	3,486,214	955,960
303	CSIP Debt Svc	1,776,400	1,835,779	1,850,000	1,790,621	14,221
313	SVWP Debt Svc	0	2,134,063	2,134,063	0	0
425	MRWP Const	10,940	0	0	10,940	0
Totals		13,784,204	22,443,528	20,770,519	12,111,195	(1,673,009)

Assoc Hydrologist Applied Labor Costs - FY 2015-16 Budget

Salary (Hourly rate x 2080)	\$107,583
Sub-total Reg Employee earnings (6111)	107,583
PERS (15.900%) (6121) (Salary x 0.15900)	17,106
Medicare (6122)(Salary x 0.0145)	1,560
FICA (6131) (Salary x 0.0620)	6,670
Fringe Vision (6147)	108
Fringe Dental (6145)	480
Fringe Medical - Non elective (6141)	1,476
Flex benefit - Non-elective	11,148
Mgmt Exp Allowance (Only for X unit members)	552
Physicals	50
Prof Exp Allow	400
OPEB (25010.09/42.50)	588
Life Insurance (6142)	144
Short Term Disability	48
Long Term Disability (6143)	336
Unemployment Insurance (6757.68/42.50)	159
Workers Compensation Insurance (60284/42.50)	1,418
Fringe Employee Assistance Prog (6171)	24
Wellness Plan (3396/42.50)	80
Sub-total Benefit Costs	42,348
Salaries & Benefits Employee Costs	149,931
Overhead costs (Salary / Total Agency Salaries) x 111 costs	
Pro rated Fund 111 Estimated costs	60,982
Total Cost	210,913
Productive Hours	1,680
Hourly Productive rate for total costs (TL Cost/Productive hrs)	\$125.54
(Allocated overhead costs)	40.7%

Senior Hydrologist Applied Labor Costs - FY 2015-16 Budget

Salary	\$128,949
Sub-total Reg Employee earnings (6111)	128,949
Cell Phone Stipend	1,320
PERS (15.900%) (6121)	20,503
Medicare (6122)	1,870
FICA (6131)	7,347
Fringe Vision (6147)	108
Fringe Dental (6145)	480
Flex benefit - Non-elective	1,476
Flex benefit - EO	11,148
Mgmt Exp Allow	552
Physicals	50
Prof Exp Allow	400
OPEB	588
Life Insurance (6142)	144
Short Term Disability	48
Long Term Disability (6143)	336
Unemployment Insurance	159
Workers Compensation Insurance	1,418
Fringe Employee Assistance Prog (6171)	24
Wellness Plan	80
Sub-total Benefit Costs	48,051
Salaries & Benefits Employee Costs	177,000
Overhead costs	
Pro rated Fund 111 Estimate costs	73,093
Total Cost	250,094
Productive Hours	1,624
Hourly Productive rate for total costs (TL Cost / Productive hrs)	\$154.00
(Allocated overhead costs)	41.3%

**County of Monterey
Water Resources Agency
Cost Accounting Management System
Timecard Distribution Multi-Year**

*Summary Report by Project (W/ Lead Elmnts), Employee No
Run Date: 03/03/2016 01:58:05pm By: CSS
Fiscal Year: 2014*

Selection Criteria

Select Project

111-930-9000-900087101, 111-930-9000-900087102

	Pay Period Date	Invoice	Reg Hrs	O/T Hrs	Reg Lbr Chg	O/T Lbr Chg	Labor Charge	Fringe/Non-Prod	Ovrhd Charge	Total Charge
111	(Project (W/ Lead Elmnts)) FUND: ADMINISTRATION									
930	BUDGET UNIT: WATER RESOURCES MANAGED DISTRICT									
9000	PROGRAM: ADMINISTRATION & OVERHEAD									
900087101	PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - PRELIMINARY ENGI									
12669		CRIOLLO GERMAN E	38.00	0.00	4,154.61	0.00	4,154.61	0.00	1,502.73	5,657.34
15444		MOSS CHRISTOPHER M	2.00	0.00	276.28	0.00	276.28	0.00	99.93	376.21
17805		FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	20.00	0.00	2,762.78	0.00	2,762.78	0.00	999.30	3,762.08
20856		DEMERS, JASON	72.00	0.00	6,663.09	0.00	6,663.09	0.00	2,410.05	9,073.14
*		900087101 Subtotal	132.00	0.00	13,856.76	0.00	13,856.76	0.00	5,012.01	18,868.77
900087102	PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - OVERSIGHT									
13736		KRAFFT, ELIZABETH	7.00	0.00	921.79	0.00	921.79	0.00	333.41	1,255.20
17805		FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	12.00	0.00	1,657.67	0.00	1,657.67	0.00	599.58	2,257.25
*		900087102 Subtotal	19.00	0.00	2,579.46	0.00	2,579.46	0.00	932.99	3,512.45
**		9000 Subtotal	151.00	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	5,945.00	22,381.22
***		930 Subtotal	151.00	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	5,945.00	22,381.22
****		111 Subtotal	151.00	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	5,945.00	22,381.22
*****		Grand Total	151.00	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	16,436.22	0.00	5,945.00	22,381.22

**County of Monterey
Water Resources Agency
Cost Accounting Management System
Timecard Distribution Multi-Year**

*Summary Report by Project (W/ Lead Elmnts), Employee No
Run Date: 03/03/2016 01:56:28pm By: CSS
Fiscal Year: 2015*

Selection Criteria

Select Project

111-930-9000-900087101, 111-930-9000-900087102

	Pay Period Date	Invoice	Reg Hrs	O/T Hrs	Reg Lbr Chg	O/T Lbr Chg	Labor Charge	Fringe/Non-Prod	Ovrhd Charge	Total Charge
111	(Project (W/ Lead Elmnts)) FUND: ADMINISTRATION									
930	BUDGET UNIT: WATER RESOURCES MANAGED DISTRICT									
9000	PROGRAM: ADMINISTRATION & OVERHEAD									
900087101	PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - PRELIMINARY ENGI									
10282		JUAREZ, SHAUNNA L	153.00	0.00	12,790.00	0.00	12,790.00	0.00	0.00	12,790.00
11487		QUEZADA MANUEL L	36.00	0.00	3,769.27	0.00	3,769.27	0.00	0.00	3,769.27
12669		CRIOLLO GERMAN E	240.50	0.00	23,796.61	0.00	23,796.61	0.00	2,396.47	26,193.08
15444		MOSS CHRISTOPHER M	70.50	0.00	8,604.21	0.00	8,604.21	0.00	0.00	8,604.21
17805		FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	66.00	0.00	8,941.14	0.00	8,941.14	0.00	908.37	9,849.51
20856		DEMERS, JASON	133.00	0.00	12,067.49	0.00	12,067.49	0.00	1,536.43	13,603.92
21387		ROITZ, JOHN	5.00	0.00	307.44	0.00	307.44	0.00	0.00	307.44
23312		GAGNE, AMY	8.50	0.00	802.36	0.00	802.36	0.00	0.00	802.36
32549		LEAL, CLAYTON C.	1.00	0.00	69.11	0.00	69.11	0.00	0.00	69.11
33607		RAMIREZ, ELISE C	179.00	0.00	12,668.15	0.00	12,668.15	0.00	0.00	12,668.15
* 900087101		Subtotal	892.50	0.00	83,815.78	0.00	83,815.78	0.00	4,841.27	88,657.05
900087102	PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - OVERSIGHT									
13736		KRAFPT, ELIZABETH	115.00	0.00	12,238.83	0.00	12,238.83	0.00	48.11	12,286.94
17805		FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	98.00	0.00	12,515.20	0.00	12,515.20	0.00	1,312.08	13,827.28
* 900087102		Subtotal	213.00	0.00	24,754.03	0.00	24,754.03	0.00	1,360.19	26,114.22
** 9000		Subtotal	1,105.50	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	6,201.46	114,771.27
*** 930		Subtotal	1,105.50	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	6,201.46	114,771.27
**** 111		Subtotal	1,105.50	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	6,201.46	114,771.27
*****		Grand Total	1,105.50	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	108,569.81	0.00	6,201.46	114,771.27

**County of Monterey
Water Resources Agency
Cost Accounting Management System
Timecard Distribution Multi-Year**

*Summary Report by Project (W/ Lead Elmnts), Employee No
Run Date: 03/03/2016 01:50:58pm By: CSS
Fiscal Year: 2016*

Selection Criteria

Select Project

111-930-9000-900087101, 111-930-9000-900087102

	<u>Pay Period Date</u>	<u>Invoice</u>	<u>Reg Hrs</u>	<u>O/T Hrs</u>	<u>Reg Lbr Chg</u>	<u>O/T Lbr Chg</u>	<u>Labor Charge</u>	<u>Fringe/Non-Prod</u>	<u>Ovrhd Charge</u>	<u>Total Charge</u>
111	(Project (W/ Lead Elmnts)) FUND: ADMINISTRATION									
930	BUDGET UNIT: WATER RESOURCES MANAGED DISTRICT									
9000	PROGRAM: ADMINISTRATION & OVERHEAD									
900087101	PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - PRELIMINARY ENGI									
10282		JUAREZ, SHAUNNA L	28.50	0.00	2,786.88	0.00	2,786.88	0.00	1,101.79	3,888.67
11487		QUEZADA MANUEL L	40.00	0.00	4,940.24	0.00	4,940.24	0.00	1,953.12	6,893.36
12669		CRIOLLO GERMAN E	50.50	0.00	5,295.79	0.00	5,295.79	0.00	2,079.20	7,374.99
17020		SHEPHERD, THOMAS J	13.00	0.00	1,677.00	0.00	1,677.00	0.00	663.00	2,340.00
17805		FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	16.00	0.00	2,152.51	0.00	2,152.51	0.00	831.66	2,984.17
20856		DEMERS, JASON	2.00	0.00	177.90	0.00	177.90	0.00	70.33	248.23
33607		RAMIREZ, ELISE C	20.50	0.00	1,709.52	0.00	1,709.52	0.00	675.85	2,385.37
* 900087101		Subtotal	170.50	0.00	18,739.84	0.00	18,739.84	0.00	7,374.95	26,114.79
900087102	PROJECT NO.: INTERLAKE TUNNEL - OVERSIGHT									
13736		KRAFFT, ELIZABETH	52.00	0.00	6,497.50	0.00	6,497.50	0.00	2,566.47	9,063.97
17020		SHEPHERD, THOMAS J	4.00	0.00	516.00	0.00	516.00	0.00	204.00	720.00
17805		FRANKLIN, HOWARD B	11.00	0.00	1,446.22	0.00	1,446.22	0.00	571.78	2,018.00
* 900087102		Subtotal	67.00	0.00	8,459.72	0.00	8,459.72	0.00	3,342.25	11,801.97
** 9000		Subtotal	237.50	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	10,717.20	37,916.76
*** 930		Subtotal	237.50	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	10,717.20	37,916.76
**** 111		Subtotal	237.50	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	10,717.20	37,916.76
*****		Grand Total	237.50	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	27,199.56	0.00	10,717.20	37,916.76

Interlake Tunnel Project Reimbursement

MYA*1397

EPC	Consultants	Total	Reimbursement from County		
			Amount Reimbursed	Date Reimbursed	IET #
\$ 515,559.92	\$ 405,764.13	\$ 921,324.05	\$ 847,131.09		

P75

