

Western Riverside Council of Governments Administration & Finance Committee

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 10, 2017 12:00 p.m.

County of Riverside
Administrative Center
4080 Lemon Street
5th Floor, Conference Room C
Riverside, CA 92501

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if special assistance is needed to participate in the Administration & Finance Committee meeting, please contact WRCOG at (951) 955-8320. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to meeting time will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility at the meeting. In compliance with Government Code Section 54957.5, agenda materials distributed within 72 hours prior to the meeting which are public records relating to an open session agenda item will be available for inspection by members of the public prior to the meeting at 4080 Lemon Street, 3rd Floor, Riverside, CA, 92501.

The Administration & Finance Committee may take any action on any item listed on the agenda, regardless of the Requested Action.

1. CALL TO ORDER (Ben Benoit, Chair)

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

At this time members of the public can address the Administration & Finance Committee regarding any items listed on this agenda. Members of the public will have an opportunity to speak on agendized items at the time the item is called for discussion. No action may be taken on items not listed on the agenda unless authorized by law. Whenever possible, lengthy testimony should be presented to the Committee in writing and only pertinent points presented orally.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

All items listed under the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and may be enacted by one motion. Prior to the motion to consider any action by the Committee, any public comments on any of the Consent Items will be heard. There will be no separate action unless members of the Committee request specific items be removed from the Consent Calendar.

	Α.	Committee meeting are available for consideration.					
		Requested Action:	1.	Approve the Summary Minutes from the April 12, 2017, Administration & Finance Committee meeting.			
	В.	Finance Department	t Activi	ities Update	P. 9		
		Requested Action:	1.	Receive and file.			
	C.	Financial Report su	mmary	through March 2017	P. 11		
		Requested Action:	1.	Receive and file.			
4.	REP	ORTS / DISCUSSION	1				
	A.	Final draft Fiscal Ye	ar 2017	7/2018 Agency Budget	P. 17		
		Requested Action:	1.	Recommend that the Executive Committee approve the W final draft Budget for Fiscal Year 2017/2018, substantially a form.			
	В.	BEYOND Framewor	k Fund	Round II Funding Awards	P. 59		
		Requested Actions:	1. 2.	Discuss and provide a recommendation for which BEYON application(s) to fund and at what amount. Discuss and provide a recommendation for which BEYON application(s) to fund and at what amount.			
	C.	Transportation Unifo	orm Mi	tigation Fee (TUMF) Program Nexus Study Update	P. 85		
		Requested Action:	1.	Discuss and provide input regarding comments on the drain Study.	ft Nexus		
	D.	Update on WRCOG	Agenc	y office relocation	P. 101		
		Requested Action:	1.	Discuss and provide direction on the Agency office relocat	ion.		
5.	ITEM	IS FOR FUTURE AG	ENDA	S Members			
		pers are invited to sugg nistration & Finance Co		ditional items to be brought forward for discussion at future e meetings.			
6.	GEN	ERAL ANNOUNCEM	IENTS	Members			
		pers are invited to anno ance Committee.	unce ite	ems / activities which may be of general interest to the Admi	nistration		
7.	CLO	SED SESSION					

A. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR PURSUANT TO SECTION 54957.6

Agency Representative: Committee Chair or designee

Unrepresented Employee: Executive Director

B. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 54957

Title: Executive Director

8. **NEXT MEETING:** The next Administration & Finance Committee meeting is scheduled for

Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 12:00 p.m., in the County of Riverside

Administrative Center, 5th Floor, Conference Room C.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Page Wientiough Film Blank

Banking Stranger Str

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Administration & Finance Committee (Committee) was called to order at 12:07 p.m. by Chair Ben Benoit, at the County of Riverside Administrative Center, 5th Floor, Conference Room C.

Members present:

Debbie Franklin, City of Banning
Eugene Montanez, City of Corona
Bonnie Wright, City of Hemet
Laura Roughton, City of Jurupa Valley
Brian Tisdale, City of Lake Elsinore
Kelly Seyarto, City of Murrieta
Ben Benoit, City of Wildomar (Chair)
Chuck Washington, County of Riverside District 3
Marion Ashley, County of Riverside District 5
Brenda Dennstedt, Western Municipal Water District (12:30 p.m. departure)

Staff present:

Steve DeBaun, Legal Counsel, Best Best & Krieger
Rick Bishop, Executive Director
Ernie Reyna, Chief Financial Officer
Barbara Spoonhour, Director of Energy & Environmental Programs
Jennifer Ward, Director of Government Relations
Christopher Gray, Director of Transportation
Tyler Masters, Program Manager
Andrew Ruiz, Program Manager
Crystal Adams, Program Manager
Janis Leonard, Executive Assistant

Guests present:

Warren Diven, Best Best & Krieger Ryan Baron, Best Best & Krieger Paul Granillo, Inland Empire Economic Partnership Juan Lopez, Inland Empire Economic Partnership Arnold San Miguel, Southern California Association of Governments

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

<u>3. CONSENT CALENDAR</u> – (Seyarto/Franklin) 10 yes; 0 no; 0 abstention. Items 3.A through 3.H were approved by a unanimous vote of those members present. The City of Temecula was not present.

A. Summary Minutes from the March 8, 2017, Administration & Finance Committee meeting are available for consideration.

<u>Action</u>: 1. Approved the Summary Minutes of the March 8, 2017, Administration & Finance Committee meeting.

B. Finance Department Activities Update

Action: 1. Received report.

C. Financial Report Summary through February 2017

This item was pulled for discussion by Committee member Laura Roughton, who asked about the TUMF commercial service revenue and the Agency fringe benefits expenditures, as well as bank fees and communications computer service fees.

Ernie Reyna responded that many of these are addressed in Item Number 3.E, the 3rd quarter Budget amendment. The communications computer service fees are a result of increases in the County IT fees; the rates ended up higher than initially anticipated. There was an increase in bank fees due to additional investments at Citizens Trust.

Christopher Gray added that the change in TUMF commercial service revenue is due to more TUMF in commercial than originally projected.

Action: 1. Received report.

D. Single Signature Authority Report

Action: 1. Received report.

E. 3rd Quarter draft Budget amendment for Fiscal Year 2016/2017

This item was pulled for discussion by Committee member Laura Roughton, who asked about the overall increase in the Energy Department, which is noted to be offset by future PACE revenues. It is not called out in the Environmental Department where the expenditure increase of \$9,712 is coming from.

Ernie Reyna responded that the additional increase amount is for radio and television advertisements, as well as salaries, which is being offset by additional revenues from several different line items.

Action: 1. Recommended that the Executive Committee approve the 3rd Quarter draft Budget amendment for Fiscal Year 2016/2017.

F. Selection of Financial Auditors

Action: 1. Approved Rogers, Anderson, Malody, and Scott, LLP, to conduct financial auditing services for WRCOG in an amount not to exceed \$25,000 for Fiscal Year 2016/2017 and \$76,510 (total) through Fiscal Year 2018/2019.

G. Consideration of revised Agency Investment Policy

Action:

1. Recommended the WRCOG Executive Committee adopt WRCOG Resolution
Number 11-17; A Resolution of the Executive Committee of the Western
Riverside Council of Governments adopting a revised Investment Policy.

H. Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Program Activities Update

Action: 1. Received report

4. REPORTS/DISCUSSION

A. Continued Membership in the Inland Empire Economic Partnership

Rick Bishop reported that this Committee discussed this matter a few months ago and favored continued membership, but requested a presentation by IEEP.

Paul Granillo reported that the IEEP has been around for over 30 years. The IEEP strives to bring together the region's leadership to deal with matters that affect the economy, health, well-being, and quality of life in the Inland Empire, which consists of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties exclusively. This region's average educational level is baccalaureate, which is a major concern for IEEP.

IEEP is comprised of the larger employers of the region, e.g., Amazon, Loma Linda Health, Cardenas markets, and Coca Cola, to name a few. The Growing Inland Achieving Initiative was created by the IEEP Education Council. IEEP sought and received a \$5 million award from the Governor's Office. An innovation economy cannot be built on only 20% of the regions' residents having a baccalaureate degree. IEEP has a Business Council, consisting of the regions' major employers, and Education Council, and a Healthcare Council. The combined weight of the IEEP is what helps to move issues along.

Committee member Debbie Franklin asked how many students in total go through the UC and private school systems in the Inland Empire.

Mr. Granillo responded that 6% of this region's young adults are entering the UC and/or private school systems.

Committee member Kelly Seyarto asked about the IEEP's goal to increase academic expectations for all students K-12, and if this is concerning the curriculum or the expectation that the students attend college.

Mr. Granillo responded that part of that is the A–G curriculum. Students are told that if they take the A–G curriculum that they are automatically accepted into the CalState or UC system.

Committee member Seyarto asked if this is in addition to the IB / AP system.

Mr. Granillo indicated that of the 56 school districts in the Inland Empire, approximately 19 are chronically failing.

Committee member Seyarto indicated that kids are burning out and dropping out of school because of the high expectations being put on them to go to college, and does not understand how to help the kids by making things harder than they already are.

Mr. Granillo indicated that to be at the state level, the region needs to produce double the number of baccalaureate degrees.

Committee member Chuck Washington indicated that the Murrieta and Temecula School Districts are typically ranked in the top three in the County. Yet conversations with Superintendents a few years ago indicate that the number of students that met the A–G requirements was at approximately 35%. The point today is to get kids on the pathway so that upon graduation they have met the minimum requirements to get into the CalState or UC systems. At the very least we can do better at preparing them for college. Many kids decide to attend a community college, and then go on to a 4-year university; the transfer rate is approximately 10%, and this is an area we are weak in. This, in addition to health, is a marker for what this region is not achieving what it wants to achieve.

Mr. Granillo indicated that every student in the state of California is eligible for a certain amount of financial aid; they must complete a FAFSA, which takes approximately 2.5 hours. When kids are not completing the FAFSA, they are missing out on opportunities. If cities are concerned about graduation rates, creating FAFSA completion programs can help affect that.

Committee member Dennstedt indicated that she has attended three FAFSA workshops and they were not helpful. Committee member Dennstedt indicated that her child was an IB graduate, who is now attending Northern Arizona University, and received three academic scholarships because of her graduation status. She did not stay in California because another institute provided the scholarships.

Mr. Granillo indicated that companies will not locate in this region because of the low baccalaureate attainment. Those students who go elsewhere to achieve a baccalaureate will not return to this region because there are no innovation jobs.

There is a Silicon Valley leadership group similar to the IEEP which starts 5,000 innovation start-ups. To qualify, the business must have five full employees and make \$500,000 annually. It would be surprising if the Inland Empire is creating 50 innovation start-ups.

Committee member Debbie Franklin indicated that she works with a program which aims to get more kids thinking about college, but the question is how to change the conversation at the dinner table. Does the IEEP have a program that will address this?

Mr. Granillo responded that there are a lot of programs within IEEP on this matter. The closer the program is to the community the better the chances at accomplishing this. IEEP would like WRCOG to have a place on the Board of Directors for the Growing Inland Achieving Initiative to tie in the cities.

Mr. Bishop indicated that there are different levels of membership. WRCOG currently holds a position on the Board of Directors; this is where WRCOG can be most impactful.

Committee member Laura Roughton thought there was some concern that WRCOG had not been super involved, the actual mission was unclear, and that there was not enough staff time to continue to be involved.

Mr. Bishop indicated that if he cannot attend a Board meeting, Ernie Reyna attends on his behalf. IEEP's mission aligns with the six initiatives the WRCOG Executive Committee has prioritized for WRCOG.

Action: 1. Recommended to the Executive Committee to authorize WRCOG to renew membership in the Inland Empire Economic Partnership for 2017.

(Ashley/Tisdale) 10 yes; 0 no; 0 abstention. Item 4.A was approved by a unanimous vote of those members present. The City of Temecula was not present.

B. 26th Annual General Assembly & Leadership Address

Jennifer Ward reported that Robert Gates, former Secretary of Defense, has been secured as this year's guest speaker.

Staff received seven nominations for this year's Community Service Award. Regardless who or how many awardees are chosen, all awardees will be recognized at the event, and the winners will be presented awards on stage.

Nominees included John J. Benoit, Estella Cline, Diana Fox, Linda Krupa, Rose Mayes, Sonja Ramos, and Randy Record.

Committee member Laura Roughton nominated Diana Fox.

Committee member Debbie Franklin nominated Rose Mayes.

Committee member Marion Ashley nominated Randy Record.

Committee member Debbie Franklin suggested a special award for John Benoit. The Committee concurred.

Committee member Brenda Dennstedt suggested one award for non-profit, and one for public.

Chuck Washington nominated Randy Record for the public side and Rose Mayes for the non-profit side.

Action: 1. Recommended that the recipients:

- 1. John J. Benoit be recognized with a Lifetime Achievement Award, to be accepted by his wife and family.
- 2. Rose Mayes be recognized with an Award for Outstanding Community Service in the private / non-profit sector.
- 3. Randy Record be recognized with an Award for Outstanding Community Service in the public sector.

(Washington/Franklin) 9 yes; 1 no; 0 abstention. Item 4.B was approved by a unanimous vote of those members present. The City of Jurupa Valley opposed. The City of Temecula was not present.

C. Fiscal Year 2015/2016 Financial Audit

Ernie Reyna reported that WRCOG again received an unmodified opinion, the highest form of auditor assurance, on the completion of the Fiscal Year 2015/2016 financial audit. WRCOG will also be receiving the Government Finance Officers Association Award for the fourth straight year in a row.

There were two findings in the audit. One was a TUMF liability; an amount staff listed was higher than what the auditors suggested should be, and was based on a remaining amount in the Transportation Improvement Plan. The auditors asked staff to list the liability amount based upon what the member jurisdictions' Finance Directors asked WRCOG to accrue. This was a difference in accounting type. Corrective action includes utilizing the numbers provided by the Finance Directors going forward.

The second finding was an investment policy issue. Citizens Trust purchased a medium-term note from a utility company that ended up being a Japanese company, even though it had holdings within the United States. Per WRCOG's investment policy, there cannot be any foreign investments in the investment pool. As a correction, Public Financial Management is overseeing WRCOG investments and is preparing a revised Investment Policy.

Action: 1. Received report.

D. PACE Programs Activities Update

Barbara Spoonhour reported that the PACE Ad Hoc Committee met to discuss the addition of seismic retrofit projects to both the residential and commercial PACE Programs, development of an SB 555 Program, and eligible improvements.

SB 602 was enacted in 2015, which allows PACE Programs to include seismic retrofit as an eligible improvement. The Ad Hoc Committee was in favor of staff developing a seismic retrofit program. The Cities of Berkeley and Los Angeles have asked WRCOG to incorporate seismic retrofits into the PACE Program. The City of Los Angeles would join the California HERO Program for this reason.

Staff still needs to outline specific items that would qualify as seismic retrofit eligible. Other PACE Programs allow seismic retrofits; however, no seismic retrofit projects have yet to be funded. The Executive Committee will be required to adopt a resolution of intention modifying the Program report

and, if interested, cities would have to take action to amend existing resolutions and implementation agreements with WRCOG.

Ygrene operates an SB 555 Program, which is a Community Facilities District Program. Ygrene has asked WRCOG to develop an SB 555 Program in which Ygrene can operate under WRCOG. Ygrene has the option to operate under an AB 811 Program, but has not done so to date. The cost and timeline to prepare and implement an SB 555 Program was one of the contributing factors for the Ad Hoc Committee to recommend that WRCOG not pursue an SB 555 Program. If Ygrene would like to operate within WRCOG's subregion, it would be much faster for Ygrene to do so under WRCOG's current AB 811 Program.

CaliforniaFIRST has requested that additional eligible products be added to the Program Report, such as dishwashers, refrigerators, freezers, washing machines, dryers, etc. These are products which staff and the Ad Hoc Committee feels are not within the spirit of the Program in that these products are not permanently affixed to a property. The requested products are already included in the CSCDA Programs. The Ad Hoc Committee is recommending to not add the appliances.

Action:

- 1. Recommended that the Executive Committee amend the PACE Program Report to include seismic retrofit products for residential and commercial properties.
- 2. Recommended to the Executive Committee that WRCOG not proceed with establishing an SB 555 Program.
- 3. Recommended that the Executive Committee not include the proposed eligible products in the PACE Program Report.

(Franklin/Seyarto) 10 yes; 0 no; 0 abstention. Item 4.B was approved by a unanimous vote of those members present. The City of Temecula was not present.

E. Community Choice Aggregation Program Activities Update

Barbara Spoonhour reported that the CCA Ad Hoc Committee met earlier today to discuss geographical boundaries, governance, and staffing.

Rick Bishop indicated that this Committee had previously expressed the desire for staff to focus on the size of a CCA; preferably a Riverside County CCA, or something smaller like a Western Riverside County CCA. In conversations with staff from the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), that Agency will be seeking a CCA for that subregion only. The San Bernardino Council of Governments' (SBCOG) is not moving forward with being involved in the formation of a CCA as a Council of Government entity. There was no specific direction given by its Board, therefore the item died from lack of a second to the motion. This leaves the door open for jurisdictions to join another entity's CCA.

This Committee also indicated that it desired WRCOG be involved in the CCA staffing in some capacity. Staff is recommending that the CCA being formed for Western Riverside County be a separate Joint Powers Authority from WRCOG. The staffing arrangement would like the arrangement WRCOG currently has with the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency, in that that Agency is a separate entity, yet WRCOG provides the oversight and management thereof. This same model staff is recommending with a CCA. This would provide initial upfront cost savings in that staff already exists, and the CCA, being its own entity, could decide whether or not it would want to continue that type of relationship with WRCOG.

Not knowing how the implementation of a CCA will play out, staff is recommending the hiring of a CCA Director, who could then determine a staffing level and make those hires. The Director would serve in an At Will capacity.

Committee member Brenda Dennstedt indicated that the staff report referenced a \$130,000 feasibility study and asked for clarification.

Ms. Spoonhour responded that that was the cost of the feasibility study, which showed that moving forward with the creation of a CCA is favorable. The cost was shared amongst WRCOG, SBCOG, and CVAG.

Committee member Dennstedt asked if a customer survey will be prepared to seek customer interest in joining the CCA.

Ms. Spoonhour reposed that for those jurisdictions which choose to join the CCA, those city councils are required to take action to do so. WRCOG staff would have to ensure the consumers are aware that they would automatically join the CCA, and would have to opt-out if they wanted to remain with their current service provider, Southern California Edison (SCE). There is no cost to the consumer to opt-out. SCE will most likely require those customers who opt-out to remain with SCE for one year. If, within that year, SCE's rates increase, the customer will have to stay with SCE and pay those higher rates until the one year is up.

Rick Bishop indicated that within the Request For Proposals was an community outreach requirement. Mr. Bishop, Ms. Spoonhour, and another staff member will be traveling to Marin and Sonoma Counties to shadow those CCA's staff in their daily operations.

Committee member Dennstedt asked if staff have visited any of the local utilities, e.g. City of Riverside, to ask what their own pitfalls have been.

Ms. Spoonhour responded that the City of Riverside is a municipal utility, and a CCA is a hybrid utility since SCE will still control and operate distribution lines, controls the maintenance, and processes the billings. The CCA customer will continue to receive an SCE bill. Rate comparison will be required by the CCA once per year.

Committee member Dennstedt asked what the impact is on care customers.

Ms. Spoonhour responded that any incentives SCE currently provides, so will the CCA. The only change that will occur is the purchase of power.

Action:

- 1. Recommended that the Executive Committee direct the Executive Director to move forward with the development of a Community Choice Aggregation Program for the Western Riverside subregion, leaving the door open for neighboring jurisdictions to join the Program.
- 2. Received report on the draft Joint Powers Agreement.
- 3. Recommended that the Executive Committee direct the Executive Director to hire a Community Choice Aggregation Director.

(Tisdale/Seyarto) 8 yes; 0 no; 2 abstentions. Item 4.B was approved by a unanimous vote of those members present. The Cites of Banning and Corona abstained. The City of Temecula was not present.

F. Draft Fiscal Year 2017/2018 Agency Budget

Ernie Reyna reported that there are four departments within the budget structure; General Fund, Energy, Environment, and Transportation. Each department has its own programs.

New this year, transfers will occur for programs paying overhead, and a transfer into the General Fund, which will help to mitigate that negative amount that has been seen in the past for overhead. Total anticipated revenues in addition to transfers total \$6.3 million; total anticipated expenditures total \$5.6 million.

It is anticipated that the PACE Programs will bring in approximately \$10.1 million and provide \$4.7 million in carryover revenue. Total revenues are projected to be \$16.3 million; total anticipated expenditures are \$16.2 million.

The Environmental Department is expected to be a wash with \$372,000 in both revenues and expenditures.

Transportation Department revenues are anticipated to be \$42.6 million, against total expenditures of \$42.2 million.

Overall Agency revenues are projected to be \$64.9 million and provide a balanced budget with expenditures at \$64.4 million

Action: 1. Received report.

G. Nominations for WRCOG Chair, Vice-Chair, and 2nd Vice-Chair positions for Fiscal Year 2017/2018

Rick Bishop reported that this Committee serves as the nominating Committee for leadership positions.

Action: 1. Recommended the following individuals:

Chair: Debbie Franklin, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Banning Vice-Chair: Chuck Washington, Supervisor, District 3, County of Riverside

(Ashley/Roughton) 10 yes; 0 no; 0 abstention. Approved by a unanimous vote of those members present. The City of Temecula was not present.

2nd Vice-Chair: Bonnie Wright, Councilmember, City of Hemet

(Franklin/Seyarto) 10 yes; 0 no; 0 abstention. Approved by a unanimous vote of those members present. The City of Temecula was not present.

5. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

There were no items requested for future agendas.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no general announcements.

7. CLOSED SESSION

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed to the May meeting.

8. NEXT MEETING: The next Administration & Finance Committee meeting is scheduled for

Wednesday, May 10, 2017, at 12:00 p.m., in the Riverside County

Administrative Center, 5th Floor, Conference Room C.

9. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting of the Administration & Finance Committee adjourned at 1:15 p.m.



Western Riverside Council of Governments Administration & Finance Committee

Staff Report

Subject: Finance Department Activities Update

Contact: Ernie Reyna, Chief Financial Officer, reyna@wrcog.cog.ca.us, (951) 955-8432

Date: May 10, 2017

The purpose of this item is to provide an update on the upcoming financial audit of Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/2017, as well as the fourth quarter FY 2016/2017 budget amendment, and the FY 2017/2018 budget development process.

Requested Action:

1. Receive and file.

Financial Audit

FY 2016/2017 is quickly coming to an end and the newly engaged auditors from Rogers, Anderson, Malody, & Scott will be in the WRCOG offices soon to begin the upcoming financial audit. The audit will begin with Interim testing, which will include testing of payroll, accounts payable invoices, and personnel files. The Interim audit is scheduled for the week of June 5, 2017. The auditors are anticipated to return for Final Fieldwork the week of August 28, 2017, and conclude their audit in the months of September and October 2017. The final Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) will be issued no later than November 15, 2017, and presented at the December 2017 Administration & Finance Committee, with the Executive Committee receiving the report at its January 2018 meeting.

Budget Amendment

June 30, 2017, will mark the end of the fourth quarter and Fiscal Year 2016/2017, and the Administration & Finance Committee will be presented with an amendment report at its July 12, 2017, meeting. It is also anticipated that the Technical Advisory Committee will consider the amendment report at its July 20, 2017, meeting, and the Executive Committee will consider the report at its August 7, 2017, meeting.

FY 2016/2017 Budget Development Process

Staff is currently preparing the FY 2017/2018 Agency Budget (see Agenda Item Number 4.A). Upon completing the draft budget, presentation to and review by WRCOG's Committees is scheduled as follows (the General Assembly approves the final Agency Budget in June):

March 23, 2017: Finance Directors' Committee (first review)

April 12, 2017: Administration & Finance Committee (first review)

April 20, 2017: Technical Advisory Committee (first review)

May 1, 2017: Executive Committee (first review)

May 10, 2017: Administration & Finance Committee (second review)

May 18, 2017: Technical Advisory Committee (second review)

June 5, 2017: Executive Committee (second review)

June 22, 2017: General Assembly

Prior Actions:

May 1, 2017: The Executive Committee received report.

April 20, 2017: The Technical Advisory Committee received report.

Fiscal Impact:

This item is informational only; therefore, there is no fiscal impact.

Attachment:

None.



Western Riverside Council of Governments Administration & Finance Committee

Staff Report

Subject: Financial Report summary through March 2017

Contact: Ernie Reyna, Chief Financial Officer, reyna@wrcog.cog.ca.us, (951) 955-8432

Date: May 10, 2017

The purpose of this item is to provide a monthly summary of WRCOG's financial statements in the form of combined Agency revenues and costs.

Requested Action:

Receive and file.

Attached for Committee review is the Financial Report summary through March 2017.

Prior Action:

May 1, 2017: The Executive Committee received report.

April 20, 2017: The Technical Advisory Committee received report.

Fiscal Impact:

This item is informational only; therefore there is no fiscal impact.

Attachment:

1. Financial Report summary – March 2017.

Page hiteritionally left Blank

Item 3.C

Financial Report summary through March 2017

Attachment 1

Financial Report summary – March 2017

Page Wite Hiordly Lett Blank

Western Riverside Council of Governments Monthly Budget to Actuals For the Month Ending March 31, 2017

		Approved 6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 3/31/2017 Actual	Remaining 6/30/2017 Budget
	Revenues			
40001	Member Dues	309,410	306,410	3,000
42001	Other Revenue	-	4,050	(4,050)
42004	General Assembly	300,000	5,000	295,000
40601	WRCOG HERO	1,963,735	989,707	974,028
40603	CA HERO	7,615,461	5,020,989	2,594,472
40605	The Gas Company Partnership	62,000	58,654	3,346
40606	SCE WRELP	4,692	77,698	(73,006)
40607	WRCOG HERO Commercial	27,500	13,404	14,096
40609	SCE Phase III	10,643	10,634	9
40611	WRCOG HERO Recording Revenue	335,555	216,630	118,925
40612	CA HERO Recording Revenue	1,301,300	1,004,385	296,915
40614	Active Transportation	200,000	50,254	149,746
41201	Solid Waste	107,915	98,415	9,500
41401	Used Oil Opportunity Grants	290,227	264,320	25,907
41402	Air Quality-Clean Cities	228,000	161,750	66,250
40616	CCA Revenue	247,950	102,095	145,855
40617	Energy Admin Revenue	31,678	30,000	1,678
41701	LTF	701,300	701,250	50
43001	Commercial/Service - Admin (4%)	37,074	47,176	(10,102)
43002	Retail - Admin (4%)	142,224	83,425	58,799
43003	Industrial - Admin 4%)	128,446	145,867	(17,421)
43004	Residential/Multi/Single - Admin (4%)	1,067,271	569,560	497,711
43005	Multi-Family - Admin (4%)	224,983	90,294	134,689
43001	Commercial/Service \	889,786	1,132,504	(242,718)
43002	Retail	3,413,375	2,002,198	1,411,177
43003	Industrial	3,082,710	3,500,813	(418,103)
43004	Residential/Multi/Single	25,614,514	13,669,166	11,945,348
43005	Multi-Family	5,399,595	2,167,048	3,232,547
	Total Revenues	61,237,078	32,524,040	28,513,727
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	1,981,159	1,692,124	289,035
61000	Fringe Benefits	578,219	434,156	144,063
	Total Wages and Benefits	2,619,378	2,126,280	493,098
	General Operations			
63000	Overhead Allocation	1,520,636	1,160,494	360,142
65101	General Legal Services	450,949	510,069	(59,120)
65401	Audit Fees	25,000	23,879	1,121
65505	Bank Fees	25,500	115,751	(90,251)
65507	Commissioners Per Diem	46,950	40,050	6,900
73001	Office Lease	145,000	113,701	31,299
73003	WRCOG Auto Fuels Expense	678	399	279
73004	WRCOG Auto Maint Expense	33	33	0
73101	Special Mail Srvcs	1,500	1,028	472
73101	Parking Validations	3,755	3,710	45
73104	Staff Recognition	1,200	632	568
73107	Event Support	185,980	86,066	99,914
73107	General Supplies	21,021	13,428	7,593
73100	Computer Supplies	8,937	4,920	4,017
73110	Computer Software	13,705	24,396	(10,691)
- · ·	1 - · · · - · · - · · ·	,	,	(-,/

Western Riverside Council of Governments Monthly Budget to Actuals For the Month Ending March 31, 2017

		Approved 6/30/2017	Thru 3/31/2017	Remaining 6/30/2017
		Budget	Actual	Budget
73111	Rent/Lease Equipment	25,000	25,320	(320)
73113	Membership Dues	21,364	21,091	273
73114	Subcriptions/Publications	8,539	16,700	(8,161)
73115	Meeting Support/Services	14,809	7,577	7,232
73116	Postage	5,708	2,814	2,894
73117	Other Household Expenditures	2,523	5,240	(2,717)
73118	COG Partnership Agreement	40,000	17,772	22,228
73119	Storage	16,000	3,175	12,825
73122	Computer Hardware	4,000	337	3,663
73126	EV Charging Equipment	49,605	49,605	0
73201	Communications-Regular	2,000	1,763	237
73203	Communications-Long Distance	1,200	170	1,030
73204	Communications-Cellular	11,802	8,978	2,824
73206	Communications-Comp Sv	18,271	49,253	(30,982)
73209	Communications-Web Site	15,600	1,324	14,276
73301	Equipment Maintenance - General	7,070	11,499	(4,429)
73302	Equipment Maintenance - Computers	8,151	25,445	(17,294)
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	73,220	73,725	(505)
73407	WRCOG Auto Insurance	1,570	1,294	276
73502	County RCIT	2,500	787	1,713
73506	CA HERO Recording Fee	1,636,855	975,042	661,813
73601	Seminars/Conferences	23,035	12,390	10,646
73605	General Assembly	300,000	2,394	297,606
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	21,920	12,419	9,501
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	8,779	3,464	5,315
73613	Travel - Airfare	22,837	12,474	10,363
73620	Lodging	19,016	9,175	9,841
73630	Meals	10,633	6,830	3,803
73640	Other Incidentals	14,888	9,435	5,453
73650	Training	12,200	919	11,281
73703	Supplies/Materials	41,851	300	41,551
73704	Newspaper Ads	21,863	10,700	11,163
73706	Radio & TV Ads	44,853	51,333	(6,480)
XXXXX	TUMF Projects	38,399,980	40,604,306	(2,204,326)
85101	Consulting Labor	3,497,028	2,237,895	1,259,133
85102	Consulting Expenses	245,000	4,577	240,423
85180	BEYOND Expenditures	2,023,000	274,366	1,748,634
90101	Computer Equipment/Software	31,500	21,227	10,273
90501	Office Improvements	100,000	(1,181,809)	1,281,809
97005	Benefits Transfer Out	-	(439,386)	439,386
97001	Operating Transfer Out	(1,518,136)	(1,033,406)	(484,730)
0.00.	operating transfer out	(1,010,100)	(1,000,100)	(101,100)
	Total General Operations	56,198,774	44,017,070	12,181,704
Tota	al Expenditures	58,818,152	46,143,350	12,674,802

Emil Regna



Western Riverside Council of Governments Administration & Finance Committee

Staff Report

Subject: Final draft Fiscal Year 2017/2018 Agency Budget

Contact: Ernie Reyna, Chief Financial Officer, reyna@wrcog.cog.ca.us, (951) 955-8432

Date: May 10, 2017

The purpose of this item is to provide members of the Administration & Finance Committee with minor updates to the final draft Budget for Fiscal Year 2017/2018 and request that the Committee recommend that the Executive Committee approve the final draft.

Requested Action:

1. Recommend that the Executive Committee approve the WRCOG final draft Budget for Fiscal Year 2017/2018, substantially as to form.

Update

Staff has presented the draft Budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/2018 through WRCOG's Committee structure, and will now begin to present the draft Budget for a second time according to the below schedule. Based on discussions and comments from both staff and the Committees, the following are highlights to the revisions made to the draft Budget since the first round.

First, the Transportation Department will be adding additional funding for 3rd party litigation. This amount is for claims against third parties due to negligent / intentional acts based on a prior lawsuit WRCOG was involved in.

The second revision adds to the Budget a Community Choice Aggregation Director, based on direction/authority given to staff at the last Administration & Finance Committee meeting.

Budget

WRCOG's annual Budget is adopted every June by the General Assembly. Before the Budget is approved by the General Assembly, it is vetted through WRCOG's Committees for comment and direction. The Budget is assembled by the Agency Departments: General Fund, Energy, Environment, and Transportation. Each Department contains its own programs and has its own source of funds within the accounting system. Once the Budget has been vetted through the Committees, it is presented to the General Assembly as an "Agencywide" Budget.

The final draft Budget for FY 2017/2018 is presented according to the following schedule:

• March 23, 2017: WRCOG Finance Directors' Committee (first review)

April 12, 2017: WRCOG Administration & Finance Committee (first review)
 April 20, 2017: WRCOG Technical Advisory Committee (first review)

May 1, 2017: WRCOG Executive Committee (first review)

May 10, 2017: WRCOG Administration & Finance Committee (second review)

May 18, 2017: WRCOG Technical Advisory Committee (second review)

June 5, 2017: WRCOG Executive Committee (second review)

• June 22, 2017: WRCOG General Assembly

The final draft FY 2017/2018 Budget (attached) is presented by Departments (General Fund, Energy, Environment, and Transportation) with each department displaying its own programs.

The tab labeled "Total General Fund" includes the default Administration Program as well as the Governmental Relations Program. The Administration Program receives its revenues mostly from member dues. Budgeted expenditures include salaries and benefits of those employees charged to Administration, including the Executive Director and the Executive Assistant; the lease WRCOG pays to the County for rent; and audit, bank, legal, and consulting fees to name a few. Expenditures have historically exceeded revenues in this Program so the Agency must charge overhead to the remaining Departments to balance its Budget. The overhead is determined during the creation of the Budget and is simply the amount necessary to have revenues equal expenditures. Departments will show the amount of overhead they are paying in the General Operations line item. The amount provided by the various Departments will then be transferred out to the Administration Program to balance that particular Budget.

The Administration Program has Budgeted funds for an office move, but the status of the move as of the time of this writing is uncertain.

The Governmental Relations Program will continue to fund the BEYOND Program with \$2M in Agency carryover funds, an increase of \$200K from the previous fiscal year. The WRCOG Fellowship Program will also continue into FY 2017/2018 with excess carryover funds from Round I of the Fellowship Program.

The Energy Department includes the following Programs: PACE local (WRCOG), statewide (CA), Spruce, and CaliforniaFirst; the Western Riverside Energy Partnership (WREP); the Regional Streetlight Program; and Community Choice Aggregation. The HERO Program has generated revenues for the Agency over the past couple of years, and it is anticipated that trend will continue into the FY 2017/2018 Budget year.

The Environment Department includes the Solid Waste and Used Oil Programs, which receive state funding to provide services to WRCOG's member agencies. FY 2017/2018 will also be the pilot year for WRCOG's new Litter Program.

The Transportation Department includes the following Programs: Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF); the Active Transportation Plan (ATP); and the Clean Cities Program. The majority of revenues received in the Transportation Department come from the TUMF Program.

The Agency's FY 2017/2018 total Budget will present a higher total amount of revenues and expenditures than in previous years because staff will continue to include total TUMF revenue and total project expenditures in the Budget. In past years, the only portion included for TUMF was the 4% Administration amount WRCOG received from the Program. The revenue and expenditures will continue to include 100% of the TUMF Program's total revenue and expenditures. Because of this additional amount for TUMF, total Agency revenue for FY 2017/2018, plus transfers from other departments for overhead, is projected to be \$65,117,046 against total Agency expenditures of \$65,065,086. The amount of revenue for FY 2017/2018 represents an increase of \$4,258,370, or 7%, against the prior Fiscal year. Expenditures for FY 2017/2018 represents an increase of \$5,029,951, or 8%, against the prior Fiscal year.

Prior Actions:

May 1, 2017: The Executive Committee received report.

April 20, 2017: The Technical Advisory Committee received report.

Fiscal Impact:

All known and expected revenues and expenditures impacting the Agency have been budgeted for Fiscal Year 2017/2018, but will be continually updated throughout the Budget process.

Attachment:

1. Draft summary Agency Budget for Fiscal Year 2017/2018.

Page Intentionally Lett Blank

Item 4.A

Final draft Fiscal Year 2017/2018 Agency Budget

Attachment 1

Draft summary Agency Budget for Fiscal Year 2017/2018

Page Whentionally Lett Blank



DRAFT 5/10/17

WESTERN COUNCIL OF GOV	N RIVERSIDE VERNMENTS	6/30/2017	Thru 2/28/2017	Proposed 6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
R	Revenues			
40001	Member Dues	309,410	306,410	311,410
42004	General Assembly	300,000	500	300,000
40008	BEYOND	1,800,000	1,800,000	2,052,917
40601	WRCOG HERO Residential Revenue	1,963,735	903,078	816,771
40603	CA HERO Residential Revenue	7,615,461	4,573,813	7,639,575
40605	The Gas Company Partnership	62,000	41,031	50,000
40607	SAMAS Commercial Revenue (WRCOG)	25,000	5,649	10,000
40608	Renovate Commercial Revenue (WRCOG)	-	-	5,000
40607	SAMAS Commercial Revenue (Statewide)	2,500	7,755	8,000
40606	SCE WREP Revenue	4,692	77,698	75,000
40610	Renovate Commercial Recording Revenue (WRCC	G) -	-	350
40610	Renovate Commercial Recording Revenue (Statew	ide) -	-	350
40611	WRCOG HERO Residential Recording Revenue	335,555	200,625	182,775
40612	CA HERO Residential Recording Revenue	1,301,300	919,305	1,508,036
40613	SAMAS Commercial Recording Revenue (WRCOG) 1,200	285	350
40613	SAMAS Commercial Recording Revenue (Statewid	e) -	-	350
40618	CA First Residential Revenue	-	-	167,000
40620	Spruce Residential Revenue	-	-	167,000
40621	CA First Residential Recording Revenue	-	-	86,000
40623	Spruce Residential Recording Revenue	-	-	86,000
40613	Regional Streetlights	276,561	-	228,960
41201	Solid Waste	107,915	98,415	117,100
41401	Used Oil Revenue	265,227	240,227	255,000
40614	Active Transportation Revenue	200,000	50,254	150,000
41402	Air Quality-Clean Cities	139,500	139,250	137,500
41701	LTF	701,300	701,250	825,000
43001	Commercial/Service - Admin Portion	37,074	45,953	101,097
43002	Retail - Admin Portion	142,224	54,031	118,867
43003	Industrial - Admin Portion	128,446	113,242	249,133
43004	Residential/Multi/Single - Admin Portion	1,067,271	475,354	1,045,779
43005	Multi-Family - Admin Portion	224,983	58,994	129,787
43001	Commercial/Service - Non-Admin Portion	889,786	1,103,157	2,426,945
43002	Retail - Non-Admin Portion	3,413,375	1,296,736	2,852,820
43003	Industrial - Non-Admin Portion	3,082,710	2,717,816	5,979,195
43004	Residential/Multi/Single - Non-Admin Portion	25,614,514	11,408,214	25,098,070
43005	Multi-Family - Non-Admin Portion	5,399,595	1,415,859	3,114,890
49002	Fund Balance/Carryover	4,009,000	-	6,299,409
	Total Revenues	60,156,962	29,282,933	62,996,435
	Overhead Transfer In			
				1 575 644
	Transfer In from Other Departments Transfer In from CA HERO to Energy Programs			1,575,611 545,000
			-	3-10,000
	Total Revenue and Transfer In			65,117,046



DRAFT 5/10/17

Thru

Proposed

COUNCIL OF GO	VERNMENTS	6/30/2017 Budget	2/28/2017 Actual	6/30/2018 Budget
E	Expenditures			<u> </u>
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	1,971,226	1,264,572	2,593,365
61000	Fringe Benefits	576,636	381,845	745,925
61012	OPEB Expense	60,000	-	60,000
	Total Wages and Benefits	2,607,862	1,646,417	3,399,291
	General Operations			
63000	Overhead Allocation	<u> </u>		
65101	General Legal Services	450,949	481,939	530,233
XXXXX	3rd Party Litigation		-	250,000
65401	Audit Fees	25,000	15,300	27,500
65505	Bank Fees	25,500	19,265	29,000
65507	Commissioners Per Diem	46,950	35,250	62,500
73001	Office Lease	145,000	90,826	360,409
73003	WRCOG Auto Fuel	678	353	750
73004	WRCOG Auto Maintenance	33	33	100
73101	Special Mail Srvcs	1,500	1,028	1,800
73102	Parking Validations	3,755	3,655	4,775
73104	Staff Recognition	1,200	712	1,245
73106	Coffee and Supplies	-	-	160
73107	Event Support	146,133	51,840	112,600
73108	General Supplies	52,753	33,373	66,536
73109	Computer Supplies	10,837	4,768	12,500
73110	Computer Software	13,705	24,272	18,000
73111	Rent/Lease Equipment	25,000	21,695	35,000
73113	Membership Dues	19,864	17,176	31,950
73114	Subcriptions/Publications	10,039	16,356	6,500
73115	Meeting Support/Services	10,271	5,650	12,100
73116	Postage	10,246	2,696	8,155
73117	Other Household Expenditures	2,523	4,764	4,880
73118	COG Partnership Agreement	40,000	17,772	25,000
73119	Storage	5,000	-	1,000
73120	Printing Services	29,947	-	15,000
73121	Public Notices	13,000	-	11,900
73122	Computer Hardware	4,000	337	1,000
73201	Communications-Regular	2,000	559	1,000
73203	Communications-Long Distance	1,200	151	500
73204	Communications-Cellular	11,040	8,009	12,677
73206	Communications-Comp Sv	18,271	42,558	75,000
73209	Communications-Web Site	15,600	1,314	5,600
73301	Equipment Maintenance - General	7,070	10,565	11,000
73302	Equipment Maintenance - Computers	8,151	14,264	25,000
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	73,045	72,845	72,950
73407	WRCOG Auto Insurance	1,570	1,570	1,570
73502	County RIFMIS Charges	2,675	720	1,200
73506	PACE Recording Fees	1,636,855	895,960	1,862,811
73601	Seminars/Conferences	19,562	8,982	24,550
73605	General Assembly Expenditures	303,473	3,317	304,200



DRAFT 5/10/17

WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS		Total Agenty Bauget			
COUNCIL OF GO	VERNMENTS		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
73611	Tra	vel - Mileage Reimbursement	16,002	7,981	15,700
73612	Tra	vel - Ground Transportation	13,337	5,640	13,100
73613	Tra	vel - Airfare	20,012	9,598	28,704
73620	Loc	dging	19,300	4,818	17,850
73630	Me	als	11,042	3,121	10,419
73640	Oth	ner Incidentals	16,981	9,147	13,358
73650	Tra	ining	12,914	1,461	14,321
73703	Su	oplies/Materials	11,850	300	35,117
73704	Ne	wspaper Ads	38,813	-	47,370
73705	Bill	board Ads	15,000	-	9,000
73706	Ra	dio & TV Ads	2,882	-	5,500
73801	Edi	ucation Reimbursement	25,000	-	25,000
85100	Dire	ect Costs	42,353	41,133	51,571
7XXXX		EB Repayment	71,053	-	71,053
85101	Co	nsulting Labor	3,490,284	1,658,778	3,659,928
85102	Co	nsulting Expenses	252,500	3,613	72,865
85160	TU	MF Project Reimbursement	38,399,980	38,858,094	39,000,000
85180	BE	YOND Expenditures	2,023,000	234,186	2,052,917
85185		lowship Expenditures		-	400,000
85190	Wa	iter Task Force Expenditures	744	744	10,000
90101	Co	mputer Equipment Purchases	31,500	24,115	41,204
90301	Off	ice Furniture Purchases	_	-	315,000
90501	Off	ice Improvements		3,276	4,000
97011	Ant	ticipated Carryover Projects (FY 17/18)	5,301,461	-	4,552,556
97012	BE	YOND/GF Projects	1,286,189	-	4,400,000
	Tot	al General Operations	54,446,197	42,825,487	58,895,184
	Overh	ead Transfer Out			
	Tra	Insfer Out from Other Departments to General Fund	1,515,636	1,010,424	2,225,611
		insfer Out from CA HERO to Energy Programs		-	545,000
	Tot	tal Expenditures and Transfer Out	58,569,695	45,482,328	65,065,086

Position	Time Spent
Executive Director	100%
Director of Transportation	100%
Chief Financial Officer	100%
Director of Energy & Environment	100%
Director of Govermental Affairs	100%
Director - CCA	100%
Program Manager- Transportation	100%
Program Manager - Energy	100%
Program Manager - Office*	100%
Program Manager - Fiscal	100%
Program Manager - Energy	100%
Program Manager - Energy	100%
Executive Assistant	100%
Executive Assistant	100%
Staff Analyst II - Fiscal	100%
Staff Analyst I - Environment	100%
Staff Analyst II -TUMF	3 100%



DRAFT 5/10/17

		rotarrigono, Daugot			
WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS				Thru	Proposed
			6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
		_	Budget	Actual	Budget
Sta	ff Analyst II - Energy	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Energy	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Gov't Affairs	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Gov't Affairs	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Streetlights*	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Environment*	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Energy	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Energy	100%			
Sta	ff Analyst I - Office*	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Energy	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Energy	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Call Center	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Call Center	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Call Center	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Call Center	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Call Center	100%			
Sta	ff Technician - Fiscal*	100%			
To be determined if po	sition will be filled.				
•					



DRAFT 5/10/17

	Total General F	6/30/2017	Thru 2/28/2017	Proposed 6/30/2018
	B	Budget	Actual	Budget
10001	Revenues	200 440	200 440	244 440
40001	Member Dues BEYOND	309,410	306,410	311,410
40008		1,800,000	1,800,000	2,052,917
40009 42004	Fellowship General Assembly	400,000	400,000 500	400,000 300,000
49002	Fund Balance/Carryover	300,000	500	1,200,000
43002	Total Revenues	2,809,410	2,508,925	4,264,327
	Overhead Transfer In			
	Transfer In from Other Departments	-		2,225,611
	Total Revenue and Transfer In		=	6,489,938
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	818,380	629,728	962,688
61000	Fringe Benefits	273,111	183,494	313,412
65330	OPEB Expense	60,000	-	60,000
	Total Wages and Benefits	1,151,491	813,222	1,336,100
65101	General Lord Services	60.000	GE 011	77 500
65401	General Legal Services Audit Fees	60,088 25,000	65,911 15,300	77,500 27,500
65505	Bank Fees	3,000	955	2,000
65507	Commissioners Per Diem	45,000	33,300	60,000
73001	Office Lease	145,000	90,826	360,409
73003	WRCOG Auto Fuel	678	353	750
73004	WRCOG Auto Maintenance	33	33	100
73101	Special Mail Srvcs	1,500	1,028	1,800
73102	Parking Validations	855	925	1,475
73104	Staff Recognition	1,000	537	800
73107	Event Support	61,561	33,394	77,000
73108	General Supplies	10,188	5,352	10,200
73109	Computer Supplies	4,437	1,824	2,500
73110	Computer Software	10,705	23,959	15,000
73111	Rent/Lease Equipment	25,000	21,452	35,000
73113	Membership Dues	14,829	15,496	25,750
73114	Subcriptions/Publications	4,864	15,931	5,000
73115	Meeting Support/Services	2,508	2,582	4,400
73116	Postage	2,053	441	1,050
73117	Other Household Expenditures	2,000	2,659	2,000
73119	Storage	5,000	-	1,000
73122	Computer Hardware	2,000	337	1,000
73201	Communications-Regular	2,000	559	1,000

73203	Communications-Long Distance	1,200	151	500
73204	Communications-Cellular	4,177	3,121	5,677
73206	Communications-Comp Sv	18,271	42,558	75,000
73209	Communications-Web Site	10,000	1,314	5,000
73301	Equipment Maintenance - General	5,570	7,445	10,000
73302	Equipment Maintenance - Computers	8,151	14,264	25,000
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	72,250	72,250	72,250
73407	WRCOG Auto Insurance	1,570	1,570	1,570
73502	County RCIT	2,500	545	1,000
73601	Seminars/Conferences	12,500	6,558	11,500
73605	General Assembly	300,000	2,125	300,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	4,859	1,956	4,500
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	2,094	525	2,000
73613	Travel - Airfare	5,300	1,199	5,300
73620	Lodging	6,600	2,992	6,600
73630	Meals	2,900	1,018	2,500
73640	Other Incidentals	1,100	480	1,100
73650	Training	5,600	-	5,600
73801	Education Reimbursement	25,000	-	25,000
7XXXX	OPEB Repayment	71,053	-	71,053
85101	Consulting Labor	26,266	39,532	100,000
85180	BEYOND Expenditures	2,023,000	234,186	2,052,917
85185	Fellowship Expenditures	-	-	400,000
85190	Water Task Force Expenditures	744	744	10,000
90101	Computer Equipment/Software	20,000	22,630	31,175
90301	Office Furniture Purchases	-	-	312,500
	Total General Operations	3,160,004	790,316	4,250,976

4,311,495

1,603,539

5,587,076

Position	Time Spent
Executive Director	100%
Chief Financial Officer	40%
Director of Govermental Affairs	100%
Program Manager - Office Manager*	100%
Program Manager - Fiscal	80%
Executive Assistant	100%
Executive Assistant	40%
Staff Analyst II - Fiscal	100%
Staff Analyst I - Gov't Affairs	100%
Staff Analyst I - Gov't Affairs	100%
Staff Analyst I - Office*	100%
Staff Technician - Fiscal*	50%

Total Expenditures

^{*}To be determined is position will be filled



DRAFT 5/10/17

	A	dministration - 12	6/30/2017	Thru 2/28/2017	Proposed 6/30/2018
	Davianusa		Budget	Actual	Budget
40001	Revenues Member Dues		200 440	206 440	211 /10
42004	General Assembly		309,410 300,000	306,410 500	311,410 300,000
42004	Total Revenues		609,410	308,925	611,410
	Total Nevellues		009,410	300,923	011,410
	Overhead Transfer In				
	Transfer In from Other Departm	ents	-	-	2,225,611
	Total Revenue and Transfer In			-	2,837,021
				-	
		(6/30/2017 Budget	2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures				
	Wages and Benefits				
60001	Wages & Salaries		631,223	334,777	738,790
61000	Fringe Benefits		225,448	150,299	261,204
65330	OPEB Expense		60,000	-	60,000
	Total Wages and Benefits		916,671	485,075	1,059,994
	General Operations				
65101	General Legal Services		60,000	63,529	75,000
65401	Audit Fees		25,000	15,300	27,500
65505	Bank Fees		3,000	955	2,000
65507	Commissioners Per Diem		45,000	33,300	60,000
73001	Office Lease		145,000	90,826	360,409
73003	WRCOG Auto Fuel		678	353	750
73004	WRCOG Auto Maintenance		33	33	100
73101	Special Mail Srvcs		1,500	1,028	1,800
73102	Parking Validations		750	715	1,225
73104	Staff Recognition		1,000	537	800
73107	Event Support		60,000	31,501	75,000
73108	General Supplies		10,000	5,156	10,000
73109	Computer Supplies		3,000	387	1,000
73110	Computer Software		10,525	23,959	15,000
73111	Rent/Lease Equipment		25,000	21,452	35,000
73113	Membership Dues		14,354	14,916	25,000
73114	Subcriptions/Publications		4,864 1,608	15,756 1,993	5,000
73115 73116	Meeting Support/Services		2,000	388	3,500
73116	Postage Other Household Expenditures		2,000	2,659	1,000 2,000
73117	Storage		5,000	2,009	1,000
73119	Computer Hardware		2,000	337	1,000
73201	Communications-Regular		2,000	559	1,000
73203	Communications-Long Distance		1,200	151	500
73204	Communications-Cellular		4,000	2,944	5,500
73206	Communications-Comp Sv	3	18,271	42,558	75,000

73209	Communications-Web Site	10,000	1,314	5,000
73301	Equipment Maintenance - General	5,570	7,445	10,000
73302	Equipment Maintenance - Computers	8,151	14,264	25,000
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	72,250	72,250	72,250
73407	WRCOG Auto Insurance	1,570	1,570	1,570
73502	County RCIT	2,500	545	1,000
73601	Seminars/Conferences	5,000	781	4,000
73605	General Assembly	300,000	2,125	300,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	2,500	764	2,500
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	1,500	232	1,500
73613	Travel - Airfare	3,500	446	3,500
73620	Lodging	3,000	436	3,000
73630	Meals	2,000	860	2,000
73640	Other Incidentals	1,000	480	1,000
73650	Training	5,000	-	5,000
73801	Education Reimbursement	25,000	-	25,000
73660	OPEB Repayment	71,053	-	71,053
85101	Consulting Labor	26,266	39,532	100,000
90101	Computer Equipment/Software	20,000	22,630	31,175
90301	Office Furniture Purchases		-	312,500
	Total General Operations	1,113,643	536,964	1,763,132

Total Expenditures 2,030,314 1,022,039 2,823,127

Position	Time Spent
Executive Director	100%
Chief Financial Officer	40%
Program Manager - Office*	100%
Program Manager - Fiscal	80%
Executive Assistant	100%
Executive Assistant	40%
Staff Analyst II - Fiscal	100%
Staff Analyst I - Office*	100%
Staff Technician - Fiscal*	50%

^{*}To be determined is position will be filled

13,894



DRAFT 5/10/17

	Government Relation	6/30/2016 Budget	Thru 2/29/2016 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Revenues			-
40008	BEYOND - Framework Fund - Round II	1,800,000	1,800,000	2,052,917
40009	Fellowship	400,000	400,000	400,000
49002	Fund Balance/Carryover			1,200,000
	Total Revenues	2,200,000	2,200,000	3,652,917
		6/30/2016 Budget	Thru 2/29/2016 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	187,157	294,952	223,898
	Fringe Benefits	47,663	33,195	52,207
	Total Wages and Benefits	234,820	328,147	276,106
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services	88	2,383	2,500
73102	Parking Validations	105	210	250
73107	Event Support	1,561	1,893	2,000
73108	General Supplies	188	196	200
73109	Computer Supplies	1,437	1,437	1,500
73113	Membership Dues	475	580	750
73115	Meeting Support/Services	900	589	900
73116	Postage	53	53	50
73204	Communications-Cellular	177	177	177
73601	Seminars/Conferences	7,500	5,777	7,500
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	2,359	1,192	2,000
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	594	293	500
73613	Travel - Airfare	1,800	753	1,800
73620	Lodging	3,600	2,556	3,600
73630	Meals	900	158	500
73640	Other Incidentals	100	-	100
73650	Training	600	-	600
85180	BEYOND Expenditures	2,023,000	234,186	2,052,917
85185	Fellowship Expenditures		-	400,000
85101	Water Task Force - Consulting	744	744	10,000
	Total General Operations	2,046,361	253,353	2,487,844
	Total Expenditures	2,281,181	581,500	2,763,950

Position	Time Spent
Director of Govermental Affairs	100%
Staff Analyst I - Gov't Affairs	100%
Staff Analyst I - Gov't Affairs	100%



DRAFT 5/10/17

	Total Energy Budget			
	Revenues	6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
40601	WRCOG HERO Residential Revenue	1,963,735	903,078	816,771
40603	CA HERO Residential Revenue	7,615,461	4,573,813	7,639,575
40605	The Gas Company Partnership	62,000	41,031	50,000
40607	SAMAS Commercial Revenue (WRCOG)	25,000	5,649	10,000
40608	Renovate Commercial Revenue (WRCOG)	-		5,000
40607	SAMAS Commercial Revenue (Statewide)	2,500	7,755	8,000
40606	SCE WREP Revenue	4,692	77,698	75,000
40610	Renovate Commercial Recording Revenue (WRCOG)	-	· -	350
40610	Renovate Commercial Recording Revenue (Statewide)		-	350
40611	WRCOG HERO Residential Recording Revenue	335,555	200,625	182,775
40612	CA HERO Residential Recording Revenue	1,301,300	919,305	1,508,036
40613	SAMAS Commercial Recording Revenue (WRCOG)	1,200	285	350
40613	SAMAS Commercial Recording Revenue (Statewide)		_	350
40618	CA First Residential Revenue		-	167,000
40620	Spruce Residential Revenue		-	167,000
40621	CA First Residential Recording Revenue		-	86,000
40623	Spruce Residential Recording Revenue		-	86,000
40613	Regional Streetlights	276,561	-	228,960
49002	Fund Balance Carryover	4,009,000	_	4,699,409
	Total Revenues	15,933,632	6,857,271	15,730,926
	Transfer In from CA HERO to Energy Programs Total Revenues and Transfers In	15,933,632	6,857,271	545,000 16,275,926
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	550,432	314,004	1,070,619
61000	Fringe Benefits	150,536	102,777	301,295
	Total Wages and Benefits	700,968	416,782	1,371,914
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services	165,937	151,884	274,733
65505	Bank Fees	22,500	18,310	27,000
65507	Commissioners Per Diem	1,950	1,950	2,500
73102	Parking Validations	1,400	1,315	1,800
73107	Event Support	37,772	16,825	31,900
73108	General Supplies	7,583	4,510	11,965
73109	Computer Supplies	3,500	1,814	6,500
73110	Computer Software	2,000	88	2,000
73113	Membership Dues	4,265	1,011	5,250
73114	Membership Daes			
	Subcriptions/Publications	175	425	500
73115	·			

73116	Postage	3,205	1,472	2,055
73117	Other Household Expenditures	310	1,858	2,000
73118	COG Partnership Agreement	40,000	17,772	25,000
73204	Communications-Cellular	4,363	2,234	3,000
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	595	595	700
73506	PACE Residential Recording Fees	1,636,855	895,960	1,862,811
73601	Seminars/Conferences	7,062	2,424	13,050
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	11,143	6,025	11,200
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	5,410	1,815	4,850
73613	Travel - Airfare	13,437	8,124	22,004
73620	Lodging	8,600	1,637	7,500
73630	Meals	4,326	818	4,700
73640	Other Incidentals	12,474	5,392	8,858
73650	Training	6,000	40	6,771
73703	Supplies/Materials	11,250	300	33,317
73704	Newspaper Ads	6,863	-	15,000
73705	Billboard Ads	-	-	5,000
85101	Consulting Labor	2,682,916	1,362,383	2,159,928
85102	Consulting Expenses	220,000	-	2,500
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases	6,500	-	5,029
90501	Office Improvements	-	3,276	4,000
97011	Estimated FY 17/18 Carryover	5,301,461	-	4,252,556
97012	BEYOND/GF Projects	1,286,189	-	4,400,000
		11,583,656	2,562,398	13,222,577

Overhead Transfer Out

Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund
Transfer Out from CA HERO to Energy Programs

669,136	446,091	1,433,031
-	-	545,000

Total Expenditures and Transfer Out

12,953,760 3,425,270 16,572,522

Position	Time
Position	Spent
Chief Financial Officer	40%
Director of Energy & Environment	100%
Director - CCA	100%
Program Manager - Energy	100%
Program Manager - Fiscal	10%
Program Manager - Energy	100%
Program Manager - Energy	100%
Staff Analyst II - Energy	100%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	100%
Staff Analyst I - Streetlights*	100%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	100%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	100%
Staff Technician - Energy	100%
Staff Technician - Energy	100%
Staff Technician - Call Center	100%
Staff Technician - Call Center	100%
Staff Technician - Call Center	100%
Staff Technician - Call Center	100%
Staff Technician - Call Center	100%

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.



Program: WRCOG HERO - 2006				
		6/30/2017	Thru 2/28/2017	Proposed 6/30/2018
	Revenues	Budget	Actual	Budget
40601	WRCOG HERO Residential Revenue	1,963,735	903,078	816,771
40607	SAMAS Commercial Revenue (WRCOG)	25,000	5,649	10,000
40608	Renovate Commercial Revenue (WRCOG)		-	5,000
40610	Renovate Commercial Recording Revenue (WRCOG)			350
40611	WRCOG HERO Residential Recording Revenue	335,555	200,625	182,775
40613	SAMAS Commercial Recording Revenue (WRCOG)	1,200	285	350
49002	Fund Balance Carryover	730,000	-	650,000
	Total Revenues	3,055,490	1,109,637	1,665,246
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	200,909	104,442	251,686
61000	Fringe Benefits	58,363	38,909	75,295
	Total Wages and Benefits	259,272	143,351	326,980
	Conoral Operations			
65101	General Operations General Legal Services	33,024	57,603	75,000
65505	Bank Fees	20,000	8,230	15,000
73102	Parking Validations	800	745	800
73102	Event Support	1,500	745	1,500
73108	General Supplies	3,500	2,111	3,000
73110	Computer Software	1,000	2,111	1,500
73113	Membership Dues	3,000	600	2,500
73115	Meeting Support/Services	250	115	300
73116	Postage	250	60	300
73204	Communications-Cellular	2,000	1,313	2,000
73506	PACE Residential Recording Fees	335,555	160,704	182,775
73601	Seminars/Conferences	3,500	2,125	4,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	2,125	911	1,500
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	1,275	1,210	1,500
73613	Travel - Airfare	5,000	4,648	8,000
73620	Lodging	3,000	1,119	2,500
73630	Meals	1,400	449	1,000
73640	Other Incidentals	2,224	2,696	3,000
73650	Training	1,500		2,000
85101	Consulting Labor	460,169	202,277	212,784
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases	3,000		2,500
97011	Estimated FY 17/18 Carryover	263,581	_	478,832
3. 5	Total General Operations	2,445,342	446,915	1,002,291
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Overhead Transfer Out Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund	350,000	233,333	340,060
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	3,054,614	823,600	1,669,331

Position	Time Spent
Chief Financial Officer	15%
Director of Energy & Environment	30%
Program Manager - Energy	30%
Program Manager - Fiscal	5%
Program Manager - Energy	30%
Staff Analyst II - Energy	30%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	30%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	40%
Staff Technician - Energy	40%
Staff Technician - Energy	40%
Staff Technician - Call Center	30%
Staff Technician - Call Center	30%
Staff Technician - Call Center	30%
Staff Technician - Call Center	30%
Staff Technician - Call Center	30%



	Program: SCE Partnership - 2010			
	Revenues	6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
40606	SCE WREP Revenue	4,692	77,698	75,000
49002	Fund Balance Carryover	44,000		25,000
	Total Revenues	105,692	77,698	100,000
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	29,240	14,318	34,442
61000	Fringe Benefits	6,178	4,119	4,937
	Total Wages and Benefits	35,418	18,437	39,379
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services	4,307	6,080	3,000
73102	Parking Validations	200		200
73107	Event Support	16,443	5,437	7,500
73108	General Supplies	1,000	-	1,750
73115	Meeting Support/Services	2,000	376	1,500
73601	Seminars/Conferences		-	1,250
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	1,677	479	1,750
73630	Meals	150	-	150
73650	Training		-	500
73703	Supplies/Materials	1,000	-	2,066
	Total General Operations	31,450	32,372	19,666
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund	34,568	23,045	40,954
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	101,436	73,854	100,000

Position	Time Spent
Director of Energy & Environment	1%
Program Manager - Energy	10%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	40%



	Program: Gas Co Partnership	2020		T I.	D
		•	10010047	Thru	Proposed
	Devenues			2/28/2017 Actual	6/30/2018
40605	Revenues The Gas Company Partnership		Budget 62,000	41,031	Budget 50,000
49002	The Gas Company Partnership Fund Balance Carryover		35,000	41,031	24,409
43002	Total Revenues		97,000	41,031	74,409
	Total Nevellues	_	31,000	71,001	7 4,403
				Thru	Proposed
		6	/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
			Budget	Actual	Budget
	Expenditures				
	Wages and Benefits				
60001	Wages & Salaries		29,240	13,216	26,927
61000	Fringe Benefits	_	6,178	4,119	4,590
	Total Wages and Benefits	_	35,418	17,334	31,517
	General Operations				
65101	General Legal Services		-	-	500
73107	Event Support		8,000	62	2,000
73108	General Supplies	_	1,000	-	200
73115	Meeting Support/Services		3,500	376	1,000
73116	Postage		103	-	250
73601	Seminars/Conferences		-	-	1,500
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement		1,298	433	1,500
73630	Meals	_	150	-	150
73703	Supplies/Materials		750	_	3,014
	Total General Operations		26,311	871	10,114
	Overhead Transfer Out				
	Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund		34,568	23,045	32,778
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	_	96,297	41,251	74,409
	Position	Time Spent			
	Program Manager - Energy	10%			
	Staff Analyst I - Energy	40%			



DRAFT 5/10/17

	Program: Regional Streetlight	Program - 20	026		
				Thru	Proposed
			6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
	Revenues	-	Budget	Actual	Budget
40613	Regional Streetlights	_	276,561	-	228,960
	Total Revenues	=	276,561	-	228,960
	Overhead Transfer In				
	Transfer In from CA HERO to Energy Programs	-			329,000
	Total Revenues and Transfers In		276,561	-	557,960
		<u>.</u>	6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures				
	Wages and Benefits				
60001	Wages & Salaries	-	33,316	26,705	103,278
31000	Fringe Benefits	-	9,702	8,888	34,480
	Total Wages and Benefits	-	43,018	35,594	137,757
	General Operations				
55101	General Legal Services	-	18,547	26,044	21,173
73107	Event Support	-	4,972	5,968	10,000
73108	General Supplies	-	-	-	1,000
73109	Computer Supplies	-	-	-	1,500
73113	Membership Dues	-	-	-	250
73115	Meeting Support/Services	-	410	410	2,000
73601	Seminars/Conferences	-	500	-	500
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	-	1,035	1,168	2,500
73630	Meals	-	176	176	200
73703	Supplies/Materials		500	300	25,000
73704	Newspaper Ads	-	-	-	15,000
73705	Billboard Ads	_	-	-	5,000
35101	Consulting Labor	_	216,275	176,130	191,520
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases		-	-	1,292
	Total General Operations	-	242,415	210,197	276,935
	Overhead Transfer Out				
	Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund	-	-	-	143,268
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	:	285,433	245,791	557,960
	Position	Γime Spent			
	Program Manager - Energy	65%			
	Stoff Analyst I. Energy	100/			

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.

Staff Analyst I - Energy

Staff Analyst I - Energy

Staff Analyst I - Streetlights*

10%

15%

100%



	Program: Community Choice Aggre	9	Th	Duamagad
		6/30/2017	Thru 2/28/2017	Proposed 6/30/2018
	Overhead Transfer In		Actual	Budget
	Transfer In from CA HERO to Energy Programs	Budget 247,950	98,032	167,000
	Total Revenues and Transfers In	247,950 247,950	98,032	167,000
	Total Revenues and Transfers III	247,950	90,032	167,000
			Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	48,191	17,212	177,401
61000	Fringe Benefits	11,909	7,939	37,531
	Total Wages and Benefits	60,100	25,151	214,933
	General Operations			
55101	General Legal Services	35,000	19,252	25,000
73113	Membership Dues	265	265	1,500
73115	Meeting Support/Services	103	103	200
73116	Postage	2	2	5
73601	Seminars/Conferences	-	-	2,500
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	400	140	500
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	250	110	150
73613	Travel - Airfare	1,937	1,937	2,504
73630	Meals	200	11	200
73640	Other Incidentals	100	-	858
	Total General Operations	187,849	160,327	33,417
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund		-	223,530
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	247,949	185,478	471,880

Position	Time
	Spent
Director of Energy & Environment	30%
Director - CCA	100%
Program Manager - Energy	10%



	Program: Energy Admin - 2100			
			Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
	Overhead Transfer In	Budget	Actual	Budget
40617	Transfer In from CA HERO to Energy Programs	31,678	30,000	49,000
	Total Revenues and Transfers In	31,678	30,000	49,000
			Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	17,989	134	17,034
61000	Fringe Benefits	4,727	3,151	3,801
	Total Wages and Benefits	22,716	3,285	20,835
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services	59	59	60
73107	Event Support	5,357	5,357	2,500
73108	General Supplies	-	12	15
73114	Subcriptions/Publications	175	425	500
73115	Meeting Support/Services	-	565	600
73601	Seminars/Conferences	1,000	299	300
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	300	-	250
73613	Travel - Airfare	1,000	-	500
73650	Training	2,000	-	1,771
	Total General Operations	60,996	56,407	6,496
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund		-	21,669
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	83,712	59,692	49,000

Position	Time Spent
Director of Energy & Environment	5%
Program Manager - Energy	5%
Program Manager - Energy	5%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	5%



	Program: Spruce - 2102			
	-		Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
	Revenues	Budget	Actual	Budget
40620	Spruce Residential Revenue			167,000
40623	Spruce Residential Recording Revenue			86,000
	Total Revenues		-	253,000
			Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	-	-	52,276
61000	Fringe Benefits	_	-	16,472
	Total Wages and Benefits		-	68,747
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services	-	-	25,000
73107	Event Support	-	-	3,200
73108	General Supplies	-	-	1,500
73109	Computer Supplies	-	-	1,500
73506	PACE Residential Recording Fees		-	86,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	58	58	100
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	-	164	100
73613	Travel - Airfare	_	75	3,000
73703	Supplies/Materials		-	1,237
	Total General Operations	58	297	121,637
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund		-	71,497
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	58	297	261,882

Position	Time
Fosition	Spent
Director of Energy & Environment	5%
Program Manager - Energy	5%
Program Manager - Energy	10%
Staff Analyst II - Energy	5%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	5%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	10%
Staff Technician - Energy	10%
Staff Technician - Energy	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%



	Program: CA First - 2103			
	Revenues	6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
40618	CA First Residential Revenue	·		167,000
40621	CA First Residential Recording Revenue	·		86,000
	Total Revenues	-	-	253,000
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries		-	52,276
61000	Fringe Benefits		-	16,472
	Total Wages and Benefits		-	68,747
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services		147	25,000
73107	Event Support		-	3,200
73108	General Supplies	-	-	1,500
73109	Computer Supplies		-	1,500
73506	PACE Residential Recording Fees		-	86,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	-	58	100
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation		93	100
73613	Travel - Airfare		1,463	3,000
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases		_	1,237
	Total General Operations		1,856	121,637
	Overhead Transfer Out Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund		_	71,497
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out		1,856	261,882

Position	Time
Fosition	Spent
Director of Energy & Environment	5%
Program Manager - Energy	5%
Program Manager - Energy	10%
Staff Analyst II - Energy	5%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	5%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	10%
Staff Technician - Energy	10%
Staff Technician - Energy	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%
Staff Technician - Call Center	10%



	Program: California HERO - 5000			
	g		Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
	Revenues	Budget	Actual	Budget
40603	CA HERO Residential Revenue	7,615,461	4,573,813	7,639,575
40607	SAMAS Commercial Revenue (Statewide)	2,500	7,755	8,000
40610	Renovate Commercial Recording Revenue (Statewide)			350
40612	CA HERO Residential Recording Revenue	1,301,300	919,305	1,508,036
40613	SAMAS Commercial Recording Revenue (Statewide)			350
49002	Fund Balance Carryover	3,200,000	-	4,000,000
	Total Revenues	12,119,261	5,500,874	13,156,311
			Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
		Dauget	Actual	Buaget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	191,547	137,977	361,300
61000	Fringe Benefits	53,479	35,653	107,717
	Total Wages and Benefits	245,026	173,630	469,018
	Compared Operations			
65101	General Logal Sandage	75.000	42.700	100,000
	General Legal Services	75,000	42,700	
65505	Bank Fees	2,500	10,080	12,000
65507	Commissioners Per Diem	1,950	1,950	2,500
73102	Parking Validations	200	570	800
73107	Event Support	1,500	2 200	2,000
73108	General Supplies	2,083	2,388	3,000
73109	Computer Supplies	2,000	1,814 88	2,000
73110	Computer Software	1,000	146	500
73113 73115	Membership Dues	1,000	592	1,000
73115	Meeting Support/Services			1,000
73110	Postage Other Household Expenditures	2,800 310	1,409	1,500
	Other Household Expenditures	40,000	1,858	2,000
73118 73204	COG Partnership Agreement Communications-Cellular	2,000	17,772 921	25,000 1,000
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	595	595	700
73506	PACE Residential Recording Fees	1,301,300	735,257	1,508,036
73601	Seminars/Conferences	2,062	733,237	3,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	4,250	2,778	3,000
73612	Travel - Mileage Reinbursement Travel - Ground Transportation	2,125	238	3,000
73612	Travel - Airfare	4,000	230	5,000
73620	Lodging	4,000	518	5,000
73630	Meals	2,000	510	3,000
73640	Other Incidentals	10,000	2,696	5,000
73650	Training	2,500	40	2,500
73703	Supplies/Materials	2,000	40	2,000
85101	Consulting Labor	1,856,880	825,469	1,755,624
85101	Consulting Expenses	220,000	020,409	2,500
90501	Office Improvements	220,000	3,276	4,000
97011	Estimated FY 17/18 Carryover	5,037,880	3,270	3,773,724
31011	Louinated 1 11/10 Carryover	3,037,000		5,115,124

BEYOND/GF Projects

Total General Operations

-	-	4,400,000
8,589,235	1,653,154	11,630,384

Overhead Transfer Out

Transfer Out from Energy to General Fund
Transfer Out from CA HERO to Energy Programs

250,000	166,667	487,778
-	-	545,000

1,993,451

13,132,180

9,084,261

50%

50%

Total Expenditures and Transfers Out

Staff Technician - Call Center

Staff Technician - Call Center

Position	Time
1 Coltion	Spent
Chief Financial Officer	25%
Director of Energy & Environment	24%
Program Manager - Energy	60%
Program Manager - Fiscal	5%
Program Manager - Energy	45%
Staff Analyst II - Energy	60%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	50%
Staff Analyst I - Energy	40%
Staff Technician - Energy	40%
Staff Technician - Energy	40%
Staff Technician - Call Center	50%
Staff Technician - Call Center	50%
Staff Technician - Call Center	50%



	Total Environn	nent Budget		
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Revenues			
41201	Solid Waste	107,915	98,415	117,100
41401	Used Oil Revenue	265,227	240,227	255,000
	Total Revenues	373,142	338,642	372,100
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	54,584	61,930	114,234
61000	Fringe Benefits	13,182	2,369	27,555
0.000	Total Wages and Benefits	67,766	64,299	141,788
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services	-	1,817	500
73102	Parking Validations	-	80	195
73104	Staff Recognition	-	-	160
73106	Coffee and Supplies	-	-	200
73107	Event Support	33,632	24,341	43,021
73108	General Supplies	1,900	303	2,500
73111	Rent/Lease Equipment	<u> </u>	243	100
73113	Membership Dues	1,500	-	1,000
73115	Meeting Support/Services	4,538	665	4,600
73116	Postage	<u> </u>	-	630
73119	Storage	16,000	-	10,000
73120	Printing Services	13,000	-	11,900

73209	Communications-Web Site	-	-	1,000
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	175	175	200
73601	Seminars/Conferences	1,800	-	2,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	2,773	1,814	3,000
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	255	99	400
73613	Travel - Airfare	950	189	1,000
73620	Lodging	1,200	219	1,269
73630	Meals	200	6	200
73650	Training	600	-	1,800
73703	Supplies/Materials	18,200	-	30,620
73704	Newspaper Ads	15,000	-	4,000
73705	Billboard Ads	-	-	3,000
73706	Radio & TV Ads	42,353	41,133	51,571
85101	Consulting Labor	6,000	-	10,365
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases	-	-	2,500
	Total General Operations	160,176	71,171	187,731
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Environmental to General Fund	46,500	31,000	42,580
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	274,442	166,469	372,099

Position	Time Spent
Staff Analyst I - Environment	100%
Staff Analyst I - Environment*	100%

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.



	Program: Solid Waste - 1	038		
		6/30/2017	Thru 2/28/2017	Proposed 6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
	Revenues			
41201	Solid Waste	93,415	93,415	94,000
	Total Revenues	93,415	93,415	94,000
			Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017	2/28/2017	6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	7,988	21,936	42,360
61000	Fringe Benefits	- 1,000		7,291
	Total Wages and Benefits	7,988	21,936	49,651
	General Operations			
65101	General Operations General Legal Services	_	_	500
73102	Parking Validations			100
73102	Event Support	4,192	24	8,000
73108	General Supplies	400	228	1,000
73115	Meeting Support/Services	1,538	665	1,600
73116	Postage	- 1,000	-	500
73120	Printing Services	1,000	_	1,000
73209	Communications-Web Site	- 1,000	_	1,000
73601	Seminars/Conferences	800	_	1,000
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	213	430	600
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	170	-	300
73613	Travel - Airfare	350	_	400
73620	Lodging	400	-	469
73650	Training	600	-	1,800
73703	Supplies/Materials	2,000	-	6,500
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases	-	_	2,500
	Total General Operations	11,663	1,434	27,269
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Environmental to General Fund	21,500	14,333	17,080
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	41 151	37 70 <i>4</i>	94,000
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	41,151 Time	37,704	

Position	Time
Fosition	Spent
Staff Analyst I - Environment	50%
Staff Analyst I - Environment*	15%

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.



	Program: Used Oil Block OPP6	- 2032		
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
41401	Revenues Used Oil Revenue	240,227	240,227	230,000
41401	Total Revenues	240,227	240,227	230,000
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	27,230	19,301	49,027
61000	<u></u>	1,421	14,753	
	Total Wages and Benefits	38,950	20,723	63,780
	General Operations			
73102	Parking Validations	-	80	95
73104	Staff Recognition	-	-	160
73106	Coffee and Supplies	-	-	200
73107	Event Support	28,000	23,065	30,000
73108	General Supplies	1,500	74	1,500
73113	Membership Dues	1,500	-	1,000
73115	Meeting Support/Services	3,000	-	3,000
73119	Storage	16,000	-	10,000
73120	Printing Services	12,000		10,000
73405	Insurance - General/Business Liason	175	175	200
73601	Seminars/Conferences	1,000	4.400	1,000
73611 73612	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement Travel - Ground Transportation	2,500 85	1,126 99	2,000 100
73612	Travel - Airfare	600	189	600
73620	Lodging	800	219	800
73630	Meals	200	6	200
73703	Supplies/Materials	15,000		20,000
73704	Newspaper Ads	15,000	_	4,000
73705	Billboard Ads	- 10,000	_	3,000
73706	Radio & TV Ads	42,353	41,133	45,000
85101	Consulting Labor	6,000	· -	10,365
	Total General Operations	145,813	67,045	143,220
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Environmental to General Fund	25,000	16,667	23,000
	Total Expanditures and Transfer Out	200 702	104 424	220.000
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	209,763	104,434	230,00

Position	Time
Fosition	Spent
Staff Analyst I - Environment	30%
Staff Analyst I - Environment*	65%

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.



	Program: Litter Progran	n		
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Revenues			
41201	Solid Waste	14,500	5,000	23,100
	Total Revenues	14,500	5,000	23,100
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	10,246	5,423	12,919
61000	Fringe Benefits	1,421	947	2,280
	Total Wages and Benefits	11,667	6,370	15,199
	General Operations			
73107	Event Support	1,440	28	1,500
73116	Postage	-	-	130
73120	Printing Services	-	-	900
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	60	259	300
73703	Supplies/Materials	1,200	-	2,000
73706	Radio & TV Ads	=	-	3,071
	Total General Operations	2,700	287	7,901
	Total Expenditures	14,367	6,657	23,100

Position	Time
Position	Spent
Staff Analyst I - Environment	15%
Staff Analyst I - Environment*	5%

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.



	Program: Riverside Used Oil			
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
41401	Revenues Used Oil Revenue			25 000
41401	Total Revenues		-	25,000 25,000
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	-	-	9,928
61000	Fringe Benefits	-	-	3,231
	Total Wages and Benefits	-	-	13,159
	General Operations			
63000	Overhead Allocation			
73107	Event Support		-	3,521
73111	Rent/Lease Equipment	-	-	100
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	-	-	100
73703	Supplies/Materials		-	2,120
73706	Radio & TV Ads		-	3,500
	Total General Operations		-	9,341
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Environmental to General Fund		-	2,500
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out		-	25,000

Position	Time
Position	Spent
Staff Analyst I - Environment	5%
Staff Analyst I - Environment*	15%

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.



	Total Transportation B	Budget		
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
R	Revenues			
40614	Active Transportation Revenue	200,000	50,254	150,000
41402	Air Quality-Clean Cities	139,500	139,250	137,500
41701	LTF	701,300	701,250	825,000
43001	Commercial/Service - Admin Portion	37,074	45,953	101,097
43002	Retail - Admin Portion	142,224	54,031	118,867
43003	Industrial - Admin Portion	128,446	113,242	249,133
43004	Residential/Multi/Single - Admin Portion	1,067,271	475,354	1,045,779
43005	Multi-Family - Admin Portion	224,983	58,994	129,787
43001	Commercial/Service - Non-Admin Portion	889,786	1,103,157	2,426,945
43002	Retail - Non-Admin Portion	3,413,375	1,296,736	2,852,820
43003	Industrial - Non-Admin Portion	3,082,710	2,717,816	5,979,195
43004	Residential/Multi/Single - Non-Admin Portion	25,614,514	11,408,214	25,098,070
43005	Multi-Family - Non-Admin Portion	5,399,595	1,415,859	3,114,890
49002	Fund Balance/Carryover		-	400,000
	Total Revenues	41,053,778	19,580,109	42,629,082
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
E	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
	•			
60001	Wages & Salaries	547,830	258,909	445,824
	-	547,830 139,807	258,909 93,205	
	Wages & Salaries	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	103,664
60001 61000	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits	139,807	93,205	445,824 103,664 549,488
	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits	139,807	93,205	103,664
61000	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations	139,807 687,637	93,205 352,114	103,664 549,488
61000 65101 XXXXX	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services	139,807 687,637	93,205 352,114	103,664 549,488 177,500
61000 65101 XXXXX 73102	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation	139,807 687,637 224,924	93,205 352,114 262,327	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000
61000 65101 XXXXX 73102 73104	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation Parking Validations	139,807 687,637 224,924 - 1,500	93,205 352,114 262,327 - 1,415	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000 1,500 250
61000 65101 XXXXX 73102 73104 73107	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation Parking Validations Staff Recognition	139,807 687,637 224,924 - 1,500 200	93,205 352,114 262,327 - 1,415 94	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000 1,500 250 3,500
65100 65101 XXXXX 73102 73104 73107 73108	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation Parking Validations Staff Recognition Event Support	139,807 687,637 224,924 - 1,500 200 46,800	93,205 352,114 262,327 - 1,415 94 398	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000 1,500 250 3,500 1,350
61000 65101 KXXXX 73102 73104 73107 73108 73109	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation Parking Validations Staff Recognition Event Support General Supplies	139,807 687,637 224,924 - 1,500 200 46,800 1,350	93,205 352,114 262,327 - 1,415 94 398 394	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000 1,500 250 3,500 1,350 1,000
61000 65101	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation Parking Validations Staff Recognition Event Support General Supplies Computer Supplies	139,807 687,637 224,924 - 1,500 200 46,800 1,350 1,000	93,205 352,114 262,327 - 1,415 94 398 394 827	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000 1,500
61000 65101 XXXXX 73102 73104 73107 73108 73109 73110	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation Parking Validations Staff Recognition Event Support General Supplies Computer Supplies Computer Software	139,807 687,637 224,924 - 1,500 200 46,800 1,350 1,000 1,000	93,205 352,114 262,327 - 1,415 94 398 394 827 139	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000 1,500 250 3,500 1,350 1,000 1,000
61000 65101 XXXXX 73102 73104 73107 73108 73109 73110 73113	Wages & Salaries Fringe Benefits Total Wages and Benefits General Operations General Legal Services 3rd Party Litigation Parking Validations Staff Recognition Event Support General Supplies Computer Supplies Computer Software Membership Dues	139,807 687,637 224,924 - 1,500 200 46,800 1,350 1,000 1,000 770	93,205 352,114 262,327 - 1,415 94 398 394 827 139 670	103,664 549,488 177,500 250,000 1,500 250 3,500 1,350 1,000 1,000 850



	Total Transportation Budg	get		
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
73120	Printing Services	9,000	-	5,000
73204	Communications-Cellular	2,500	2,654	4,000
73209	Communications-Web Site	3,100	-	600
73601	Seminars/Conferences	1,673	1,193	2,200
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	3,060	1,487	3,250
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	1,020	177	1,000
73613	Travel - Airfare	3,150	-	2,750
73620	Lodging	2,616	1,066	1,950
73630	Meals	3,207	3,269	3,200
73640	Other Incidentals	1,214	1,421	1,950
73703	Supplies/Materials	13,750	-	1,750
73705	Billboard Ads	2,882	-	2,500
85101	Consulting Labor	781,102	256,864	1,400,000
85102	Consulting Expenses	26,500	3,613	60,000
85160	TUMF Project Reimbursement	38,399,980	38,858,094	39,000,000
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases	5,000	1,485	5,000
97011	Estimated FY 17/18 Carryover	-	-	300,000
	Total General Operations	39,542,361	39,401,602	41,233,900
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Environmental to General Fund	800,000	533,333	750,000
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	41,029,998	40,287,050	42,533,388

Position	Time	
Fosition	Spent	
Director of Transportation	100%	
Chief Financial Officer	20%	
Program Manager- Transportation	100%	
Program Manager - Fiscal	10%	
Executive Assistant	60%	
Staff Analyst II -TUMF	100%	
Staff Technician - Fiscal*	50%	

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.



DRAFT 5/10/17

	Program: Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee				
	_	6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget	
44704	Revenues LTF	704 200	701.250	925 000	
41701 43001	Commercial/Service - Admin Portion	701,300 37,074	701,250 45,953	825,000 101,097	
43001	Retail - Admin Portion	142,224	54,031	118,867	
43002	Industrial - Admin Portion	128,446	113,242	249,133	
43004	Residential/Multi/Single - Admin Portion	1,067,271	475,354	1,045,779	
43005	Multi-Family - Admin Portion	224,983	58,994	129,787	
43001	Commercial/Service - Non-Admin Portion	889,786	1,103,157	2,426,945	
43002	Retail - Non-Admin Portion	3,413,375	1,296,736	2,852,820	
43003	Industrial - Non-Admin Portion	3,082,710	2,717,816	5,979,195	
43004	Residential/Multi/Single - Non-Admin Portion	25,614,514	11,408,214	25,098,070	
43005	Multi-Family - Non-Admin Portion	5,399,595	1,415,859	3,114,890	
49002	Fund Balance/Carryover	-	-	400,000	
	Total Revenues	40,701,278	19,390,606	42,341,582	
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget	
	Expenditures Wages and Benefits				
60001	Wages & Salaries	487,653	250,558	384,032	
61000	Fringe Benefits	122,551	81,701	90,169	
	Total Wages and Benefits	610,204	332,259	474,202	
	General Operations				
65101	General Legal Services	220,519	260,423	175,000	
XXXXX	3rd Party Litigation	-	-	250,000	
73102	Parking Validations	1,500	1,415	1,500	
73104	Staff Recognition	200	94	250	
73107	Event Support	300	300	500	
73108	General Supplies	1,000	394	1,000	
73109	Computer Supplies	1,000	827	1,000	
73110	Computer Software	1,000	139	1,000	
73113	Membership Dues	670	670	750	
73115	Meeting Support/Services	500	248	500	
73116	Postage	250	119	250	
73117	Other Household Expenditures	213	247	250	
73120	Printing Services	7,500		5,000	
73204	Communications-Cellular	1,500	1,429	2,500	
73209	Communications-Web Site	500	-	500	

TUMF 1148 Page 3

73601	Seminars/Conferences	1,123	1,193	1,500
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	1,275	1,471	1,500
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	170	177	250
73613	Travel - Airfare	1,000	-	1,000
73620	Lodging	1,066	1,066	1,000
73630	Meals	2,207	3,269	2,500
73640	Other Incidentals	614	1,421	1,500
73703	Supplies/Materials	250	-	250
73705	Billboard Ads	2,882	-	2,500
85101	Consulting Labor	621,507	252,342	1,200,000
85102	Consulting Expenses	15,000	3,613	50,000
85160	TUMF Project Reimbursement	38,399,980	38,858,094	38,800,000
90101	Computer Equipment Purchases	5,000	1,485	5,000
97011	Estimated FY 17/18 Carryover	-	-	300,000
	Total General Operations	39,292,226	39,393,554	40,807,000
	Overhead Transfer Out			
	Transfer Out from Environmental to General Fund	770,000	513,333	750,000
	Total Expenditures and Transfer Out	40,672,430	40,239,146	42,031,202

Positi	on	Time
		Spent
Directo	or of Transportation	85%
Chief I	Financial Officer	20%
Progra	m Manager- Transportation	75%
Progra	ım Manager - Fiscal	10%
Execu	tive Assistant	50%
Staff A	nalyst II -TUMF	100%
Staff 7	echnician - Fiscal*	50%

^{*}To be determined if position will be filled.

TUMF 1148 Page 4



Program: Active Transportation Plan				
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
40614	Revenues	200,000	50,254	150,000
40014	Active Transportation Revenue Total Revenues	200,000	50,254 50,254	150,000
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
60001	Wages and Benefits Wages & Salaries	28,318	94	23,824
61000	Fringe Benefits	6,989	4,659	5,467
0.000	Total Wages and Benefits	35,307	4,754	29,291
	General Operations			
65101	General Legal Services	1,905	1,905	2,500
85101	Consulting Labor	158,095	4,522	125,000
85102	Consulting Expenses	10,000	-	5,000
	Total General Operations	170,000	6,427	132,500
	Total Expenditures	205,307	11,180	161,791

Position	Time Spent
Director of Transportation	5%
Program Manager- Transportation	10%
Executive Assistant	5%



	_	6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
41402	Revenues Air Quality-Clean Cities	100,000	100,900	100,000
	Total Revenues	113,000	100,900	100,000
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	21,854	8,257	14,144
61000	Fringe Benefits	6,861	4,574	2,560
	Total Wages and Benefits	28,715	12,831	16,704
	General Operations			
73107	Event Support	40,000	98	2,500
73108	General Supplies	100	-	100
73113	Membership Dues	100	-	100
73115	Meeting Support/Services	100	283	500
73116	Postage	100	-	100
73204	Communications-Cellular	1,000	1,225	1,500
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	1,275	16	1,500
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	425	-	500
73613	Travel - Airfare	750	-	750
73620	Lodging	600	-	500
73630	Meals	250	-	250
73640	Other Incidentals	250	-	250
73703	Supplies/Materials	3,500	-	500
85101	Consulting Labor	1,500	-	75,000
85102	Consulting Expenses	1,500	-	5,000
	Total General Operations	78,400	14,955	89,050
	Total Expenditures	107,115	27,786	105,754

Position	Time Spent
Director of Transportation	5%
Program Manager- Transportation	5%



		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Revenues			
41402	Air Quality-Clean Cities	27,000	27,100	25,000
	Total Revenues	27,000	27,100	25,000
		6/30/2017 Budget	Thru 2/28/2017 Actual	Proposed 6/30/2018 Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	5,888	-	18,227
61000	Fringe Benefits	2,092	1,395	4,058
	Total Wages and Benefits	7,980	1,395	22,284
	General Operations			
73108	General Supplies	250	-	250
73115	Meeting Support/Services	100	-	100
73116	Postage	100	-	100
73209	Communications-Web Site	100	-	100
73601	Seminars/Conferences	200	-	200
73703	Supplies/Materials	8,000		500
	Total General Operations	21,610	3,667	1,250
	Total Expenditures	29,590	5,061	23,534

Position	Time
Position	Spent
Director of Transportation	5%
Program Manager- Transportation	5%
Executive Assistant	5%



	Program: Clean Cities - 1010-	01b DOE Contract P-1010	-03	
			Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017		6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
	Revenues			
41402	Air Quality-Clean Cities	12,50		
	Total Revenues	12,50	0 11,250	12,500
			T I	D
		6/20/204	Thru	Proposed
		6/30/2017		6/30/2018
		Budget	Actual	Budget
	Expenditures			
	Wages and Benefits			
60001	Wages & Salaries	4,11	7 -	5,598
61000	Fringe Benefits	1,31		
	Total Wages and Benefits	5,43		
	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·
	General Operations			
73107	Event Support	1,00	- 00	500
73601	Seminars/Conferences	10	- 00	500
73611	Travel - Mileage Reimbursement	17		250
73612	Travel - Ground Transportation	25	55 -	250
73613	Travel - Airfare	1,00	- 00	1,000
73620	Lodging	45	- 50	450
73630	Meals	45	- 50	450
73640	Other Incidentals	20	- 00	200
73703	Supplies/Materials	2,00	- 00	500
	Total General Operations	10,12	25 3,000	4,100
	Total Expenditures	15,55	3,876	11,107
	Position	Time		

Position	Time
Position	Spent
Program Manager- Transportation	5%



Western Riverside Council of Governments Administration & Finance Committee

Staff Report

Subject: BEYOND Framework Fund Round II Funding Awards

Contact: Andrea Howard, Staff Analyst, howard@wrcog.cog.ca.us, (951) 955-8515

Date: May 10, 2017

The purpose of this item is to provide members of the Administration & Finance Committee with an overview of the project applications submitted for funding through the three BEYOND funding categories and to solicit input on the final funding award determination.

Requested Actions:

- 1. Discuss and provide a recommendation for which BEYOND Team application(s) to fund and at what amount.
- 2. Discuss and provide a recommendation for which BEYOND Health application(s) to fund and at what amount.

Background

The BEYOND Framework Fund is designed to enable member agencies to develop and implement plans and programs aimed at improving quality of life in Western Riverside County by addressing the goal areas outlined in WRCOG's Economic Development and Sustainability Framework (the Framework). There are six Framework goal areas: economic development, health, education, energy & environment, water, and transportation. Round I of BEYOND funded more than 30 projects beginning in February 2016 which are scheduled to be completed by no later than August 31, 2017.

On June 24, 2016, the Executive Committee approved funding for a second Round of BEYOND and expanded the Program to include two competitive funding categories (entitled BEYOND Team and BEYOND Health), in addition to the central pot of non-competitive funding (BEYOND Core). The funding for BEYOND comes from WRCOG's Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/2016 Agency Carryover Funds, which has been allocated as follows:

Agency Carryover Funds FY 16/17			
Contribution to WRCOG Agency Reserves	\$ 1,047,083.00		
BEYOND Core - Round II	\$ 2,052,917.00		
BEYOND Team - Regional Collaboration Set Aside	\$ 175,000.00		
BEYOND Health - Healthy Communities Set Aside	\$ 75,000.00		
Funding for WRCOG Agency Activities	\$ 700,000.00		
Funding for Regional Economic Development Initiative	\$ 250,000.00		
Total Funds Available	\$ 4,300,000.00		

BEYOND Round II opened in February 2017 with the release of the Program Guidelines. The BEYOND Round II Program milestones are summarized below:

BEYOND Round II Program Milestones				
	BEYOND Core	BEYOND Team BEYOND Health		
Call for Concept Proposals	February 28, 2017	-		
Concept Proposals due	March 10, 2017	-		
Notification of Concept approval status by	March 24, 2017	-		
Call for Applications	March 24 2017	March 6, 2017		
Full Applications due	April 21, 2017	April 7, 2017		
Notice of Project Application approval status by	May 12, 2017	May 12, 2017		
BEYOND Funding Agreement provided by	May 19, 2017	May 19, 2017		
Projects completed by	November 15, 2018	November 15, 2018		

Round II Applications

Applications for each of the three BEYOND funding categories (Core, Team, and Health) were due in April 2017. Staff are working with jurisdictions that requested extensions for BEYOND Core submittals; however, the deadline for submitting applications for Team and Health funds was firmly set due to the competitive nature of these funds.

<u>BEYOND Core</u>: As of this writing, WRCOG has received BEYOND Core applications for 38 projects, which support one or more of the Framework goal areas, as required by the Program Guidelines. WRCOG anticipates receiving at least six additional project applications for Round II. Nine member agencies have divided their fixed Core allocation between two or more projects, leveraging the adaptability of the Program to meet a variety of needs with relatively unrestricted usage parameters. Attachment 1 to this report lists the BEYOND Core funding allocation for each member agency. Attachment 2 to this report summarizes each of the projects submitted for funding through BEYOND Round II Core funding.

<u>BEYOND Team</u>: WRCOG received three applications for BEYOND Team funding for a combined total ask of \$394,293.00, exceeding the \$175,000 available by \$219,293. Each of the three applications meets the minimum criteria of:

- Supporting one or more of the Framework goal areas; and
- Involving a collaboration between two or more member agencies.

Attachment 3 summarizes each of the three BEYOND Team application submissions, which include an application submitted by the City of Perris in partnership with Eastern Municipal Water District and local agencies to support the City of Perris' HealthyCommunity50 Green City Farm Project; and two applications submitted in partnership with multiple member agencies to address homelessness, one in the southwest region and the other in the northwest region.

<u>BEYOND Health</u>: WRCOG received 14 applications for funding through BEYOND Health for a combined total ask of \$105,000, exceeding the \$75,000 available by \$30,000. Each jurisdiction requested the maximum allotted per agency of \$7,500. Six BEYOND Health applicants submitted applications that directly correlate / support their BEYOND Core application, as the Program allowed for projects seeking funding through both Core and Health to streamline the process and submit only one application for consideration through both funding categories. As required, each project demonstrates support for the health goal area of the Framework. Attachment 4 to this report summarizes each of the 14 BEYOND Health project application submissions.

Next Steps

On May 10, 2011, staff will be requesting that the Administration & Finance Committee discuss options and make a determination on how to award funds for BEYOND Team and BEYOND Health applicants. Staff will

present multiple award funding scenarios for the Committee members to consider. Subsequent to the approval of funding awards, staff will work with applicants to finalize a BEYOND Funding Agreement and initiate work on the proposed projects.

Prior Action:

None.

Fiscal Impact:

Funding for Round II of the BEYOND Framework Fund has been programmed accordingly under the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Agency Budget, in the General Fund.

Attachments:

- 1. BEYOND Core funding allocation.
- 2. BEYOND Round II Core Project applications summary.
- 3. BEYOND Round II Team Project applications summary.
- 4. BEYOND Round II Health Project applications summary.

Page hiteritionally left Blank

Item 4.B

BEYOND Framework Fund Round II Funding Awards

Attachment 1

BEYOND Core funding allocation

Page Whentionally Lett Blank





BEYOND Round II

BEYOND Core Funding Allocation Distribution

Jurisdiction	Allocation
Banning	\$ 62,664.24
Calimesa	\$ 35,000.00
Canyon Lake	\$ 39,488.29
Corona	\$ 150,868.24
Eastvale	\$ 94,576.24
Hemet	\$ 107,257.24
Jurupa Valley	\$ 120,837.49
Lake Elsinore	\$ 92,959.24
Menifee	\$ 113,957.74
Moreno Valley	\$ 161,049.24
Murrieta	\$ 129,101.74
Norco	\$ 58,135.54
Perris	\$ 102,496.24
Riverside	\$ 190,877.49
San Jacinto	\$ 82,009.54
Temecula	\$ 126,736.24
Wildomar	\$ 67,648.34
County of Riverside	\$ 177,254.30
Eastern Municipal Water District	\$ 35,000.00
Western Municipal Water District	\$ 35,000.00
Riverside County Superintendent of Schools	\$ 35,000.00
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	\$ 35,000.00
Total BEYOND Core Allocation	\$ 2,052,917.31

Pode Intentionally Left Blank

Item 4.B

BEYOND Framework Fund Round II Funding Awards

Attachment 2

BEYOND Round II Core Project applications summary

Pode Intentionally Left Blank





Citv/	Project Name	Goal	Project Description
Agency		Area(s)	
City of Banning	Lions Park Expansion	CVA)	The City of Banning is allocating BEYOND Round II Core funding toward design and park improvements for Lions Park. The park is currently 9.12 acres consisting of 3 baseball fields, snack bar, and a playground. The City is working to expand the park to include an additional 7.46 acres, to be used for two multi-purpose fields. Round I funding was applied to a portion of the cost of the requisite CEQA analysis for the park. Additional funding is anticipated to come from the County EDA and the
City of Calimesa	Creekside Park Fitness Facilities	No.	The City of Calimesa is allocating BEYOND funding toward transforming Creekside Park into a Fitness The City of Calimesa is allocating BEYOND funding toward transforming Creekside Park into a Fitness Park by installing park grade fitness equipment stations. The installation will require relocation of existing fencing material to expand the park area; installation of rubberized safety surface around each fitness station; replacing existing benches, trash cans, and picnic tables to accommodate and encourage increased park usage.
	Railroad Canyon Road Mobility Improvement Project		The City of Canyon Lake is allocating a portion of BEYOND funding toward the installation of polemounted radar speed signs. The project is in response to high auto speeds along Railroad Canyon Road, which connects to Lake Elsinore (west) and Menifee (east) where speed limits are both higher than Canyon Lake.
Canyon Canyon Lake	Goetz Road Monument Project	•	The City of Canyon Lake is allocation BEYOND funding to branding and establishing its identity as a municipality amongst its neighboring cities. The City is utilizing a portion of BEYOND funds for a city monument at the entry point along Goetz Road, adjacent to Menifee's Audie Murphy Ranch residential development project.
	City Website	C.	The City of Canyon Lake is allocating a portion of BEYOND funding to perform the annual website update to ensure the site continues to help inform, promote, and describe the City to website visitors.
City of Corona	Corona Innovation Center	o o	The City of Corona is allocating BEYOND Core Round II funding to continue work on the BEYOND RI funded Corona Innovation Center. RII funds will support physical upgrades and ADA renovations to the economic development resource center.
City of Eastvale	Bus Shelters & Appurtenances	The way	The City of Eastvale is allocation BEYOND Core funding toward the installation of overhead bus shelters, benches, and/or a trash container at its more than 30 bus stops along Route 2 and Route 29.
City of Hemet	Hemet HEROES Initiative	Q	The City of Hemet is utilizing BEYOND Core funding for development of the Hemet HEROES (Helping Everyone Realize Opportunity, Equality, & Sustainability) Initiative, which will focus on creating a city-wide branding initiative, business retention and expansion efforts, and coordinated economic development.



City /	Project Name	Goal Area(s)	Project Description
	JV Chamber of Commerce	0	The City of Jurupa Valley is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core Round II funding to continue developing its partnership with the Jurupa Valley Chamber, focusing on business retention and small business development.
	Farmers Market		The City of Jurupa Valley is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core Round II funding to support the continued operation and enhancement of the JV Farmers Market through market expansion and establishment of an ongoing marketing campaign.
City of Jurupa Valley	Marketing/Bran ding Program	0	The City of Jurupa Valley is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to initiate a city-wide branding program to include development of a City brochure and other informational marketing.
Î	Radar Display Signs		The City of Jurupa Valley is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to install up to 6 solar powered radar speed signs to enhance safety awareness of motorists when approaching school zones.
	Rubidoux Walking Corridor		The City of Jurupa Valley is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core Round II funding for enhancements to the Rubidoux Walking Corridor, established through BEYOND RI funds. Funding will go toward construction of informational kiosks at each end of the corridor, enhancement of the Edible Path to School, and installation of murals.
	Regional Cancer Taskforce	\$	The City of Lake Elsinore is allocating a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to contribute toward the efforts of the SW Cities Cancer Services Taskforce. The Taskforce will hire a facilitator and perform a study to identify trends and regional needs in the area of Cancer services. Results of the assessment are intended to be used in planning for and attracting in-demand services to the region.
City of Lake Elsinore	Healthy LE Program	ON THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PR	The City of Lake Elsinore is allocating a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to support the Healthy LE Program. A majority of funding will be directed to hiring a part-time Graduate Student intern to support program activities. Additional funds will go toward project materials and event programming.
	Fit-Trails Equipment	College Colleg	The City of Lake Elsinore is allocating a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to install fitness equipment stations at four parks throughout the city. The four parks were selected based on current activity and utilization levels, varied user types, disbursement of locations throughout the city, and existing walking path infrastructure.
City of	Communicating Menifee's Brand!	O.	The City of Menifee is allocating a portion of its BEYOND Core Round II funding to build off of the RI Re-branding project to develop a marketing communication plan to include creating an independent economic development website and developing marketing materials.
Menifee	Menifee Homeless Taskforce		The City of Menifee is allocating a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to the Southwest Homeless Alliance Coalition, specifically for creating and printing marketing materials associated with the Coalition.



City / Agency	Project Name	Goal Area(s)	Project Description
City of Moreno Valley	Community Enhancement Program		The City of Moreno Valley is utilizing BEYOND funding for a multi-faceted project to promote active transportation, community engagement, and enhanced quality of life through ten tasks: (1) Community Cleanup Event, (2) Cyclocross Race, (3) Ride Moval Community Bicycle Race, (4) 5K walk / Pet Adoption Fair Events, (5) Healthy Moreno Valley student campaign, (6) Juan Batista de Anza Trail raised crossing / SB821 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities from Bay Avenue to Cottonwood Street, (7) Mini-Round About Demonstration, (8) existing conditions Health Impact Assessment, (9) Community Health Element to General Plan, and (10) Exercise Equipment along Juan Bautista De Anza Trail.
City of	Economic Development Site Selector Website	•	The City of Murrieta is utilizing a portion of BEYOND Core funds to develop a website in coordination with the Chamber of Commerce to provide comprehensive information to help new, expanding, and relocating businesses find the optimal location for sucess with the City of Murrieta. The website will utilize GIS software, real estate, demographic, workforce, and industry data to create this tool.
	HVAC Replacement at Murrieta Innovation Center	\$	The City of Murrieta is utilizing a portion of BEYOND Core funds to replace 11 aging HVAC units and install new Title 24 compliant units. Round I funding had been programmed for this, but was reprogrammed for upgrades to the Police and Fire Department HVAC units.
City of Norco	Ensuring Safety Through Feedback Signs		The City of Norco is utilizing BEYOND Core funding to purchase, install, and program 12-15 permanent speed feedback signs.
City of	Well One		The City of Perris, in partnership with Loma Linda University Dental School, and Lake Perris SDA Church, are organizing a bi-monthly dental clinic to serve the community to be integrated into an existing community medical and mental health clinic. Perris residents are granted first priority for appointments, but walk-ins from all areas are welcome. Funds will buy equipment and supplies. The clinic will be largely staff by volunteers, including volunteer dental students and professors.
Perris	Perris green City Farm/HealthyCo mmunity50	S	Perris was one of 50 awardees for the national HealthyCommunity50 Challenge, to compete to develop practical, evidence-based strategies to improve measurable health outcomes and promote health and wellness, equity and social interaction. Perris' strategy focuses on healthy food access and is seeking funding to expand its network of community gardens. Funds will focus on developing a goal of 31 gardens.



/ \ '	Drojoct Namo	100	Droiort Description
Agency		Area(s)	
City of Riverside	The Marketplace TOD & Mobility Hub Specific Plan Update	A	The City of Riverside is combing its Round I and Round II funding allocation for development of a Marketplace TOD & Mobility Hub Specific Plan in the area around the Downtown Metrolink Station. With BEYOND funds, the City will prepare a two phased plan to (1) develop a baseline infrastructure opportunities and constraints plan, and (2) create an implementable Mobility Hub Specific Plan. The City seeks to collaborate with RTA to plan for the area.
City of San Jacinto	San Jacinto Gateway Specific Plan		The City of San Jacinto is seeking funding to support the Gateway Specific Plan. Core funds will be dedicated toward preliminary document review, coordinating community visioning workshops and stakeholder interviews, coordinating public meetings and hearings, developing a market feasibility study, and grant management.
	Temecula Youth Project Construct	*	The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to create the Temecula Youth Construct project which aims to bridge the gap between educational attainment and vocational skills and offer an avenue, for students who do not attend college, to gain skills that will allow them to be successful within the community.
	Regional Cancer Taskforce		The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to contribute toward the efforts of the SW Cities Cancer Services Taskforce. The Taskforce will hire a facilitator and perform a study to identify trends and regional needs in the area of Cancer services. Results of the assessment are intended to be used in planning for and attracting in-demand services to the region both to support health outcomes and economic development.
City of Temecula	Emergency Management System		The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to host a one-day regional Emergency Management Summit, for the purpose of convening regional first responders, emergency managers, elected officials, businesses, and the general public to discuss emergency preparedness for the region.
	Intergenerationa I Horticulture Program	♦	The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to support the public-private partnership between the City and Our Nicholas Foundation which offers specialized vocational skill training for teens, adults, and seniors with special needs. Modeled after the RI BEYOND Funded Global Citizens Special Needs project, the Horticulture Program would be designed to teach basic skills that encompass cultivation of plants, vegetable gardening, landscaping, irrigation, and basic business practices for all ages with special needs from several communities in Western Riverside County.
	Bicycle Sharrows		The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to install 70 sharrows (or shared lane markings) divided between five areas surrounding schools in Temecula providing critical connections between local neighborhoods and schools as identified by the Trails and Bikeways Master Plan.



City / Agency	Project Name	Goal Area(s)	Description
	Industry Sector Promotions/Site Visits & Surveys	8	The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to create marketing pieces/strategies specific to industry sectors that are growing in Temecula: craft brewing, high tech, advanced manufacturing, and specialty retail. Additionally, the City's Economic Development team will conduct in-depth site visits with existing businesses to better understand their operations and needs.
City of Temecula	Government Leadership Program for Youth (GLPY)	*	The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to purchase equipment that will support the City's Government Leadership Program for Youth which facilitates interaction and communication between school districts, high school students and City staff in order to foster engagement.
	Sixth Street Sidewalk Improvements		The City of Temecula is utilizing a portion of its BEYOND Core funding to design and construct sidewalk improvements on the north side of Sixth Street, between Mercedes Street and the entrance to the Mary Philips Senior Center.
	Supervisorial District Projects		The County of Riverside will be dividing Round I and Round II BEYOND allocations, less a total of \$50,000 which has been directed to Public Health, to projects at the supervisorial district level.
Kiverside County	RUHS-PH Healthy Development Checklist	\$	Riverside University Health System-Public Health (RUHS-PH) is using \$25,000 from the Round II County BEYOND Core allocation to expand upon and support implementation of the Bi-County Healthy Development Checklist.
Eastern Municipal Water District	EMWD Sustainability Center Feasibility Study		EMWD is utilizing BEYOND Core funding to perform a feasibility analysis of siting a Sustainability Center near its Perris office campus, in partnership with the City of Perris and WRCOG.
RCOE	Meta THINK	**	The Riverside County Office of Education is utilizing BEYOND funding to partner with MetaTHINK and local school districts to address chronic absenteeism by working with parents, communities, and school administrators. The Program's aim is to improve student success as chronic absence is a strong indicator of poor performance.
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Dial-A-Ride Expansion	A	The Morongo Band of Mission Indians is utilizing BEYOND Round II funding to support continued operation of the Dial-A-Ride program which was initiated with BEYOND Round I funding. The Program provides access within and from the Reservation to such destinations as employment, educational centers, and health care facilities.

Page Witeritough Flank

Item 4.B

BEYOND Framework Fund Round II Funding Awards

Attachment 3

BEYOND Round II Team Project applications summary

Page Intentionally Left Blank



Summary of Round II BEYOND Team Project Applications



Lead	Partners	Project	Amount	Goal	Project Description
Agency		Name	Requested	Area(s)	
City of	EMWD,	Healthy	\$175,000.00		The City of Perris was one of 50 awardees for the national
Perris	UC Extension -	Community			HealthyCommunity50 Challenge, competing to develop practical, evidence-
	Master Gardener;	50/Perris	_		based strategies to improve measurable health outcomes and promote
	3 Elementary	Green City		(Sh.	health, wellness, equity, and social interaction. Perris' strategy focuses on
	Schools	Farm			healthy food access and is seeking funding to expand its network of
					community gardens. Team funds would support development of 10+ new
					gardens; the total goal is 31 gardens.
City of	Cities of Corona,	Western	\$94,293.00		Western Riverside Homeless Collaborative's (WRHC) main objective is to
Riverside	Jurupa Valley, Lake	Riverside			stabilize homeless people through the use of shelters, permanent housing,
	Elsinore, County of	Homeless			and assistance programs to reduce homelessness in the subregion. The
	Riverside, and	Collaborative			WRHC aims to achieve this objective by adopting a comprehensive regional
	Path of Life				approach to programming, performing asset mapping, strategic capacity
	Ministries				building, and coordinated placement and case management. Specific tasks
				•	to be completed include: (1) hiring Homeless Facilitators, (2) creating a
					Subregional Leadership Committee, (3) performing Asset Mapping, (4)
					assembling a Law Enforcement Case Conferencing Team, (5) identifying
					faith-based and other access points for a Coordinated Entry System, (6)
					Responsible Compassion and love Your Neighbor Campaign, and (7)
					Performance Measurement.
City of	Cities of Lake	Regional	\$125,000.00		The goal of the Regional Homeless Alliance is to achieve functional zero
Temecula	Elsinore, Menifee,	Homeless			homeless. BEYOND Team funds would support development of a more
	Murrieta, Wildomar,	Alliance			comprehensive regional program by building on the existing foundation with
	Temecula, and	(Southwest			a focus on immediate needs: beds, outreach, housing options and
	Community Mission	Cities)			coordination of services. Specific activities will include (1) development of a
	of Hope				Community Asset Assessment and Roadmap to address future needs, (2)
					development of formal housing navigation process, and (3) development of a
				•	replicable, coordinated entry system through outreach, housing navigation
					and low barrier supportive services. Specific tasks include hiring a part-time
					homeless outreach coordinator and part-time housing navigator,
					management of five full-time units for rapid rehousing, and provision of
					emergency shelter for an average of three individuals/families per night.

Page Intentionally Lett Blank

Item 4.B

BEYOND Framework Fund Round II Funding Awards

Attachment 4

BEYOND Round II Health Project applications summary

Pode Intentionally Lett Blank



Summary of Round II BEYOND Health Project Applications



/ / / /	Dr	100	Desiration
Agency		Area(s)	
City of	Lions Park		The City of Banning seeks additional funding support through BEYOND Health for the design and park
Banning	Expansion		improvements for Lions Park. The park is currently 9.12 acres consisting of 3 baseball fields, snack bar,
		W	and a playground. The City is working to expand the park to include an additional 7.46 acres, to be
			CEQA analysis for the park, the City's full Round II Core allocation (\$62,600) is being directed to park
٠٠٠ <u>٠</u> ٠٠	Orookeido Dark		The City of Colimosa scales BEVOND Health finade to transform Crackeide Bork into a Ethnose Bork by
Calimera	Creekside Park		installing park grade fitness equipment stations. The installation will require relocation of existing
	Facilities	TANK)	fencing material to expand the park area; installation of rubberized safety surface around each fitness
			station; and replacing existing benches, trash cans, and picnic tables to accommodate and encourage increased park usage. The City has allocated 100% of Round II Core funds (\$35,000) to this project.
City of	Health and		The City of Corona is performing an interim update to the General Plan and seeks BEYOND Health
Corona	Wellness		funds to offset approximately 35% of the costs associated with creating a Health and Wellness
	Component of	3	Component which would include an existing conditions analysis and the establishment of specific goals,
	General Plan		policies, and programs to address identified health concerns.
	Interim		
	l echnical		
City of	Rubidoux		The City of Jurupa Valley seeks funding for further development of The Walk-Rubidoux, a place-based
Jurupa	Healthy Walk		health strategy in a socio-economically disadvantaged area using placemaking tactics to activate the
Valley	Enhancement	AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	area socially, economically, and culturally, while promoting physical activity and healthy eating.
	Program		Strategies include planting fruit trees and edible gardens in public spaces, and placing a community garden at Higher Ground Church on Mission Blvd.
City of	Fit-Trails		The City of Lake Elsinore seeks BEYOND Health funding to install fitness equipment stations at four
Lake	Equipment	2	parks throughout the city. The four parks were selected based on current activity and utilization levels,
Elsinore			varied user types, disbursement of locations throughout the city, and existing walking path infrastructure. The City has allocated \$74.500 of Round II Core funds to the Fit Trails project
City of	Southwest		The Cities of Menifee and Murrieta are seeking BEYOND Health funding to contribute toward the efforts
Menifee	Riverside		of the SW Cities Cancer Services Taskforce. The study will identify trends and regional needs in the
	County Cancer		area of Cancer services. Results of the assessment are intended to be used in planning for and
	Needs		development.
	Assessment		

Summary of Round II BEYOND Health Project Applications



City /	Project Name	Goal	Project Description
Agency		Alea(s)	
City of	Moreno Valley		The City of Moreno Valley seeks BEYOND Health funding for the City's Healthy Community Element to
Moreno	Healthy		be integrated into the City's planned comprehensive General Plan update. Through the Health element,
Valley	Community		the City strives to improve community awareness and planning for access to healthy lifestyle choices,
1	Element		alternative transportation modes, and more considerate development strategies that ultimately support
			active living, social and economic progress, and higher quality of life. The City has allocated \$35,800 of
			Round II Core funding to the Healthy Community Element.
City of	HVAC		The Cities of Menifee and Murrieta are seeking BEYOND Health funding to contribute toward the efforts
Murrieta	Replacement at	*	of the SW Cities Cancer Services Taskforce. The study will identify trends and regional needs in the
	Murrieta		area of Cancer services. Results of the assessment are intended to be used in planning for and
	Innovation	F	attracting in-demand services to the region both to support health outcomes and economic
, () () () () () () () () () () () () ()	Center		development. The City of Norce accide BEVOND Hoolth finalise for the Borth Pordense Program which are video
בונא פו פ	rany randners		The City of Norco seeks be Young health lunding for the Party Pardners Program which provides
Norco		All Park	activities for developmentally disabled adults. BEYOND Health funds would be put toward bi-monthly social events that include dancing, games, crafts, and live entertainment.
City of	Well One		The City of Perris, in partnership with Loma Linda University Dental School, and Lake Perris SDA
Perris			Church, are organizing a bi-monthly dental clinic to serve the community to be integrated into an
			existing community medical and mental health clinic. Perris residents are granted first priority for
		Mar	appointments, but walk-ins from all areas are welcome. The City seeks BEYOND Health funds in
			addition to Core funds to buy equipment and supplies. The clinic will be largely staff by volunteers,
			including volunteer dental students and professors. The City has allocated \$20,000 of Round II Core
			funding toward the Well One project.
City of	Green Action		The City of Riverside seeks BEYOND Health funding to update the City's Green Action Plan (GAP).
Riverside	Plan		Through the update, the City plans to strengthen the cross-sectoral collaboration among stakeholders
			and merge the GAP progress indicators with the Sustainability Tools for Assessing and Rating
			Communities (STAR) framework. Working to enhance the GAP and increase alignment with the STAR
			Framework, the City's goal is to become a 4-STAR Community by July 2018.
City of	San Jacinto		The City of San Jacinto seeks BEYOND Health funding to support the Gateway Specific Plan. Core
San	Gateway		funds will be dedicated toward preliminary document review, coordinating community visioning
Jacinto	Specific Plan	. Charles	workshops and stakeholder interviews, coordinating public meetings and hearings, developing a market
			feasibility study, and grant management. The City has allocated 100% of Round II Core funding
			(\$82,000) toward the Specific Plan. Round I funding was also directed to the plan, which had included a المارية المار
			nealthy San Jacinio Initiative.



Summary of Round II BEYOND Health Project Applications

City / Agency	Project Name	Goal Area(s)	Description
County of Riverside	RUHS-PH Healthy Development Checklist	College Colleg	The County of Riverside seeks financial support through BEYOND Health for the 2017 Healthy Living Extravaganza which is a one-day event occurring annually in the Spring at the Rancho Jurupa Park in Jurupa Valley. The Extravaganza provides family entertainment; games; informational booths offering info on nutrition, healthy living resources. Attendance is estimated to be approximately 3K, primarily from Jurupa Valley.
Eastern Municipal Water District	EMWD Sustainability Center Feasibility Study		EMWD seeks BEYOND Health funding for the H20 To Go program which will provide chilled water fountain and water bottle fill stations at four schools in EMWD's potable water service area which also participate in the 100 mile club (an organization promoting increased physical activity). The stations will replace aged/failing fountains and promote increased water drinking and physical activity through marketing.

Page Intentionally Lett Blank



Western Riverside Council of Governments Administration & Finance Committee

Staff Report

Subject: Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Program Nexus Study Update

Contact: Christopher Gray, Director of Transportation, gray@wrcog.cog.ca.us, (951) 955-8304

Date: May 10, 2017

The purpose of this item is to provide Committee members with an update on the progress of the TUMF Nexus Study update, including the response to comments received during the comment period.

Requested Action:

Discuss and provide input regarding comments on the draft Nexus Study.

WRCOG's TUMF Program is a regional fee program designed to provide transportation and transit infrastructure that mitigates the impact of new growth in Western Riverside County. Each of WRCOG's member jurisdictions and the March JPA participates in the Program through an adopted ordinance, collects fees from new development, and remits the fees to WRCOG. WRCOG, as administrator of the TUMF Program, allocates TUMF to the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), groupings of jurisdictions – referred to as TUMF Zones – based on the amounts of fees collected in these groups, and the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA). The TUMF Nexus Study is intended to satisfy the requirements of California Government Code Chapter 5 Section 66000-66008 (also known as the California Mitigation Fee Act), which governs imposing development impact fees in California. The Study establishes a nexus, or reasonable relationship, between the development impact fee's use and the type of project for which the fee is required. The TUMF Program is a development impact fee and is subject to the California Mitigation Fee Act (AB 1600, Govt. Code § 6600), which mandates that a Nexus Study be prepared to demonstrate a reasonable and rational relationship between the fee and the proposed improvements for which the fee is used. AB 1600 also requires the regular review and update of the Program and Nexus Study to ensure the validity of the Program. The last TUMF Program Update was completed in October 2009.

Draft TUMF Nexus Study

<u>Nexus Study Updates</u>: WRCOG staff has determined that some modifications to the TUMF Network, which is a key determinant of the fee, are appropriate given recent State Legislation as well as questions from stakeholders regarding the status of certain projects that were under construction during the preparation of the Nexus Study. These modifications will result in a reduced fee schedule as shown in the table below.

The largest single change in network results from the anticipated passage of SB 132, which is a companion bill to the recently enacted SB 1. SB 132 provides over \$400 million in direct transportation funding for five projects in Western Riverside County, including three that were included in the draft TUMF Nexus Study. These three projects include the following:

- McKinley Avenue Grade Separation
- Limonite Avenue / I-15 interchange
- Hamner Avenue Bridge

The final draft fee schedule in the TUMF Nexus Study is below:

Land Use Type	Current Fee	Draft Nexus Study Fee	% Change from current fee – with TUMF Network adjustments
Single-Family Residential	\$8,873	\$9,418	6%
Multi-Family Residential	\$6,231	\$6,134	<0%
Industrial	\$1.73	\$1.77	3%
Retail	\$10.49	\$12.31	17%
Service	\$4.19	\$4.56	9%

Staff will not be accepting any additions to the TUMF Network but will be removing projects if a jurisdiction formally requests to do so based on the extensive outreach related to the network previously completed. Additionally, the Public Works Committee formally reviewed and approved the roadway network after numerous iterations and meetings with jurisdictions. Staff forwarded this information to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Executive Committee for approval.

Based on the above revised TUMF schedule, the change in fee for each land use will have the resulting adjustments in development costs:

Land Use Type	All Fees as % of Total Dev. Cost / Return	TUMF as % of All Fees	TUMF as % of Total Dev. Cost / Return	Illustrative % Increase in TUMF	Resulting % Increase in All Fees	Resulting % Increase in All Dev. Costs / Returns
Single Family	9.2%	24.6%	1.8%	6%	1.2%	0.11%
Multi Family	9.3%	22.0%	2.0%	<0%	-0.4%	-0.03%
Industrial	4.1%	30.5%	1.3%	3%	0.7%	0.03%
Retail	8.0%	43.6%	3.5%	17%	7.5%	0.60%
Office	4.7%	17.0%	0.8%	9%	1.5%	0.07%

On February 28, 2017, WRCOG released the draft TUMF Nexus Study for review and comment, with the comment period extending through April 21, 2017. With the comment period now closed, staff, in consultation with legal counsel and the TUMF consultant, are reviewing all comments submitted on the draft TUMF Nexus Study and will be preparing responses to each individual comment. Staff will provide an update on the response to comments and once finalized, the responses will be posted on the WRCOG website. WRCOG received ten formal comment letters on the draft TUMF Nexus Study. Each correspondence is briefly summarized below.

The City of Calimesa submitted a letter of support and recommended that a phase-in approach be utilized for fee increases.

NAIOP submitted a letter of support on the draft TUMF Nexus Study.

The Corona Chamber of Commerce submitted a letter of support on the draft TUMF Nexus Study.

KWC Engineers, as a representative of the development firm Castle and Cooke, submitted a letter of support on the draft TUMF Nexus Study recommended that WRCOG consider a phase-in approach for fee increases.

The City of Moreno Valley provided comments, primarily on the TUMF Network and requested a number of changes to the funding provided for facilities in Moreno Valley. The City also recommended that any fee increase be implemented through a phasing process.

County of Riverside District 1 Supervisor, Kevin Jeffries, submitted a comment letter that notes negative impacts on retail uses from any proposed fee increase. This letter also states that the Nexus Study incentivizes industrial and mining uses by not considering the full impact of truck related uses.

Pacific Retail Partners submitted a letter, which primarily addresses the impact of a TUMF fee increase on retail uses.

The BIA submitted three comment letters. The first letter is a review of the Nexus Study conducted by the law firm of Rutan & Tucker, LLP, which questions impact fees in general, the TUMF Program, and elements of the Nexus Study. The second letter is from Proactive Engineering Consultants West and raises questions about cost calculations in the TUMF Program, primarily costs for right-of-way and other soft costs like planning and design. The third letter is a request to phase in any fee increases for single-family residential uses.

WRCOG also retained a consultant to conduct a peer review of the draft TUMF Nexus Study during the comment period. This consultant concluded that the TUMF Nexus Study met the legal requirements for a Nexus Study and complied with applicable state law and regulations for a fee study.

Staff also followed up with Highland Fairview, who submitted a formal comment letter on the draft 2015 TUMF Nexus Study, to determine whether they had any questions on the latest draft TUMF Nexus Study. Staff at Highland Fairview determined that all of their comments from 2015 had been addressed by WRCOG in the draft TUMF Nexus Study.

With the receipt of a letter of support from NAIOP and no further comments from Highland Fairview, the BIA is the only party who provided significant comments on the 2015 Draft Nexus Study and significant comments on the updated Study.

While WRCOG is finalizing the responses to each individual comment, staff would like to provide a few general responses that address a number of comments received, which are below:

TUMF Network: As part of the Nexus Study update, WRCOG engaged in a comprehensive review of the Network by taking multiple approaches. WRCOG worked with TUMF consultants, stakeholders, and member jurisdiction staff over the course of the Nexus Study update to develop the TUMF Network. The proposed network was then distributed to the Public Works Committee and the Executive Committee for approval, which occurred December 8, 2016, and January 9, 2017, respectively. Each WRCOG member jurisdiction had an opportunity to provide comments on the Network throughout this process and no further changes to the Network will be forthcoming. The only possible Network edits will be to remove any completed or partially completed projects based on a review of existing conditions for each roadway in question.

Soft cost and right-of-way allocations: The TUMF Program allows planning, engineering and contingency costs for eligible projects to be reimbursed through the Program. The TUMF Nexus Study currently defines planning costs as those associated with "planning, preliminary engineering and environmental assessment costs" with the eligible amount being 10% of the estimated TUMF eligible construction cost only. Engineering costs are defined in the TUMF Nexus Study as "project study report, design, permitting and construction oversight costs" based on 25% of the estimated eligible construction cost only. Contingency is provided based on 10% of the total estimated eligible facility cost. Staff has conducted a review of recent projects and determined that the allocated soft costs are in line with the average expenses. In several recent instances, jurisdictions have exceeded the allocation for soft costs in TUMF, which has required the City to make up the shortfall. As for the right-of-way allocations, the TUMF Program adjusts the right-of-way component by implementing a 75% global reduction to account for instances in which right-of-way is dedicated for the TUMF improvements. This global reduction accounts for those instances in which ROW is available for specific corridors.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) approach: SB 743 establishes the use of VMT as the preferred basis for measuring traffic impacts, in recognition of the fact that VMT more accurately reflects traffic impacts as it takes into account both the number of trips being made and the distance of those trips. Consistent with SB 743, consideration of travel impacts in terms of peak period VMT more accurately reflects the realities of travel

behavior as the basis for determining impacts on the regional transportation system by reflecting the peak demands on the system based on the number of trips and the cumulative distance these trips occupy facilities in the system. Variation in trip length for different trip purposes is important to quantify since the impact associated with a trip is not limited to whether a trip occurs or not. A longer distance trip occupies more roadways over a longer period of time (all else being equal), and therefore goes through more intersections and consumes more capacity requiring greater levels of mitigation. As the purpose of the TUMF is to mitigate the traffic impacts of future growth, a VMT based approach better aligns with this purpose than a more simplistic trip-based methodology. The VMT approach also aligns the TUMF Study with future requirements to mitigation VMT impacts, which maintains the utility of the TUMF program as a CEQA mitigation measure.

WRCOG staff anticipates the below schedule regarding review of the Nexus Study by the WRCOG Committees. The opportunity for member jurisdictions and stakeholders to provide public testimony on the Nexus Study will be at the June 5, 2017, Executive Committee meeting.

May 18, 2017: Technical Advisory Committee discusses response to comments on the draft TUMF

Nexus Study.

June 5, 2017: Executive Committee discusses final response to comments on the draft TUMF Nexus

Study.

June 8, 2017: Public Works Committee makes a recommendation on the draft TUMF Nexus Study. Administration & Finance Committee makes a recommendation on the draft TUMF

Nexus Study.

June 15, 2017: Technical Advisory Committee makes a recommendation on the draft TUMF Nexus

Study.

July 10, 2017: Executive Committee takes action on the draft TUMF Nexus Study.

Fall 2017: Any change in fee goes into effect (depending on each member jurisdiction's approval of

TUMF Ordinance / Resolutions).

The above schedule is tentative and subject to change depending on input from our Committees and stakeholders.

Prior Actions:

<u>May 1, 2017</u>: The Executive Committee continued this item to its next meeting due to time constraints.

April 20, 2017: The Technical Advisory Committee received report.

April 13, 2017: The Public Works Committee received report.

April 12, 2017: The Administration & Finance Committee received report.

Fiscal Impact:

TUMF activities are included in the Agency's adopted Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget under the Transportation Department.

Attachment:

Draft TUMF Nexus Study comments.

Item 4.C

Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Nexus Study Update

Attachment 1

Draft TUMF Nexus Study comments

Pode Intentionally Lett Blank

Comment	Agency / Stakeholder	Submitted Comment
City of Calime	esa	
A1.1	City of Calimesa	The City also appreciates WRCOG implementing a phased approach for the fee increases for single family residential and retail land use categories. This will allow the City time to work with developers on moving current projects forward without the threat of substantial fee increases in the near term.
City of Moren	o Valley	
A2.1	City of Moreno Valley	The original Draft TUMF Nexus Study was distributed in August of 2015 and included comments from private developers, the BIA and governmental agencies. Include a summary of how comments/questions were addressed in the Final TUMF Nexus Study.
A2.2	City of Moreno Valley	There was no mention in the TUMF Nexus Study of any fee reductions for affordable housing or senior housing projects. WRCOG staff has recently informed a perspective developer in Moreno Valley that a reduced fee for senior housing will be implemented in the next two to three months. It is strongly recommended that a fee reduction mechanism for affordable housing and senior housing be evaluated and implemented within the final TUMF Nexus Study.
A2.3	City of Moreno Valley	An updated fee chart was provided at the March 6, 2017 WRCOG Executive Committee meeting that included a phase-in option for fee increase implementation from July 1, 2017 to July 1, 2020. In order to minimize the proposed increases in fees across the board, it is highly recommended that a phase-in fee implementation mechanism be considered as an option and included in the Final TUMF Nexus Study.
A2.4	City of Moreno Valley	Clarify whether Cities will be required to make up the difference in fees if the implementation is phased and measured against a 100% threshold on the effective date.
A2.5	City of Moreno Valley	Include a section on how WRCOG will handle reimbursements/credits from developers and agencies who built facilities on the network under the currently-adopted Nexus Study, and those facilities are now being deleted from the network in the 2017 study.
A2.6	City of Moreno Valley	Provide explanation of how Maximum TUMF Share was calculated for each facility in Moreno Valley, for example, which outside fund sources and from what reference. For example, Gilman Springs Road from 60 to Alessandro; and Reche Vista from City limit to Heacock. Also provide detail in Section 4.5, p. 39 what amounts and locations are covered in Existing Obligated Funding. Also provide more information in Section 4.7.
A2.7	City of Moreno Valley	Provide explanation of how new "% completed" were developed. Several differ from those reported by Moreno Valley. Specifically, several percent's are too high for the facility.
A2.8	City of Moreno Valley	City was aware that Perris Boulevard street segment was potentially to be removed from network, which is now reflected in the 2017 Draft. However, City requests that Perris/60 interchange remain on the Network.
A2.9	City of Moreno Valley	City's formal comments dated August 27, 2015 are not shown in the comment matrices nor were they addressed. Please incorporate and they are repeated here.

A2.10	City of Moreno Valley	The City has the following comments on the Draft 2015 TUMF Nexus Study dated August 17, 2015: Include State Route (SR) 60/Moreno Beach Interchange as a line item – this location is already on the 2009 network as a Type 2 interchange and appears to have been missed. On the Draft 2015 network, the SR-60/Moreno Beach interchange cost would be \$37,483,000, the same as other Type 2 interchanges.
A2.11	City of Moreno Valley	Ironwood Avenue from SR-60 to Day Street as shown in Appendix G-1 should state "Full funding available from other sources" instead of "City to fund with local sources."
A2.12	City of Moreno Valley	Since SR-60/Nason Interchange is shown on the 2015 Draft Nexus study at \$11,128,000, please reference the City's February 6, 2015 request that WRCOG acknowledge the City's \$19,106,000 savings as satisfaction against the \$999,302.77 loss to the network. (As an alternate option as suggested in our letter, for ease of accounting \$14,100,000 could be shown on the network, which would consist of \$13,069,951 allocated in TUMF TIP funds plus \$1,000,000 50% TUMF reduction deficit make-up.)
A2.13	City of Moreno Valley	Heacock from San Michelle to Harley Knox segment - will the \$300k network reduction affect current funding on the proposed TIP? City is moving forward with the Heacock project and opposes any reduction in funding for this segment.
A2.14	City of Moreno Valley	Nason from Fir (south of SR-60) to Alessandro was completed in 2016 with 100% City funds and City will bill (or request savings against the network) for the 2009 TUMF maximum share.
A2.15	City of Moreno Valley	Section 1.1.1., subsection (4) - "list of roads that have existing capacity deficiencies" - where is this list?
A2.16	City of Moreno Valley	Include the August 8, 2015 comment letter from the BIA's consultant, referenced on p. 35 in Section 4.3.
A2.17	City of Moreno Valley	Section 4.3, page 35, reference to Appendix G should include a description of what's included in G-1 and G-2, and the dates of actions by WRCOG and committees.
A2.18	City of Moreno Valley	Provide a fee comparison table to show differences from 2009 to 2017.
A2.19	City of Moreno Valley	In Appendix A, correct the spelling of the committee member Gutierrez's first name to the following: Yxstian
A2.20	City of Moreno Valley	In Appendix F, page F-3, the pavement thickness appears too thin for the streets in the TUMF program. For example, for minor arterials and above, the City's minimum pavement thickness is 0.5-ft of asphalt and 1.0-ft aggregate base. This promotes a stronger pavement structure and longer life, avoiding premature reconstruction. The City recommends WRCOG verify pavement sections with their member agencies.
A2.21	City of Moreno Valley	In Exhibit F-2, master unit cost summary, "ramp realignment" cost is blank.
A2.22	City of Moreno Valley	In Exhibit F-2, master unit cost summary, what types of street lights are assumed and are eligible - LED, HPSV, or other?
	•	·

A2.23	City of Moreno Valley	Referencing Exhibit F-4, Land Use cost assumption page, include in the study an explanation of how the 25% was derived.
A2.24	City of Moreno Valley	In Appendices G, G-1 and G-2, include dates of each agency's comments.
A2.25	City of Moreno Valley	In Appendices G, G-1 and G-2, include City's comments of 8/27/15. Specific comments are listed in #9 above.
A2.26	City of Moreno Valley	In Appendix G-1, Theodore Street from 60 to Eucalyptus, comment should state City will provide \$19.7 million in local funding, not \$20 million. Reference City's February 5, 2015 comment letter.
A2.27	City of Moreno Valley	In Appendix G-2, Ironwood from 60 to Day should remain on the network, with zero dollars, contingent on allocating the funds to another Moreno Valley street.
A2.28	City of Moreno Valley	In Exhibit G-2 and H-1, Day / 60 Interchange maximum value can be \$15 million. \$17,897,000 is too high for the improvements needed.
A2.29	City of Moreno Valley	In Appendix G-2, Moreno Beach/60 interchange, see previous comment for this location. Restore as Type 2 interchange at 35% completion level.
A2.30	City of Moreno Valley	Figure 4.4 - Transit Center (Mobility Hub) should be shown on the NW corner of Alessandro Boulevard and Nason Street
A2.31	City of Moreno Valley	Page 46 - Harley Knox terminates at Redlands Avenue, not Evans Road. Diagrams and any costs associated should be updated
A2.32	City of Moreno Valley	Page 28 - reference to year 2035. Horizon year is 2040.
A2.33	City of Moreno Valley	Exhibit E-1 should be updated to reflect 2017 built conditions. Perris Boulevard 4 lanes s/o Heacock; Cactus Avenue 6 lanes Elsworth Street to Heacock Street; Ironwood Avenue 4 lanes Heacock to Perris
A2.34	City of Moreno Valley	Page 46 - Day Street (SR-60 to Eucalyptus) should reflect 80% complete 5 lanes exist, 6 future. Funds should be added to complete the segment
A2.35	City of Moreno Valley	Page 10 Nexus Study and TUMF Fee Calculation Handbook consideration should be given to add a special category for Amazon Fulfilment Centers

ix F, page F-2 Typical Roadway Cross Section, City recommends updating the 4-foot bicycle lane to a minimum of 6 s is the typical width on Arterial Roadways.
H-1, Alessandro from 215 to Perris: correct the % complete from 74% to 60%. Alessandro from Perris to Nason: complete from 19% to 15%.
H-1, Gilman Springs from 60 to Alessandro, why does this not have full value?
H-1, Eucalyptus from 215 to Towngate: correct the % complete from 42% to 25%.
H-1, Heacock from Cactus to San Michelle: correct the % complete from 77% to 15%.
H-1, Day from Ironwood to 60: correct the number of existing lanes from 4 to 3.
H-1, Eucalyptus from Heacock to Kitching: correct the number of future lanes from 2 to 4.
H-1, Lasselle from JFK to Oleander, change Oleander to Harley Knox.
H-1, Pigeon Pass/CETAP corridor from Cantarini to Ironwood, change number of future lanes to 4.
H-1, Nason from 60 to Alessandro, the City completed widening with 100% City funds and will bill WRCOG the TUMF share from 2009 study (Fir to Alessandro segment).
1, include Logistics in the Industrial sector.
proposal to significantly increase the TUMF for new retail business facilities will put western Riverside County at a competitive disadvantage in not only seeking small and medium business creation - but will substantially harm our dvance permanent job creation in those sectors. Additionally this office believes that the proposed fee structure will y hamper our ability to comply with and/or achieve the above state regulatory directives for live - work housing in western Riverside County.

A3.2	County of Riverside - District 1	The preliminary TUMF study conclusion itself acknowledges the potential adverse impact of the proposed increases fee structure, as evidenced by the recommendation to delay (or spread) the substantial increases over a few years.
A3.3	County of Riverside - District 1	Furthermore, the proposed rate structure continues to appear to incentivize warehouse and mining development in Riverside County over other non-residential uses. These rates appear to only consider trip counts, and do not seem to take into account the extra burden of heavy trucks on congestion and road maintenance costs.
A3.4	County of Riverside - District 1	In closing, spreading an excessive fee increase over a few years will not make Western Riverside County any more competitive in advancing and achieving local job creation this county so desperately needs, and will instead simply serve to advance the personal and financial costs of "exporting" our county's labor force each day.
Building Indu	stry Association	on (BIA)
A4.1	BIA	Given the state of the housing market / development climate for single family homes, the BIA respectfully requests that WRCOG apply the same two-year freeze and subsequent two-year phase in for single family home development that is being applied to the retail development industry in the study.
BIA (Rutan &	Tucker, LLP)	
A5.1	BIA	The Draft Study accurately recites the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act that must be met in order to adopt or amend valid fees, but significant parts of the Draft Study fail to comply with those requirements;
A5.2	BIA	The Draft Study's proposed change so as to calculate "impacts" based on new use of a VMT methodology may be theoretically acceptable, but it raises important questions about the accuracy and fairness of the assumptions and conclusions of the VMT inputs used in the Draft Nexus Study for allocation of costs of new TUMF improvements, e.g., assumptions or data supporting the proposed reliance use of "peak hour" trips for residential sources. WRCOG should be asked to provide additional, more focused, data on these issues.
A5.3	BIA	The Draft Study fails to properly take into account the probability of new State funding for many of the improvements included in the study;
A5.4	BIA	The Draft Study does not appear to take into account – and credit other, non-TUMF, funding sources for the proposed facilities and improvements (e.g., existing surpluses, interest, local non-TUMF tax revenues generated by new development, etc.)
A5.5	BIA	The Draft Study, in its present draft form, does not appear to provide sufficient evidence and analysis to meet the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act or other applicable laws.

A5.6	BIA	Threshold Issues Raised by "Transportation Impact Fees - Generally: Despite the increased reliance upon traffic impact fees by many agencies in California, such fees suffer inherent conceptual and causal weaknesses not common to other infrastructure fees. There are legitimate concerns about the "accuracy" or fairness of using "development mitigation fees" in the context of funding improvements to streets, highways, and other components of a road system that serves, and benefits, a large, open-ended, communityOne obvious error in some current practice is the calculation of traffic impact fees based on loading the network with the new development's traffic and looking for congestion. This violates the basic principle of impact fee design, namely, that all users face the marginal cost.
A5.7	BIA	"Nexus" Requirements - Generally: WRCOG must show "reasonable nexus" and "rough proportionality" between impacts caused and the amount of fees charged to justify TUMF. Here, the TUMF program allows fees to be collected from development in one area of the WRCOG and to be expended on roads in areas that are far distant from the homes or employment of the fee payers. It is questionable whether the WRCOG is vested with legal authority to transfer fee proceeds beyond the jurisdictions in which they are collected or generated. Also, the imposition of development fees depends upon exercise of police power authority, which generally can be exercised only within the territorial boundaries of the city or county imposing the fee or regulation
A5.8	BIA	Temporal nexus question: in addition, the rational nexus test usually requires that there must be a temporal connection between when the fee is imposed or collected, and when the agency collecting the fee uses it to provide the public benefits or facilities for which the fee is imposed. (See, e.g. Gov. Code §§ 66001(c) and 66006.) It is not clear that the TUMF program is depositing, accounting for, and applying the fee revenues collected in a timely manner as required by the Fee Act.
A5.9	BIA	Credits for prior fee collections? If the TUMF program currently has any previously-collected fee proceeds on deposit which have not already been spent on or committed to specific TUMF improvement programs, those 'surplus' or uncommitted fee balances should be shown as a credit going forward.
A5.10	BIA	Interest on collected fees? Does the TUMF program disclose its interest earnings on collected, but unspent, fee revenues? Any such interest accruals should be shown as a credit going forward.
A5.11	BIA	Reasonable "fees" or disguised "taxes"? The courts have emphasized that these nexus requirements are of constitutional significance, and essential to the validity of any attempt to impose "mitigation fees" of any type. The requirement for demonstration of a reasonable nexus is also one critical distinction between a "fee" from a "tax." Purported "fees" which exceed the reasonable costs of providing the facilities or services for which they are imposed are properly regarded as "taxes" rather than fees.
A5.12	BIA	The WRCOG bears the burden of producing evidence to justify its fees, not only as to the amount of the fees but as to their nature and as to their allocation.
A5.13	BIA	(A) Gov. Code § 66001(a)(2) Identification of specific facilities to be funded by TUMF? Gov. Code § 66001(a)(2) requires that the agency establishing fees must "identify the use to which the fee is to be put" and if that intended use is "financing public facilities" then the agency must identify those facilities. While the Draft Nexus Study appears to have a fairly specific list of facilities and improvements that are to be funded by the TUMF, has that list been "finalized" or adopted in a capital improvement plan by the governing board of WRCOG or the participating agencies? WRCOG and its members should demonstrate that adequate and reasonably funding commitments have been secured to cover that portion of the costs of new facilities which cannot lawfully be attributed to "new" development paying TUMF fees.
A5.14	BIA	(B) Gov. Code § 66001(b) Determination of reasonable costs of facilities? Gov. Code § 66001(b) requires the WRCOG to make certain determinations based on finding a reasonable relationship between the "reasonable costs" of the proposed facilities "attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed," and the proposed new TUMF fees.

	I	
A5.15	BIA	(C) Gov. Code § 66000(g) – Existing deficiencies? California law expressly prohibits the calculation or imposition of fees on new development in order to address existing needs or deficiencies. (Gov. Code § 66000(g) [prohibiting fees from including any costs attributable to "existing deficiencies"]; Bixel Assoc. v. City of Los Angeles (1989). 216 Cal.App.3d 1208.) It is not clear from my review of the Draft Update as to whether the study sufficiently segregates existing transportation deficiencies and roads operating at below-standard levels from new and improved roadways and facilities due needed as a consequence of new development. Lanes of highway and road surface, and other transportation infrastructure, must generally be built in large bulk units not easily susceptible to nuanced allocation.
A5.16	BIA	(D) Gov. Code § 66005.1 – Special treatment for transportation impact fees imposed on housing developments meeting transit-oriented criteria? The Nexus Study does not appear to acknowledge this statute, which was added to the Mitigation Fee Act in 2008, and became effective in January 2011. Section 66005.1 specifically applies to any fee imposed "for purposes of mitigating vehicular traffic impacts" – like the TUMF. It requires that for housing developments meeting certain criteria (e.g. located within ½ mile of a transit station), the agency must set the traffic impact fees "at a rate that reflects a lower rate of trip generation" than the rate generally applicable to housing that does not meet those criteria (with some exceptions)
A5.17	BIA	Selection of appropriate road segments to be funded by Fee?
A5.18	BIA	Some of the costs may be for improvements in quality (not just capacity improvements to the existing road facilities - this creates benefits enjoyed by all existing users and should thus be allocated differently. Cf. Gov't Code §66001(g).
A5.19	BIA	Costs attributable to building less than 100% of new lanes? (See discussion under item 4(C) above.
A5.20	BIA	Excessive "contingency" percentages. The cost estimates used in the study appear to include unusually large (excessive?) "contingency" percentages over and above the remaining cost estimates. It would be reasonable to try to ascertain if the Nexus Study is adequately supported by substantial evidence as to these estimates.
A5.21	BIA	The Draft Nexus Study points out that this fee analysis, for the first time, is based on use of VMT methodologies, in contrast to previous TUMF Nexus Studies. WRCOG's cover letter acknowledges that this change in methodology appears to result in allocating a larger percentage of the estimated costs of mitigation projects to "residential" development than under previous approaches.
A5.22	BIA	WRCOG cites no legal authority specifically approving the use of that VMT methodology for the purposes of calculating or allocating transportation impact mitigation fees. While WRCOG notes that VMT analyses are increasingly used in the context of CEQA studies and for measuring project-specific (or program-specific) "impacts" on traffic in that context, that is not the same as attempting to use VMT for the purposes of allocating the costs of mitigating traffic/transportation impacts between various sub-sets of users of open-ended public roads and highways. Attempting to rely on VMT in this new Draft Nexus Study for the purpose of allocating the estimated costs of mitigation work therefore should require that WRCOG provide more comprehensive data/evidence supporting the assumptions in the Draft Nexus Study, and should more fully account for VMT from all sources of anticipated increases in traffic impacts using TUMF facilities.
A5.23	BIA	To the extent that VMT is being used, some observations may be made: Fees should be proportionate to new development's contribution to the anticipated increase in traffic impacts. "Traffic impact" here is measured as "peak-hour" vehicle-miles of travel, and is the product of peak-hour trips generated per dwelling unit (or per square feet of gross floor area for nonresidential use), the percentage of these trips that are not stopping as part of a longer trip somewhere else (i.e., non-pass-by trips), and a relative index of trip length within the area.

A5.24	BIA	Question as to whether data supports the assumptions about residential units as sources of peak hour trips;
A5.25	BIA	Question as to whether estimates here as to trips per day are properly adjusted for "peak hour" congestion.
A5.26	BIA	Question as to whether the trips attributed to/generated by residential users are properly adjusted for travel at times outside of "peak hour." Non-peak trips would have less impact and create less need for additional improvements and fees.
A5.27	BIA	Assuming \$3,139M is accurate estimate of total costs of all proposed improvements, the Draft Nexus Study appears to impose all such costs on new private sector development.
A5.28	BIA	Are there any allocations to "orphan shares" (users who add to impacts and transportation needs but which are exempt from TUMF for policy reasons)?
A5.29	BIA	Any allocation of costs to existing users – other users who benefit from improvements in quality of transportation system?
A5.30	BIA	Any allocation of costs to exempt or public sector users or users not otherwise subject to the TUMF fees?
A5.31	BIA	Any allocation of costs to users of subject road system originating outside the TUMF program area?
A5.32	BIA	New State funding – e.g., SB 132 provides substantial new funding for transportation improvements in Riverside County (\$427 M), and at least some of those funds would be targeted at TUMF projects (e.g., Interstate 5/Limonite Interchange; Hamner Bridge widening; possibly others such as McKinley grade separation and Jurupa Avenue grade separation). Such State contributions should therefore be reflected as credits in the Draft Nexus Study and thus reducing the TUMF project costs to be funded by fees on new development.)
A5.33	BIA	Other Transportation Funding Sources (feds, regional, local taxes, etc.)
A5.34	віа	Although we are informed that approximately \$80 million of proposed projects/facilities were removed from the Draft Study in anticipation of State transportation funding being provided for those projects, it appears that the Draft Study should remove additional projects, or otherwise reflect appropriate credits, for additional State transportation funding being provided in the Governor's recent allocation of SB-1 revenues. Governor Brown's new proposal for increased gas taxes and vehicle registration fees to provide more State funding for road improvements is this addressed in the TUMF Nexus Study?

A5.35	BIA	Credits for additional tax revenues/street improvements from new development? New development ultimately will be paying property and gasoline taxes, in addition to TUMF fees, that will be used to fund arterial roads. In addition, local jurisdictions in WRCOG will require subdividers and other developments to provide (at developer cost) internal streets and key access road improvements, in addition to roads and highways funded by TUMF.
A5.36	BIA	CEQA compliance is an additional issue that should be raised at the appropriate time before the WRCOG considers or adopts any new TUMF requirements, although CEQA is distinct from the "nexus study" requirement addressed in this memo. CEQA provides only limited exemptions for actions establishing fees and those limited exemptions only apply if the fees are not designed to increase services or expand a system. (Pub. Res. Code § 21080(b)(8); CEQA Guidelines § 15273.) That is not the case here, since the TUMF itself admits that it is largely intended to expand and improve road facilities. Therefore action on the new TUMF fees is not exempt from CEQA (cf., CEQA Guideline § 15273(b).)
BIA (Proactive	Engineering	Consultants West)
A6.1	BIA	The initial review was limited to confirming that the 2016 up-date had made the Lane Mile Network changes recommended by PECW/BIA when we conducted our last review in 2015. The changes we requested in 2015 to WRCOG related to eliminating new lane improvements from the network which already existed physically on the ground. Many of the changes we requested in 2015 were not made with the 2016 up-date. PECW/BIA had several conference calls with WRCOG staff, and ultimately they agreed with over 90% of our recommendations and up-dated their study accordingly, for a total reduction amount of over \$80,000,000.
A6.2	ВІА	In addition to reviewing the lane mile network changes, PECW and the BIA continue to question WRCOG on the high "percentage of construction" cost numbers for consulting fees for Planning and Engineering. TUMF uses a flat 10% of construction cost for "Planning Consulting Fees" and 25% for "Engineering Consultant Fees". Both are two times the average regional cost for public works planning and engineering consulting. When questioned about the high numbers (which currently total over \$640,000,000 in the 2016 up-date) WRCOG responded that they are told by the public works directors that 10% for planning and 25% for engineering is needed. If the consulting percentages were reduced to industry standards of 5% for planning and 12% for engineering, the total cost would reduce by more than \$320,000,000.
A6.3	BIA	The last issue PECW was asked to review was the cost to acquire Right of Way (ROW) for the Land Use Category 2. TUMF identifies three separate land use categories within the network. Land use 1 (for developed urban areas), Land Use 2 (developed suburban areas) and Land Use 3 (for undeveloped rural areas). The 2016 up-date increased all three categories, however Land Use 2 increased by 280%. The study calculated the cost to acquire Right of Way by a simple formula: (segment length x number of new lanes x cost per lane mile). The cost for acquiring R/W in Land Use 3 is \$287,000 per lane mile. The cost for acquiring R/W in Land Use 2 is \$2,263,000/lane mile. There are two major flaws with the Nexus study in their calculations for determining cost of Right of Way. 1) The study does not make any adjustments for segments where portions of, or all of the Right of Way needed for the new lane construction is already dedicated. 2) The study does not make any adjustments for segments where portions of, or all of the Land Use Categories are actually 3 (undeveloped) and not 2 (developed).
KWC Enginee	rs	
		4
A7.1	KWC Engineers	In our review of the Nexus Study we have seen how the WRCOG has included TUMF eligible facilities within and adjacent to our Alberhill project, particularly along the Temescal Canyon Road, Lake Street and Nichols Road corridors, along with the I-15 Freeway interchanges at Lake Street and Nichols. In addition, WRCOG has added other additional significant TUMF eligible improvements within Lake Elsinore which bodes well with the emerging development within the City. We understand that City's management and WRCOG have spent significant time selecting projects within the City. Based on the proposed TUMF Study, we have estimated that Castle & Cooke's projects will generate over \$100,000,000 in TUMF revenue to WRCOG. The amount of TUMF eligible improvements is significantly improved over the 2009 Nexus Study. We are in support of those TUMF eligible facilities that are currently proposed in the Draft TUMF 2017 Nexus Study.

A7.2	KWC Engineers	Our other comment of the study is relative to the proposed fee increase, particularly for single and multi-family housing, and commercial development. As always we are concerned when fee increases are required of developers, and in this case the significant increase of \$3.00/SF for the commercial fee will be challenging for those of us developing commercial property. Our suggestion to WRCOG is to consider a phased fee increase over time for all your fee increases. On behalf of Castle & Cooke, we support the TUMF Nexus Study and we ask for your consideration of our suggestion for the phased fee increase over time.
NAIOP (Comr	nercial Real Es	tate Development Association)
A8.1	NAIOP	As an industry group, we appreciate the effort WRCOG took to involve NAIOP as a stakeholder in your study and decision making process. We understand the need to raise fees from time to time and continue to remember and appreciate WRCOG's willingness to lower fees in difficult economic times. We hope the stakeholder process WRCOG undertook becomes a model for future decision making in the County and we support the newly proposed TUMF fee.
Pacific Retail	Partners	
r acinc Ketali	raitileis	
A9.1	Pacific Retail Partners	The methodology does not reflect reality. A Shopping Center is a "follower" of the residential market. Homes are built first (and therefore create the first trip to the new area), then a new Shopping Center becomes viable. Many of the trips to Shopping Centers are simply serving the passer by trips already created by the residential properties.
A9.2	Pacific Retail Partners	We use the term "Shopping Center" intentionally. A Shopping Center is a mix of "Retail" and "Service". There is a mix of these uses in a Shopping Center. Uses like a drycleaner, hair salon, food establishments, banks, credit unions and dentists all fall under Service. We have been paying a TUMF fee on our Shopping Centers based upon the "Retail" fee structure, while more than 50% of shop space today is not Retail, but rather Service. The county may have been over collecting against Shopping Centers since the inception of TUMF.
A9.3	Pacific Retail Partners	The Shopping Center world is changing rapidly. The internet has become a strong competitor and Shopping Centers will need to reinvent themselves. Paying the largest fee per square foot currently and now being asked to pay the largest increase will severely hurt the industry. Also, we would like to confirm that the new study contemplates all the new '-delivery truck" trips from fulfillment centers. These "Delivery Trips" should reduce retail trips.
A9.4	Pacific Retail Partners	We think cities and counties still want retail for the tax dollars. Punishing retail with the largest fee and increase seems counterproductive to this goal. Fees (all fees) for a Shopping Center currently being developed in Riverside County cities is fast approaching\$40/sf. In addition to fees, Shopping Center developers are asked to pay mitigation "fair share" costs for road improvements not covered by a transportation fee or program. These costs are just fees under a different name.
Corona Cham	ber of Comme	rce
A10.1	Corona Chamber of Commerce	On behalf of the hundreds of employers we work with daily, thank you to WRCOG for your work to update the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program through the completion of the required nexus study. TUMF is a key part of Riverside County's multi-jurisdictional public-private policy strategy to build great infrastructure and great communities and this nexus study helps keep the program on track for the challenges ahead for developers and communities.



Western Riverside Council of Governments Administration & Finance Committee

Staff Report

Subject: Update on WRCOG Agency office relocation

Contacts: Ernie Reyna, Chief Financial Officer, reyna@wrcog.cog.ca.us, (951) 955-8432

Date: May 10, 2017

The purpose of this item is to provide the Administration & Finance Committee with an update on the WRCOG office relocation.

Requested Action:

1. Discuss and provide direction on the Agency office relocation.

WRCOG's Executive Committee has directed staff to relocate to the County EDA building, 6th floor. Staff will provide a verbal update to the Agency office relocation.

Prior Actions:

<u>February 6, 2017</u>: The Executive Committee approved staff's recommendation to relocate the WRCOG

offices to the Pacific Premiere Bank building and seek a 10-year lease agreement with

the County of Riverside.

<u>January 11, 2017</u>: The Administration & Finance Committee recommended that WRCOG relocate its

offices to the Pacific Premiere building located at 3403 Tenth St., Riverside.

January 9, 2017: The Executive Committee authorized WRCOG to relocate the WRCOG offices to the

Citrus Towers, utilizing 10,597 square feet, with a 10-year lease.

<u>December 14, 2016</u>: The Administration & Finance Committee recommended that WRCOG relocate its

offices to the Citrus Tower building located at 3390 University Ave., Riverside.

August 1, 2016: The Executive Committee directed staff to 1) request the County to hold the space for

another 60 days; 2) circle back with WMWD for further discussions; 3) explore the

purchase of a building in an expanded area beyond a half-block radius; and 4) revisit

options for the 2nd floor within this building.

<u>July 11, 2016:</u> The Administration & Finance Committee recommended that the Executive Committee

approve the relocation of the Agency to space within a County-owned building at 3404

10th Street, Riverside.

Fiscal Impact:

The fiscal impact of an office redesign and/or relocation will vary depending on the time taken to demolish, design, and construct a facility. Funding for office relocation is included in the proposed Fiscal Year 2017/2018 Budget.

Attachment:

None.