

# District Board of Directors 

8888 Cabrillo Highway
Montara, California 94037

# November 3, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. 

CALL TO ORDER<br>ROLL CALL<br>PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT<br>ORAL COMMENTS (Items other than those on the agenda)<br>PUBLIC HEARING<br>CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approve Minutes for Special Meeting on September 29, 2016.
2. Approve Financial Statements for September 2016.
3. Approve Warrants for November 1, 2016.
4. SAM Flow Report for September 2016.
5. Monthly Review of Current Investment Portfolio.
6. Connection Permit Applications Received.
7. Monthly Water Production Report for September 2016.
8. Rain Report.
9. Solar Energy Report.
10. Monthly Public Agency Retirement Service Report for August 2016

## OLD BUSINESS

1. . Review and Possible Action Concerning Approval of Road Improvement Agreement with Alta Vista Neighborhood Association
2. Review and Possible Action Concerning Unveiling of OpenGov Online Platform
3. Receive Update on Diversion Structure Improvement Project

## NEW BUSINESS <br> REPORTS

1. Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside Meetings (Boyd)
2. MidCoast Community Council Meeting (Slater-Carter)
3. CSDA Report (Slater-Carter)
4. CCWD, NCCWD Committee Report (Harvey, Huber)
5. Attorney's Report (Schricker)
6. Directors' Reports
7. General Manager's Report (Heldmaier)

## FUTURE AGENDAS

## CONVENE IN CLOSED SESSION

## CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION

(Government Code §54956.9(d))
Name of case: Claim of J. Cockrell


#### Abstract

ADJOURNMENT The District has a curfew of 11:00 p.m. for all meetings. The meeting may be extended for one hour by vote of the Board.

NOTE: In accordance with the Government Code, members of the public may address the Board on specific agenda items when that matter is discussed by the Board. Any other items of interest that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the District may be addressed during the Oral Comments portion of the meeting. Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Request for a disability-related modification or an accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting should be made at (650) 728-3545. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Board after distribution of the agenda packet are available in the District Clerk's office during normal business hours. Such documents may also be available on the District's web site (www.mwsd.montara.org) subject to staff's ability to post the documents before the meeting.




# MONTARA MATER \& SANITARY <br> DISTRICT 

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING <br> September 1, 2016

## MINUTES

## REGULAR SESSION BEGAN AT 7:33 p.m.

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

Directors Present: Boyd, Harvey, Wilson and Huber
Director Slater-Carter by teleconference
Directors Absent: None
Staff Present: General Manager, Clemens Heldmaier, District Clerk, Judy Gromm
Others Present: District Counsel, Dave Schricker

## PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT - None

## ORAL COMMENTS - None

## PUBLIC HEARING - None

## CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approve Minutes for July 72016.
2. Approve Financial Statements for July 2016.
3. Approve Warrants for September 1, 2016.
4. SAM flow Report for July 2016.
5. Monthly Review of Current Investment Portfolio.
6. Connection Permit Applications Received.
7. Monthly Water Production Report for July 2016.
8. Rain Report.
9. Solar Energy Report.
10. Monthly Public Agency Retirement Service Report for June 2016.

Director Huber commented the SAM Flow looks like its lower than it has been and indicates it is starting to balance itself out. General Manager Heldmaier agreed with this statement.

Director Wilson moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Director Boyd seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was called for and the motion passed unanimously 5-0.

President Harvey reported due to a request, he will be moving New Business Item number 1 first for discussion.

## OLD BUSINESS

## 1. Review and Possible Action Concerning District Response to Grand Jury Report about Sanitary Districts in San Mateo County.

General Manager Heldmaier reported on June 29 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ the San Mateo County Grand Jury (GJ) published a report titled: "San Mateo's Cottage Industry of Sanitary District".

MWSD is required to provide a response by September $27^{\text {th }}, 2016$.
Directors were asked at the two most recent meetings to submit comments in writing. Additionally, an ad hoc committee was tasked with the preparation of a draft response. The committee, Directors Boyd and Huber, reviewed the suggested response and recommend approval of the letter.

The recommendation is to approve the attached draft response. A copy of the new draft response is attached to the minutes.

Director Huber reported there had been many conversations regarding the response to the Grand Jury. The tone of the letter reflects a high degree of professionalism and I am strongly supporting this letter.

Director Wilson suggested for the record, to note the committee members. Director Huber reported he, the General Manager and Director Boyd worked on the response along with Martin Rauch.

Director Boyd noted there were good healthy debates among the contributors and I am hoping this shows in the quality of the response. The response is readable, positively framed and informative. We corrected things that were misstated or
misunderstood and anyone who reads this is going to come away very well informed on this agency. It was a very good collaborative effort by all. Director Huber thanked General Manager Heldmaier along with Martin Rauch for not only clarifying issues, but also the wording the document with the right tone.

Director Slater-Carter is really impressed by what the committee has put together. They touched on all the points. Director Slater-Carter had hoped the work in progress with OpenGov would have been mentioned. General Manager Heldmaier noted because there was no public link at this time it is not available to the public. Director Slater-Carter suggested perhaps a note regarding how we are working with OpenGov towards that link may be a positive thing for the District.

Director Boyd supported Director Slater-Carters suggestion.
Director Wilson commended the committee for their work and asked if this could be put on the website for the public.

Bob Ptacek, a Montara resident and former MWSD Board Member commented this was about the $4^{\text {th }}$ time we have responded to the Grand Jury. Perhaps we could put all our responses up on our website. Mr. Ptacek agrees with the report, and the quality. This District has always shown accountability and fiscal responsibility. Our reviews have always be rated high and we have never have had a problem. The Grand Jury Report was made up of no substantive data. It was basically here say, emotions and sounded like our current political stream threw something out there, hopes it sticks and ticks off somebody. If the Jury really wanted to benefit, they should take the report to heart and apply it to the County. We have 6 to 7 counties in the bay area and in today's world, we do not need 7 governments. So, if we are going to do this for the benefit of the public, there is a greater public that can benefit from producing 6 or 7 counties into a possible 1 or 2. If there are going to want us to do this, they should look inside and possibly make the recommendations on themselves and show us how it's done before they ask others to do it that are actually running their Districts properly and serving the public and doing the right job.

Director Harvey reported the committee's response was both positive and constructive.

Director Slater-Carter noted the Little Hoover Commission is once again looking at special districts from a state level looking down. It is important for the District and citizens to keep a watchful eye on this because what goes on in Sacramento is not reported or payed attention to at the local level and yet it can have a huge effect on us. It has to do with the bad behavior of the City of Bell.

General Manager Heldmaier reported the California Special Districts Association made a case today regarding this very issue that I heard was excellent. I agree we should make this link available to everyone to watch.

Director Boyd moved to approve the response letter and authorize the Board President to sign and send to the Grand Jury. Director Huber seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was called for and all Directors were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

## NEW BUSINESS

## 1. Review and Possible Action Concerning Alta Vista Road Improvements.

General Manager Heldmaier reported the District operates two water tanks at the Alta Vista site. Additionally, MWSD is required to maintain public access to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Rancho Coral De La Tierra open space through the AV site.

Access to the AV site is via Alta Vista Road, a steep narrow dirt road that perennially experiences drainage and erosion problems that make passage difficult and dangerous, particularly during the wet weather season. In the past, the road was maintained to varying degrees by nearby residents, but the road remained in substandard condition. The District's predecessor, California American water Co., built a paved drainage swale along the road in 2002 that likewise has failed. District staff participated in the neighbors' efforts to maintain the road and did its best to keep the runoff swale clean of debris to avoid blockage and further erosion.

Under Jim Sayre's leadership, the bordering property owners propose to improve the read to acceptable standards. The owner's contractor has received a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) for the work. A condition of the CDP is that the owners establish a homeowners association to maintain the road in the future. Mr. Sayre is spearheading formation of the homeowners association.

The AV Road improvement project will be a private project funded by the bordering owners. In that regard, the CDP acknowledges that the road is a private road. (Historically, the County has never maintained the road.) The proposed improvements include widening and paving the surface, adding turnouts to increase emergency access, and installing drainage features. MWSD is an incidental beneficiary of the improvements because they will substantially improve access to the AV site and vicinity.

District Staff and Director Huber have been in contact with Mr. Sayre throughout the planning process. The estimated total project cost is over $\$ 180,000$. At this time the AV neighborhood is asking the District to indicate that it would participate financially with one-time contribution of $\$ 40,000$ payable after completion of the project. The payment would equate to the value receiving by District in the form of the improved access to the AV site and elimination of the periodic and uncertain costs of maintenance historically undertaken by the District. Provision for the payment would be included in an agreement with the yet-to-be formed
homeowners association that would be presented to the Board for approval at a future meeting.

Mr. Sayer, Moss Beach resident on Alta Vista Road introduced himself and then asked the Alta Vista homeowners present this evening to introduce themselves to the Board.

Present this evening are: Jim and Lucia Sayre
Stella Johnson
Jordan and Elaine Langer
Robin Lloyd
Gary and Nancy Bertolini
Michelle Resch
Peter Rudisill

Mr. Sayer then gave a presentation on the road improvement project to the Board. A copy of this presentation is attached to the minutes.

Director Harvey acknowledged the hard work that had been done by Mr. Sayer and appreciated his presentation this evening.

Director Huber commended the project from concept to permitted phase noted it was very well done. Director Huber feels this is a sound and legitimate request.

Director Boyd commented on the amazing job Mr. Sayer has done on the project and presentation.

Director Slater-Carter noted this was a great project and is proud to participate in this project. Director Slater-Carter moved to approve as a statement of present intention a contribution of $\$ 40,000$ to the cost of Alta Vista Road improvements subject to the terms and conditions of an agreement with the proposed Alta Vista Road Homeowners' Association to be presented to the Board at a future date. Director Huber seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was called for. All Directors were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

## 2. Review of 2014-2015 Single Audit Report Certification from the State Controller's Office.

General Manager Heldmaier reported a Single Audit (OMB A-133 audit) is required for an organization which expends $\$ 500,000$ or more of Federal Funds. In fiscal year 2014-2015 the District received \$1,187,291 in Federal Assistance from the US Department of Environmental protection, passed through to the CA Water Resources Control Board. The purpose of the funding is to assist in financing
construction of a project which will enable the supplier to9 meet safe drinking water standards.

The objective of the Single Audit is to provide assurance to the granting entity that the management and use of such funds fell within the parameters of the award agreement. The audit is typically performed by an independent certified public accountant and encompasses both financial and compliance components.

The results of the Single Audit are reported to the Federal Audit Clearing House as well as the State Controller's Office (SCO). The State Controller's Office accepted the Single Audit with no questioned costs or other findings.

This is for Board information only.

## 3. Review and Possible Action Concerning Cancellation of Next Regular Scheduled Meeting, September 15, 2016.

General Manager Heldmaier reports there are no urgent items that require holding the second meeting in September.

Director Wilson reported he would not be available for the October $6^{\text {th }}$ meeting and was hoping that meeting could be changed to Thursday September $29^{\text {th }}$.

General Manager Heldmaier reported if we move the meeting to September 29 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, we would then make a recommendation to hold a second meeting in October if need be.

Director Harvey would like to have all Board members check their calendars and let him know if they can attend on September 29 ${ }^{\text {th }}$.

## REPORTS

1. Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside Meeting (Boyd) - reported the Recycled Water Project will be moving ahead. Through clarification on many questions, we have found common ground. The full SAM Board is in agreement now. Ocean Colony is prepared to sign a long term contract. Things are moving along. Director Huber noted this enables us to go through a learning curve with the reverse osmosis.
2. MidCoast Community Council Meeting (Slater-Carter) - None
3. CSDA Report (Slater-Carter) - None
4. CCWD, NCCWD Committee Report - (Harvey, Huber) None
5. Attorney's Report (Schricker) - None
6. Directors Report - None
7. General Manager's Report (Heldmaier) - reported the work on $4^{\text {th }}$ Street will be going on for another 2 weeks. The project is officially slated to be over by October $15^{\text {th }}$, but we expect to be done sooner.

## FUTURE AGENDAS-

## REGULAR MEETING ENDED at 8:37P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Signed_ Secretary

Approved on the $3^{\text {rd }}$, November 2016
Signed
President

| From: | Clemens [mwsd@coastside.net](mailto:mwsd@coastside.net) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, August 31, 2016 3:40 PM |
| To: | Scott Boyd; 'Kathryn slater-carter'; whuber@gmail.com; 'Dwight Wilson'; Jim Harvey |
| Cc: | David Schricker, 'Martin Rauch'; Judy Gromm |
| Subject: | FW: Done reading entire response to GJR |

AII,
Please see Joe Loomis' comments to the latest datt of the Gl response. I promised Joe to make his comments available to the Board, in case he could not attend the meeting. We'll also have his comment available for the public's review at the meeting.

Thanks,

Clemens

From: Joe Loomis [mailto:lawyer49@pacbell.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 3:04 PM
To: Clemens [mwsd@coastside.net](mailto:mwsd@coastside.net)
Subject: Done reading entire response to GJR
Hello Clemens,
Thave now completed reading the entre 14 page MWUSD response to the GR.

I mally thought that what appears to be the cover leter loages $1-2$ was the entre response.

My intal hegative reachon was to the cover leter as beng unecessarly mothal of the Grand Jury by implying that they do not understand the industry they are evaluating because it is too complex for them to understand.

I think it suffices to say that the Grand Jury made some obsenations and conclusions that do not corespond to the facs on the ground. Then the reader can make his own jugment about the sophistication, on not, of the Grand fury.

That being said, the remander of the response (pages $3-14$ ) stating whe the heading, "Findings" was very well, and professionally, done.

I do have some ideas regarding ease of use of the distict web page:
When I was teaching computer science at the College of San Mateo and DeAnza/Foothil

Colleges, one of my topics was webage design and progemming one on myews
is that web peges should have as few "exterion fints" as possible and shoul avoid "lavers of ink" which tend to get people lost.

I dehne exterm maks as like to other pages. I defne layers of link as link to otherpages which in tum have more exterior (inks).
 incex at the top.
This would requre the user to ether click on a "page lim" in the index at the top or scrol down me page to see the infomation thev are seekng. (Idehne apage
Ink as a lnk that moves the cursor to another location on the same page. They are also called anchor links.

I fad thet whth too many exterion lhes and too many layers of hks a user con quicky becone lost.

An example of a necessary exterion ink would be alnk wa page unreated to the MWSD. For example, alnk to the San Mateo County Bulldig and Planning Deparment.

We can discuss some these web page ideas as you wish.

Thants,

Joe

From: Clemens
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 11:52 AM
To: 'Joe Loomis'
Subject: RE: Ooops! - Response to Grand Jury - Re: Agenda

Joe,
We've had a chance to clean up the existing draft and are making the latest version available to the board, and have a version available for review at our offices. For your convenience, I am attaching the version containing tracked nonsubstantial changes to this email.

Thanks,
Clemens

From: Joe Loomis [mailolowver49 pocbellnet]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 6:36 AM
P.O. Box 37013 8888 Cabrillo Hwy Montara, CA 94037-013 Montara, CA s4037-0131 t: 650.726 .3545 • f: 650.728 .855 mail: mwsdgcoastsidene wab: musd.mantara.org

September $\div 2016$
Hon. Joseph C. Scott
Judge of the Superior Court
c/o Charlene Kresevich
Hall of Justice
400 County Ctr.; $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655
Re: Response of Montara Water and Sanitary District ("MWSD") to 2015-2016 Civil Grand Jury Report Regarding Sanitary Districts
This letter is MWSD's response to the Civil Grand Jury Report entitled, "San Mateo County's Cottage Industry of Sanitary Districts" distributed by the Court Executive Officer under letter dated June 29, 2016 ("GIR"). MWSD's governing Board approved this response at a public meeting on September 1, 2016.

MWSD appreciates the extensive time and effort the Grand Jury devoted to its review of the six independent special districts in the County that provide sanitary sewage-sewer service. The wastewater industry is highly regulated, operationally complex and replete with technical requirements that are not readily understood outside the industry. Unfamiliarity with those aspects afe-is understandably revealed in the GJR.

Although responses only to findings and recommendations are required (Pen. C. $\S 933$ (c)), we discuss additional portions of the GJR pertaining to MWSD that are inaccurate or otherwise render corresponding findings or recommendations unsupported. For example, the Grand-JumgIR noted that 45 agencies in the County are "... involved in sewage collection and treatment..." (GJR p. 1), yet limited its review to six special districts. We are concerned that this small sample and narrow focus on a few agencies limits the accuracy of the generalized conclusions found in the GranduryPepertir.
Nonetheless, we concur with many comments and conclusions found in the erendfuryferofigIR and appreciate that they provide useful third party insight into our District and industry. We will take action on those as noted below in our responses to the Findings and Recommendations. However, we believe ethers-certain Findings and comments are not accurate and we respectfully offer additional information for accuracy, especially regarding public accountability, fiscal responsibility, and operational competence as they relate to our District as discussed below.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY. Contrary to the GIR's assertion that sanitary districts have minimal interaction with the public compared to water districts (GJR p. 27), MWSD has a consistent and robust record of public interaction. For example: MWSD provides outreach through newsletters; invites the public and local officials to attend grand openings of new facilities, such as its Alta Vista water reservoirs; maintains an up-to-date website, distributes press releases, sends bi-monthly bill stuffers; and places signs in public areas for special notices. Development of MWSD's Strategic Plan included two Board public planning workshops that were attended by members of the public as well as a community meeting convened specifically to obtain public input, which drew some 70 citizens.

What's more, members of the public regularly participate in Board meetings and the District's Board meetings are televised and available online. Being a small fowncommunity, citizens call or talk in person with Directors and staff on a regular basis about their questions and concerns. Several District Directors also participate in the Next Door online forums in their neighborhoods.
Even though the services we provide are limited to sanitary, water and solid waste matters, many in our community perceive MWSD as the only form of local government that represents them and their interests. We believe this representation is valuable, even when we cannot act on it. The Grand Jury Report, itself, acknowledges that having elected board members gives the public an important link to their community (GJR p. 25; see, also fn. 31). An example of this occurred in 2001, when Montara and Moss Beach residents wanted local control of their water supply, and voted 81 percent in favor of taxing themselves nearly $\$ 1,000$ per year so that the District could take over water service from an out-of-area, for-profit operator. (see: http://smarivoter.org/2001/11/06/ca/sm/meas/V/)

FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY. MWSD takes numerous actions to ensure fiscal accountability: 1) incorporates financial and rate planning in the annual strategic planning process; 2) maintains long-term capital improvement and financial plans; 3) worked to ensure its sanitary rates are rising below the rate of inflation; 4) has never received anything but an unqualified opinion over the presentation of its annual audited financial statements; and 5) notes that there is no evidence of financial impropriety in the GJR or elsewhere. Nonetheless, in response to the GJR, the District will increase its communication to the public about finances and rates as indicated in our response to the-Grand Jury Recommendations numbers eight and nine.
OPERATIONAL COMPETENCE. The GJR challenges the operational competence of MWSD and other Districts. This is puzzling given the facts. The GIR claims District operators are not certified, but in fact every one of them is certified. The GJR claims the District is not familiar with a number of current technologies and planning methods, yet the District is familiar with every one listed in the Report and utilizes all that are cost-effective and beneficial to the MWSD system. The GIR claims that the District staff and Board do not participate in professional organizations, yet both Directors and staff are engaged in leadership positions in professional organizations.

WhatsmefeAdditionally, the GJR does not appear to recognize the collection system maintenance program used by MWSD. City of Half Moon Bay, Granada Community Services District and MWSD collaborate to receive contracted sewer collection services through our ownership retienship-in Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM) - thereby obtaining an economy of scale, levels of expertise and access to more advanced equipment than each District could obtain on its own. This is laudable and is in line with best practices that promote collaboration and regional partnerships.

As noted at the beginning of this letter, MWSD appreciates the time and effort of the Grand Jury in undertaking the task of reviewing independent sewerage districts in San Mateo County. Our responses contained in this letter underscore our commitment to serving our customers well.

Very truly yours,

Jim Harvey, President, MWSD Board
cc: General Managers-eft Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside, General Manager Granada Community Services District, City Manager City of Half Moon Bay, as well as the DiskiteMWSD Sanitary Engineer and Legal Counsel

## Findings

MWSD's comments regarding the Grand Jury's Findings follow each of the quoted Findings.
Grand Jury Finding Fi. From 2013-2015, San Mateo County sewer agencies had more than twice as many sanitary sewer overflows as San Jose and three times as many as Central Contra Costa Sanitary District.

MWSD Comment: MWSD agrees partially; the simple facts in the statement appear to be correct, and MWSD shares a concern withover any spills. What we disagree with is the implication that our District is not taking effective action. We note that our maintenance crews have been rigorously trained to report absolutely every spill no matter how small. We also consider any spill to be among our highest priorities to prevent because we are located in such an environmentally sensitive area.

Our District's goal is, therefore, zero $\mathrm{SSOs}_{-, \text {, }}$ and we We maintain a prioritized capital improvement program to resolve troublesome pipelines and problem areas to lower the 550 rate. In addition, MWSD and its partners in SAM are working together to significantly increase sewer pipeline and maintenance capabilities through increased training, purchases of more advanced equipment, such as a new flusher truck, hiring ef-additional cleaning staff, and enhancements to operations and maintenance planning.
We maintain active oversight and monitoring of progress and work closely with SAM to refine practices, training and planning. MWSD also supported SAM's to-contracting for additional sewer line cleaning to speed up the cycle time and hit critical areas more often.

We also note that there are significant operational, infrastructure and environmental differences between-among the San Mateo agencies and the San Jose and Central Contra Costa Sanitary District systems referenced in the GIR. The number of SSOs can be heavily influenced by mountainous terrain, heavy rainfall, number of pump stations needed, pipeline age and other factors. Because of environmental factors such as high rainfall and steep hills, with less paved area and more vegetative area which promote high ground saturation and increase inflow and infiltration pressures compared to urban paved areas, MWSD's performance is more accurately compared to areas such as southern Marin.
Additionally, the finding does not distinguish between the San Mateo County-controlled districts, which account for $91 \%$ of the SSO's County-wide. According to the GJR, the independent districts account for only $9 \%$ (GJR, p. 40, Table 13 )... . Similarly, the GJR fails to identify SSOs by category/degree of severity or response time, thus ignoring their degrees of significance regarding impacts, if any, on the environment or public health. We know, for example, that many of our spills are very small and contained, are recovered or cleaned up very quickly, and therefore have very limited impact. There is no information about the severity of the spills reported by others. All these factors raise questions about the usefulness of the finding.

Grand Jury Finding F2. Independent district websites have gaps in information regarding historical rates, sewer system management plans, and sanitary sewer overflows. Meeting minutes and financial audits are frequently out of date.
MWSD Comment: MWSD agrees partially; we maintain an up-to-date website and most of the GIR assertions to the contrary findings are incorrect. However, we agree that some of the material is-difffewt fefind ar notavilable could be made more easily visible and easy to locate anduwe are taking action to eeffectimprove that.
The District already maintains all its rates and fees online ( http:/moved.montaraorg/rates-and-budget/rates-and-fess): However, we -and-will add a table showing historical rates as suggested by this document.

The Sanitary Sewer Svstem Master Plan (SSSMP) is located on the website at httot//musdmontaraorr/documents/ints/legat-3nd-resubtory. It is divided into Elements, Attachments and Appendices that are labeled for convenience of the reader.

The District publishes monthly SSO updates including rolling 12-month history. They have been and will continue to be reported monthly in each Board packet, and for convenience and ease of referencing, they will also be moved into a separate page on the website available.:

Meeting Minutes are up-to-date and posted in the consent agenda, in the board packet, which is a standard practice based on 6 Brown Act requirements. The minutes are available on the website as far back as 2013. However, we agree they are more difficult to find than is ideal. Therefore, MWSD will add a message to the top of the web agenda packet area noting that minutes are found within agenda packets in the month following each meeting. We also note that MWSD's website homepage under "Board Meetings" clearly states "Click here to view agendas and minutes," which link directly connects to those documents listed by Board meeting dates. (hito:/mwgelmontareorg/board-agendas/agendas-andminuces weatre20161

Audits are published annually and are up-to-date going back to 2010. hhtop/guxsdimontara,orghates-andbudgetiaudits

MWSD's website not only exceeds legal requirements (see, e.g., Gov. C. 554954.2 ), but provides broad information and access to significant documents and information going far beyond what is described or requested-suggested in this afandjufy reportGIR.

Grand Jury Finding F3. The use of the annual property tax statement for billing purposes makes the cost of sewer services less visible to residents.

MWSD Comment: MWSD agrees that the narrow statement may be correct. However, because we proactively communicate about rates in other ways as detailed below, we don't rely on the tax bill to inform customers about the details of their bill or costs of service. Instead, we use the tax bill primarily for the cost efficiency of not having to send individual bills. Collection on the tax roll eliminates District staff time and associated costs that otherwise would be encountered in enforcing delinquent payments. The economy and efficiency of this billing method should be applauded.

For the reasons given above, property tax billing for sanitary district rates is a common practice statewide - not just in the six special Districts that are the focus on this Grand Jury report.

Regarding visibility, we do believe that our customers understand our cost of service as described below. To start, the District sends out mailed bills for water service so it is in a position to experience the difference or similarities between mailed bills and property tax billing. We find that we receive a similar number of calls about both types of bills and the swnea similar level of interest and questions.

What's more, procedures for establishing rates and charges ensure opportunity for the public's and property owners' participation, including a noticed public hearing; and proposed feos-rubjectoa majority owner protest procedure required by law. MWSD takes the additional step of ensuring that notices for its various services are in plain English. Once adopted, the fees are set out in MWSD's Master Fee Schedule adopted by ordinance (MWSD Code $\$ 4-2.100$ ) which becomes effective after posting in three (3) public places in the District. Additionally, District sewer service charges have been discussed in the District newsletter, are posted on the website, and discussed during the budget process.

Those procedures provide accountability well in advance of the itemized collection of sewer service charges on the tax roll to which the Grand Jury takes exception (GJR p. 24). Likewise, they counter the

Jury's conclusion that itemization on the tax bill "...means that many people are unaware of the cost of their sewer service ..." (id.). Finally, the charges are itemized on the tax bill using clear terminology. We would note that customers who receive a bill, see much clearer terminology than the Grand Jury would have if they were just looking at an online bill on the County website. Nevertheless, we will take the opportunity to confer with the County about making the language even more clear for the next 2017 billing cycle.
We will also take the additional step, described in Responses eight and nine below, of detailing all District rates and fees by service to provide another avenue for customers to understand what they are paying for our services. And we will advertise the avallability of this information.

Grand Jury Finding F4. Elections for sanitary District board membership are rarely contested, and when they are, voter turnout is low. The average tenure of Board members is over 10 years.
MWSD Comment: MWSD partially agrees. We agree that the average tenure of our Board members is just over ten years, and agree that turnout is low compared to the ideal. However, we disagree that our elections are rarely contested and also disagree that our voter turnout is low compared to local, County and statewide averages.
Reference to uncontested elections and low voter turnout do not apply to MWSD. For example, MWSD's last election was contested as is the upcoming election this November. Furthermore, MWSD has an above-average record of having $50 \%$ of its elections contested. Notably, the average number of contested elections averaged over the six Districts focused on in the Grand Jury Report is $34.5 \%$, which is better than most general state judicial and other local county-wide elections.
MWSD's November 5, 2013 turnout of $25.9 \%$ (GIR Table 8, p. 26) exceeded the countywide turnout of 25.4\% ("Registration and Turnout," Nov. 5, 2013 Election, San Mateo County Chief Elections Officer and Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder website). In the hopes of increasing turnout even further in the future, MWSD initiated a change in early 2015 to be included in the consolidated elections that have historically higher turnout than the local elections.
In acknowledging that having elected board members gives them an important link to their community (GJR p. 25; see, also fn. 31), the Grand Jury erroneously concludes that uncontested elections means that community interest in the districts is low. This is not the case for MWSD.

Grand Jury Finding F5. Five of the six districts receive countywide property taxes, which means that residents' fees are not paying the full cost of sewer services.
MWSD Comment: MWSD agrees partially. While this Grand Jury finding is factually correct, MWSD views this from the perspective that when District residents pay property taxes, and it lowers the rate they would otherwise charge, it results in benefit to the tax payers, by helping fund an essential public service that protects health and safety. In other words, District tax revenue, a constitutional right, is put to district purposes, which serves the very people who pay it. Reallocation of tax revenue would go to non-district use, which is not guaranteed to be a higher and better use. We also note that property tax revenue makes up $10 \%$ of the District's $\$ 2.3$ million dollar operations budget, a small fraction of the total.

Grand Jury Finding F6. Sewer rates from 2010-2011 to 2015-2016 increased faster than the consumer price index. The six districts acknowledge that this trend is likely to continue, given the age of pipelines in the County and the cost of maintenance to and replacement of those pipelines.
MWSD Comment: MWSD disagrees that this is applicable to its entr-rates. MWSD's sewer rates from 2010-2011 to 2015-2016 increased 11\% across this period, well below the CPI as reported by the Grand Jury Report at $14 \%$. Moreover, the general consumer price index is not relevant for measuring service charges. Appropriate construction price and employment cost indexes, among others, are more relevant to sewer service charge trends and these are usually higher than the general CPI.

The Grand Jury's rate comparison does not recognize important differences among agencies. For example, it seeks to compare San Mateo County sewage agencies with agencies in "comparable urban areas in the [San Francisco] Bay Area" (GIR, p. 30). Such population-oriented comparisons are not useful because service charges are a function of the operational costs which reflect numerous factors unique to each agency. For example:

Flat versus mountainous. MWSD's charges must cover significant pumping costs due to mountainous terrain. These cost include substantial electrical power costs as well as installation and maintenance of additional pump stations which are significantly more expensive to build and maintain than gravity flow systems in less mountainous areas.
Rainfall differences impacts costs. High rainfall in the MWSD area increases inflow and infiltration, which makes controlling SSOs more costly. This would hold true regardless of the size of the entity managing the system.
Significant regulaton differences. There are significant regulatory differences that were not considered. For example, MWSD faces significant regulatory burdens not faced by inland agencies, including: Coastal Commission, urban ASBS definitions, green Green swreesstreets, State Water Board 300 foot to water way rules and Marine Reserve requirements. Additionally, the California Coastal Commission has placed significant regulatory constraints on coastal Cities and Agencies which are preventing best practices in construction techniques in our area. For example, it would be best to develop a parallel (redundant sewer pipeline) along some coastal cliffs to the treatment plant. Coastal regulations would make difficult - or impossible-and extremely costly, even though it is commonplace in inland communities. Such a pipe would not only provide redundancy, but would hold a large volume of sewer flow, reducing the chance of SSO's. Instead of being able to take the most cost-effective action (building a redundant pipeline) the District and its partners in SAM must build costly sewage storage tanks, face increased liability and greater maintenance challenges and costs.

For a final example, the District routinely faces significant environmental and monitoring restrictions not faced by inland agencies such as monitoring wildlife before, during and, in some cases, for many years after construction.
Cost impacts associated with these constraints would exist regardless of the size of the organization or governance structure in control or size of the sanitary system.
No explanation of specific benefits nor inefficiencies encountered in any of the larger agencies or districts is provided in the GIR. The unfortunate comparison of fundamentally different areas like urban settings with rural settings in the GIRefthis repsat do not yield meaningful results.

As mentioned above, despite all these factors, MWSD has consistently kept rate increases below the Consumer Price Index (CPI), and therefore, does not acknowledge a continuation of an above-inflationrate trend in regards to long-term rates.

Grand Jury Finding F7. Funds for treatment plants pass from ratepayers through the independent sanitary districts to the treatment plants; the sanitary districts add little value.

MWSD Comment: MWSD disagrees in its ewf-case. The practice of having regional treatment plants serving multiple local collection agencies is common throughout the state, including San Mateo County and all neighboring counties. The Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM) treatment plant serves three local sanitary service providers. The value each local agency provides is extensive: representation of their local areatcommunity and oversight through the Beardmembers thetsape-amembership on the SAM Board, expertise through their managers that also participate in a variety of Board and planning functions, and funding through the Districts and their ratepayers. The District has detailed knowledge of the topography and infrastructure which is incorporated into SAM's planning through the mechanisms above. Furthermore, the collection system to treatment plant relationships form the basis for a very cost-effective system in which the three agencies share collection system maintenance through the regional treatment plant organization (Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside). This relationship should be praised.

Grand lury Finding F8. The total budget for operating the boards of the six districts studied is over $\$ 225,000$. East Palo Alto's average annual compensation for directors is $\$ 18,000,66 \%$ higher than the next highest (and much larger) district, West Bay. Bayshore and East Palo Alto offer employee-type benefits to directors including dental insurance.
MWSD Comment: MWSD partially agrees. We agree that the facts finding may be correct overall. However, we firmly disagree in relation to the District's-awmWWD's Board costs which are the lowest covered in the GIR. This broad-brush finding leaves the mistaken impression that MWSD Board costs are high. In fact, MWSO's Board costs are the lowest of all the Districts and MWSD does not offer benefits to its directors. MWSD also has the lowest Board meeting compensation ( $\$ 75$ per Board meeting), and the lowest annual compensation per director of those identified in the report, (Figures 13, 14, page 35-36). The work done by MWSD directors on behalf of the ratepayers is a-of tremendous value. Based on their published MWSD bearct Board of difectermember compensation, it is estimated that MWSD directors are compensated an average sub-minimum wage of $\$ 2$ to $\$ 3$ per hour based on observed work and effort members put into preparing for and participating in the governance process, including committee meetings, attendance at District-related governmental meetings such as the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Local Agency Formation Commission, Coastal Commission, and others. Finally, apart from cost, having a local Board is seen by many as making possible better representation of local issues and increasing the ability of local citizens to attend meetings nearby that relate to their needs and issues.

Grand Jury Finding F9. The pipelines of the six districts are aging, with almost half having been laid over 50 years ago. These pipes are approaching end of life.

MWSD Comment: MWSD partially agrees. The age fact appears to be correct, but while some pipes are nearing the end of their life, others could last far longer. Age alone provides insufficient guidance. Best engineering practice requires that pipe segments be evaluated individually for performance and longevity. MWSD concurs that there are problems associated with aging pipelines and we have longstanding practice of evaluating, prioritizing, maintaining and replacing pipelines according to engineering criteria. (GJR p.39). Over the past decade or so MWSD doubled investment in sewer system
capital improvements, and there are steady improvements underway. In addition, evolving technologies are bringing cost efficiencies in infrastructure replacements further speeding system improvements. MWSD addresses replacement of old infrastructure through its Capital Improvement Program, which it prioritizes based on careful engineering inspection and monitoring, and updated annually on a five (5) year rolling basis. We are very diligent in this regard, semething thatwhich is not recognized in the Efand lury Repofgir. The implication of this Finding is that another form of government could do a better job when what matters is best management and engineering practices; therefore, we disagree.

Grand Jury Finding F10. There are many wholly or partially redundant activities across the six independent districts, including board costs, financial audits, legal services, and engineering.

MWSD Comment: MWSD partially agrees. There are a number of redundancies. However, many of the most financially significant are already eliminated through collaboration. For example: treatment, collection system maintenance, emergency preparedness, and safety training are carried out callaboratively among several agencies in our region. No party has provided evidence that there would be cost savings or not. Furthermore, the Grand Jury's argument that consolidation would eliminate "redundant" activities does not consider that many costs, such as engineering and legal, correspond to situations unique to each district that would not disappear upon consolidation.
The Grand Jury also does not quantify what the redundant costs specifically are. Prior studies have acknowledged the lack of data to support consolidation on a cost basis ("Special Districts: Relics of the Past or Resources for the Future?", Little Hoover Commission Peport, Mav 2000, 0. 62). Any serious approach to consolidation must be based on extensive and in-depth cost studies not reflected in the Grand Jury's assumptions. What's more, cost is not the only, or even most important issue.
Perhaps the most significant benefit of having local districts is local representation. A challenge locally is that each of the local agencies that provide sanitary service have different powers and governance structures, which would make it challenging from a purely practical level to ensure continued representation and to implement it. In the end, representation has value in its own right. It would be easy to say that two neighboring cities have redundant activities and should, therefore be consolidated, but many local citizens would not view it that way and nor do many residents in local Districts.

Grand Jury Finding F11. Most of the independent sanitary districts rely almost entirely on contractors to fulfill their responsibilities.
MWSD Comment: Whe-MWSD partially agrees. We agree with the fact that some District rely almost entirely on contractors to fulfill their responsibilities. We want to note that MWSD deasnet Whe havehas full time staff providing sewer collection maintenance through our cooperative, consolidated collection system maintenance program that we share ownership in. Furthermore, in many cases, contractors provide the most economical and efficient means for obtaining services. This is true for both large and small agencies. Private/public partnerships are an effective means of carrying out local government services, increasingly popular, and considered a best practice in industry literature and seminars. In addition, the City of Half Moon Bay, Granada Community Services District and MWSD collaborate to receive contracted sewer collection services through their ownership relationship in Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside - obtaining an economy of scale and expertise that they could not obtain each on their own.

Grand Jury Finding F12. In many cases, district leadership is unfamiliar with the existing and emerging technologies for improving sewer system performance while reducing costs.
MWSD Comment: $1 / / 2$ MWSD disagrees. The GJR incorrectly implies that MWSD is unfamiliar with and does not employ modern technologies in managing our collection system (GJR, pp. 44-45; Table 15, p. 45). To the contrary, MWSD is familiar with every one of them. And it utilizes every technology listed that is cost-effective and appropriate to its system. Below are comments and corrections to Table 15 as examples of the Districts use of technology.

| IN USE | Montara G.J Rpt. States | Comments and Corrections |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operational Performance |  |  |
| Camera | Yes | MWSD utilizes this technology |
| Sonar Technology | No | Not applicable to MWSD system |
| Root Foaming | No | Not used because it is District policy not to employ toxic materials near area of biological significance. |
| Trenchless/Slip Line Technology | Yes | MWSD utilizes this technology |
| Operator Certifications | No | Incorrect, all operators are certified by the State |
| Planning \& Control Technologies |  |  |
| Linear Asset Management Plan (LAMP) | Yes | MWSD utilizes this technology |
| Effective Utility Management | Yes | MWSD utilizes this technology |
| SCADA Systems | Yes | MWSD utilizes this technology |
| PLANNED |  |  |
| Operational Performance |  |  |
| Camera | Yes | MWSD already utilizes this technology |
| Sonar Technology | No | Not applicable to MWSD system |
| Root Foaming | No | Not used because it is District policy not to employ toxic materials near area of biological significance |
| Trenchless/ Slip Line Technology | Yes | MWSO utilizes this technology |
| Operator Certifications | No | Incorrect, all operators are certified by the State |
| Planning \& Control Technologies |  |  |
| Linear Asset Management Pian (LAMP) | No | Incorrect. MWSD utilizes this technology |
| Effective Utility Management | No | incorrect. MWSD utilizes this technology |
| SCADA Systems | Yes | MWSD utilizes this technology |

The peporf GIR does not accurately reflect MWSD's use of a variety of other technologies: asset (and utility) management techniques, GIS mapping, hydraulic modeling, and surge storage.

Grand Jury Finding F13. The proliferation of sanitary districts within San Mateo County makes it challenging to coordinate an emergency response. The districts themselves have not reviewed or discussed emergency/disaster planning within their boards in the past year.
MWSD Comment: MWSD disagrees. Emergency preparedness is an ongoing, active and regularly updated priority of the District. MWSD's Emergency Response Plan is contained in its Sewer System Management Plan (pp. 22-35; and Attachment 3), that is reviewed annually which the GJR fails to acknowledge (GIR, p. 46). The Beare-of DrectersMWSD's Board also-includestekes-4p-emergency planning in the its strategin planstrategic Plan (last updated in 2016). Specifically, emergency planning is

Hon. Joseph C. Scott, Judge of the Superior Court
covered in Objective $6.3 .0 \div$. There are 5 specific emergency work plan items to fulfill the strategic plan objective in this area cre-as shown below in our response to R13. Furthermore, MWSD works closely with its neighboring sanitary agencies on a daily basis, making coordination very easy. Furthermore, all the local districts participate in the County Sheriff's emergency preparedness planning and efrills-drills. Emergency preparedness is a very high priority item of MWSD.
Additionally, the choice of words implies a negative conclusion without offering facts. For example, the Report describes a "proliferation" of sanitary districts, as if they are sprouting up regularly. In fact, the existing district structures have been in-place for several generations; MWSD sanitary services were formed nearly 60 years ago in 1958.

## REQUEST FOR RESPONSES:

Grand Jury Recommendation R1. Not applicable to MWSD ("N.A.")

## Grand Jury Recommendation R2. N.A.

The grand jury recommends that the Boards of Granada Community Services District and Montara Water and Sanitary District and the City Council of Half Moon Bay do the following:

Grand Jury Recommendation R3. Form a committee of board members (Granada Community Services District, Montara Water and Sanitory District), councilmembers (Half Moon Bay), and staff from each to plan the consolidation or assumption of services provided by these two districts. Evaluate alternatives and determine the benefits to ratepayers. Issue a report with recommendations and a plan by September 30, 2017.
MWSD Response: The recommendation requires further analysis. However, MWSD concurs that local agencies should take up the issue of evaluating the costs and benefits of a potential consolidation and will take action on this.

R4. N.A.

The Grand Jury recommends that the Boards of Bayshore Sanitary District, East Palo Alto Sanitary District, Granada Community Senvices District, Montara Water and Sanitary District, West Bay Sanitary District, and Westborough Water District do the following:

Grand Jury Recommendation R5. Improve information visibility on their website [sic], including key system characteristics, rates and rate history, sewer system management plans, sanitary sewer overflows, and board member compensation. Key system characteristics would include population served, number of connections, number of miles of pipe (gravity, forced Maine), number of pump stations and number of pumps, average dry weather flow, and average wet weather flow. Ensure all information is up-to-date. Refresh website by September 30, 2016.

MWSD Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but has already begun this work. The District notes that much of this information is already on its website, but it will ensure that all of it is and is easy to find.

Grand Jury Recommendation R6. Implement and publish performance management metrics including but not limited to the Effective Utility Management framework, beginning with fiscal Year 2016-2017.

MWSD Response: MWSD agrees. The District already includes metrics within its strategic planning, operational and capital improvement plans. However, the District concurs that a consolidated set of metrics would be beneficial and will develop a custom set of metrics that serve its needs. The District will reference the Effective Utility Management framework in developing its metrics.

Grand Jury Recommendation R7. Adjust rates over the next five years, so that all costs are recovered from ratepayers, and the reliance on property tax is eliminated. Transition property tax revenues to neighboring cities to be used for community benefit.

MWSD Response: This recommendation will not be implemented. In characterizing district property tax allocations under Proposition 13 (Cal. Const. Art. 13 A §1) as a "subsidy," (GIR, p28), the Grand Jury loses sight of the fact that the tax revenue is put to district purposes benefitting taxpayers, including those within the districts. While eliminating the districts' property tax allocations would result in their share being "allocated elsewhere" (GJR, p. 29), the Grand Jury provides no suggestion as to what would be a better use than wastewater collection, treatment and disposal - functions that are essential to the public health, welfare and safety. Notably, no misuse of the revenue is claimed.

Grand Jury Recommendation R8. Mail notices to ratepayers at least annually with an explanation of the dollar amount of sewer service charges being billed, and the rationale. Provide information on the prior five years' rates for comparison purposes. Display the portion of the rate that is related to collection activities, and the portion allocated to treatment. Mail notices approximately 30 days before the mailing of the property tax bills. Initiate mailings by November 2016.
MWSD Response: This recommendation will be implemented in an upcoming newsletter. MWSD with $^{\text {H }}$ plans to consolidate the requested information in R8 and R9 into a single annual report with other useful information, publish it on its website and notify customers of its avallability through its regular mailings.

Grand Jury Recommendation R9. Notify ratepayers annually of the elected nature of board, role and compensation of Board members, and process for becoming a candidate. Encourage active participation by ratepayers. This notification may be included in the mailing that explains the rationale for rates. Initiate notification by November 2016

MWSD Response: This recommendation will be implemented in an upcoming newsletter. MWSD wit! plans to consolidate the requested information in R8 and R9 into a single annual report with other useful information, publish it on its website and notify customers of its availability through its regular mailings.

Grand Jury Recommendation R10. Establish term limits for the members of their boards of directors by June 30, 2017.

MWSD Response: This recommendation will not be implemented. As described under F10 above, MWSD has an above average record of contested elections and an average tenure of just over 10 years for Board members. It is noteworthy that many directors comment that it can take a couple of years to become educated in the complexities of the organization and to be working at full capacity. The District has enjoyed the benefits of Directors with high dedication and enough tenure to be very effective atin their District work. The last election was contested and two new directors were elected. The upcoming election is aiso contested toe. MWSD does not see the need for or benefit to term limits. To the contrary, term limits would artificially eliminate very dedicated and effective directors from serving the community.

Grand Jury Recommendation R11. Establish a procurement process for professional services to include formal evaluation of existing service providers, issuance of Request for Proposals, regular reviews of existing providers, and a structured negotiation process by March 31, 2017

MWISD Response: This recommendation will be implemented. MWSD concurs that clear, fair and costeffective procurement processes are important, and maintains a number of procurement policies and procedures. MWSD will review and update its procurement policies with assistance of legal counsel, as appropriate in light of the recommendations.

Grand Jury Recommendation R12. Demonstrate active participation in professional organizations focused on the work of sanitary districts, such as California Water Environment Association, by June 30, 2017. Require CWEA certification of district operators, including contractors, by June 30, 2017.

MWSD Response: The features of is feemmendetienthis recommendation is-are already in effect. MWSD already participates in numerous professional organizations, including: Association of Calffornia Water Agencies (ACWA), California Association of Sanitary Agencies (CASA), Underground Service Alert (USA), California Special Districts Association (CSDA), California Groundwater Association (CGA), and other relevant professional associations. These facts are not recognized in Appendix J of the Report

All District operators are certified by the state of California. Note that CWEA does not certify, although they do provide training.
 with Directors' and Council Members' responsibilities. Directors/Council Members are independent
 organizations. This is true in all California local and state-Stategovernment. Nonetheless, MWSD Directors have long been and are currently active in policy-professionatlevel professional organizations: Director Slater-Carter is active in CSDA and has completed her certificate from the Special District Leadership Foundation; Director Wilson is active as a Board member on the ACWA-JPIA Board; Director Boyd serves on the ACWA Management Committee;-, Atand the staff level, the General Manager serves on the ACWA groundwater committee. and District Counsel serves on the ACWA Legal Services Committee:-

Grand Jury Recommendation R13. Develop plans for coordinating resources in the event of a local or regional emergency by June $30,2017$.

MWSD Response: This The features of this recommendation is-are already in effect. The District has concrete emergency planning activities that are well established and updated. However, during the next strategic planning process (winter and spring 2017) the District will reevaluate its activities and consider if additional actions are warranted. MWSD's Emergency Response Plan is contained in its Sewer System Management Plan (pp. 22-35; and Attachment 3). This Plan is not noted in the GJR fals (GJR, p. 46). The Board of Directors also took up emergency planning in the District's strategieStrategic Planplam in Objective 6.3.0: A summary of objective (bold 6.3.0) and work plan items are shown below. These emergency planning and preparedness actions are underway ardolongoing.

| No. | P. | Action | Lead | Timing | Status | Feb. 16 <br> Assessment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.3 .0 |  | Emergency planning should be appropriately updated with documented procedures and methods in place for coordinating with others. |  |  |  |  |
| 6.3.1 | 2 | Update the existing Emergency Response and Recovery Plan (ERRP) to maintain a relevant emergency planning document. | Clemens | Aug-15 | Every five years | Completed. |
| 6.3 .2 | 3 | Become a leader and a hub for local utility emergency planning. | Clemens | Nov-15 | Annual update | Ongoing NT Nov 16 |
| 6.3.3 | 2 | Update drought contingency plan. | Clemens | May-16 | Every five Years | Not completed NT Dec 16 |

R14. N.A.

R15. N.A.

The grand jury recommends that the boards of the Bayshore Sanitary District, Montara Water and Sanitary District, and Westborough Water District do the following:

Grand Jury Recommendation R16. Explore the feasibility of establishing a flat rate for capital improvements separate from the woter usage rate. Report back at a public meeting by December 31, 2016.

MWSD Response: This will not be implemented. The Grand Jury does not provide a reason for this recommendation. Flat rate billing is commen-butincreasingly outmoded because it can be judged as being unfair under the State's Proposition 13 requirements that customers be charged the actual cost of serving them - rather than a flat fee which may not represent their cost of service. MWSD's service charges are based on units of water consumed during winter months. This methodology is a wellestablished industry practice that has been accepted by the courts (Boynton v. City of Lakeport Municipal Sewer District No. 1, et al. (1972), 28 Cal. App. $3^{\text {rd }} 91$ ). In fact, over time, more agencies are utilizing this method because it provides a far more accurate and fair measure of a user's burden on the wastewater system than, e.g., a flat rate. In addition, customers who conserve water not only benefit the water supply, but receive lower sewer rates - thereby enhancing the incentive to conserve water. MWSD's sewer service charge is also based on categories of users (e.g., residential, industrial, etc.) and
wastewater strength characteristics (Montara Water and Sanitary District Code ["MWSD Code"] §42.100). Reverting Substitutingte a flat rate for capital improvements separate from the water usage rate does not make sense because is it is less accurate and less fair. Sepafang. Furthermore, separating out the portion of the charge utilized for capital improvements is not necessary because it is stready ineoperatedincluded in the single service charge. Making a capital improvement charge a flat rate would be unfair, and in our judgment potentially illegal under Proposition 13.

R17. N.A.

R18. N.A.

## Errors in Tables

Page 43, Table 14: "Use of Contractors by Function in Independent Sanitary Districts" shows no District Clerk for MWSD. MWSD has a full time employed District Clerk who is exclusive to the sewer function.
Page 45, Table 15 "Use of Operational and Planning \& Control Technologies by District" shows a "No" under Operator Certification. All operators working in the Montara System are State certified. Effective Utility Management is shown as not utilized, which is incorrect.
Page 87, Appendix K: Director Tenure by District incorrectly shows Jim Harvey, Kathryn Slater-Carter, and Scott Boyd as Board members since 2003. Jim Harvey has served since 2002, Scott Boyd since 1998, and Kathryn Slater-Carter since 1995.
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Request for MWSD
Contribution:
Alta Vista Road Paving
Installation of Turnouts
Drainage Features
September 1, 2016
Alta Vista Neighbors
Request:
MWSD provide a one-time contribution of $\$ 40,000$ for the paving,
installation of turnouts and drainage features on Alta Vista Road.
Background

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - Alta Vista Road is a private road with public access and includes } 7 \\
& \text { residential properties } \\
& \text { - Sole access point for MWSD Alta Vista facilities } \\
& \text { - Access point for GGNRA trail-head to Montara Mountain } \\
& \text { - Currently a dirt road, narrow in spaces with dilapidated drainage syste } \\
& \text { and inadequate access for emergency vehicles } \\
& \text { - In } 2013, \text { Alta Vista Neighbors initiated project to obtain approvals and } \\
& \text { permitting for asphalt paving, installation of emergency vehicle turnot } \\
& \text { and implementation of best management practice drainage } \\
& \text { - In August, SMC Planning and Building/Public Works granted permit to } \\
& \text { proceed } \\
& \text { - Targeted construction date in October prior to rainy season }
\end{aligned}
$$




$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Public Merits of Project: Minimize soil } \\
& \text { erosion and sedimentation } \\
& \text { - Current Situation: Dirt road induces erosion due to absence of } \\
& \text { stabilizing ground cover. Storm water runoff creates water pollution } \\
& \text { and impacts drainage on streets in lower elevation areas of Montara. } \\
& \text { Historically, several tons of road base are added annually to repair the } \\
& \text { road, only to wash away in the subsequent rainy season. } \\
& \text { - Improvements: The project will implement Best Management } \\
& \text { Practices (BMPs) as approved by SMC to properly grade the road, } \\
& \text { repair the existing swale and install hydrological engineered features } \\
& \text { to minimize erosion and protect coastal water quality. Additionally, } \\
& \text { Alta Vista neighbors shall enter into an ongoing storm water } \\
& \text { maintenance agreement to maintain ongoing operation. }
\end{aligned}
$$


Neighborhood Engagement

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - All Alta Vista Road residents are participating in the project. } 6 \\
& \text { neighbors are participating on a financial basis. One neighbor, in lieu } \\
& \text { of financial participation, is granting an easement to his property to } \\
& \text { allow for the establishment of a fire lane. In addition, the single } \\
& \text { resident on an adjacent road (Vallecitos) is financially participating in } \\
& \text { the project. } \\
& \text { - Residents will enter into an ongoing financial and operational } \\
& \text { obligation to maintain the storm water drainage system. }
\end{aligned}
$$



Project Costs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - Contractor: Andreini Brothers, competitively bid for project } \\
& \text { - Project cost includes expenses associated with creating plan and } \\
& \text { obtaining permit (approximately } \$ 22,000 \text { ) and all construction costs } \\
& \text { including grading, storm water drainage repair and improvements, } \\
& \text { creating turnouts, road widening, erosion control measurements, and } \\
& \text { asphalting } 25,260 \text { sq. feet }(\$ 122,484,690)
\end{aligned}
$$
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SUBJECT: Coastal Development Permit for the asphalt paving of Alta Vista Road and installation turnouts and drainage features as necessary. Alta Vista Road, Montara
County File No. PLN 2014-00316
The Planning and Building Department has completed its review of your application for a Coastal Development Permit to pave Alta Vista Road, a private road, and install turnouts and drainage features necessary to comply with the conditions of approval imposed by the Department of Public Works and the Coastside Fire Protection District. The length of the portion of the road to be paved is 1,150 feet. A total of $25,260 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . of impervious surface will be created as a result of new paving. No trees will be removed.

The project conforms to the following General Plan policies:
Policy 1.24 - Protect Vegetative Resources. This policy directs the County to ensure that development will minimize the removal of vegetative resources. To this end, a professional biologist surveyed the project site, found no special status plant species, and determined that no special status plants are expected to occur in the area.

Policy 1.26 - Protect Fish and Wildlife Resources. This policy requires development to minimize the disruption of fish and wildlife and their habitats. A professional biologist identified several protected species of animals that might be found on the site and recommended several measures to be taken to avoid impacts to these species. You have included these impact avoidance measures in your project description.

Policy 2.17 - Regulate Development to Minimize Soil Erosion and Sedimentation. This policy directs the County to regulate development to minimize erosion. The dirt road currently exhibits erosion due to vehicle travel because the vehicles prevent the growth of stabilizing ground cover. This project will pave the road, stabilizing it. Conditions of approval require the implementation of construction erosion and sediment control measures that will stabilize soil during the construction phase of the project.


Policy 12.15 - Local Circulation Policies. This policy directs the County to plan for providing improved streets, sidewalks, and bikeways in developed areas and for access for emergency vehicles. This project will improve access within an area of Montara that is already developed. The existing dirt road restricts access for bicycles, pedestrians, and some automobiles, particularly during winter. The existing dirt road could impede emergency access, preventing the timely arrival of ambulances or fire apparatus. Improving the road would improve emergency access.

The project conforms to the following Local Coastal Program (LCP) policies:
Policy 1.35 - All New Land Use Development and Activities Shall Protect Coastal Water Quality Among Other Ways By.... This policy directs the County to require new development in the Coastal Zone to cause no increase in water pollution due to stormwater runoff and no increase in volume or velocity of stormwater runoff. This is accomplished through design and the implementation of best management practices (BMPs). Conditions of approval require the implementation of BMPs adequate to control construction stormwater pollution. The project includes hydrologically engineered features, approved by the County Department of Public Works, to control water quality in the operational phases of this project.

Policy 2.6 - Capacity Limits. This policy directs the County to limit development or expansion of public works facilities to a capacity which does not exceed that needed to serve build-out of the Local Coastal Program. This project will serve areas designated for Very Low Density Residential Development and Agricultural Development on the General Plan Land Use Map. The proposed road profiles are no more than what is necessary to serve the planned density of the area and will not cause pressure to develop the area to higher densities than planned for in the General Plan and the Local Coastal Program.

Policy 7.3-Protection of Sensitive Habitats. This policy requires that development in areas adjacent to sensitive habitats be sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade these resources.

The Sensitive Habitats Map, prepared for the San Mateo County General Plan, depicts all special habitats mapped by the County. The project site is not within any identified special habitats. The project is within the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS), the watershed in which all water flows directly into the marine reserve.

Conditions of Approval Nos. 8 through 11 imposed by the Planning Department regarding construction and permanent erosion and sediment control protect the ASBS from runoff pollution during and after construction. Construction measures require weekly inspection, and the permanent runoff pollution controls are part of the Department of Public Works' project design.

All construction will take place outside the California Coastal Commission's appeals area. Public notification was mailed on July 6, 2016. No opposition to the project presented itself. The Planning and Building Department received one comment in support of the project and
another requesting that it ensure it is built properly. A public hearing was not required, pursuant to Section 6328.10(a) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff approved the project, subject to the following findings:

## FINDINGS

After reviewing this application and accompanying materials, it is found that:

## For the Environmental Review

1. This project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15301, Class 1, relating to maintenance and minor alteration of existing facilities including streets. A Notice of Exemption will be filed and posted for review forthwith.

## For the Coastal Development Permit

2. That the project, as described in the application and accompanying materials required by Section 6328.7 and as conditioned in accordance with Section 6328.14, conforms to the plans, policies, requirements, and standards of the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

## Current Planning Section

1. This approval applies only to the proposal, documents and plans described in this letter and submitted to the Planning Department on June 1, 2016. Minor revisions or modifications to the project may be made subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director, if they are consistent with the intent of and in substantial conformance with this approval.
2. This final approval shall be valid for five (5) years from the date of approval by which time a valid building permit shall have been issued and a completed inspection shall have occurred within 180 days of its issuance. Any extension of this permit shall require written request and payment of applicable permit extension fees sixty (60) days prior to expiration.
3. This permit does not allow for the removal of any significant or heritage sized trees. Removal of any such tree with a diameter equal to or greater than 12 inches as measured 4.5 feet above the ground shall require a separate tree removal permit.
4. The applicant shall apply for a building permit and shall adhere to all requirements from the Building Inspection Section, the Department of Public Works and the respective Fire Authority.
5. No site disturbance shall occur, including any grading until the encroachment permit has been issued.
6. To reduce the impact of construction activities on neighboring properties, comply with the following:
a. All debris shall be contained on-site; a dumpster or trash bin shall be provided on-site during construction to prevent debris from blowing onto adjacent properties. The applicant shall monitor the site to ensure that trash is picked up and appropriately disposed of daily.
b. The applicant shall remove all construction equipment from the site upon completion of the use and/or need of each piece of equipment which shall include but not be limited to tractors, back hoes, cement mixers, etc.
c. The applicant shall ensure that no construction-related vehicles shall impede through traffic in the public right-of-way. All construction vehicles shall be parked out of the public right-of-way or in locations which do not impede safe access along the public right-of-way. There shall be no storage of construction vehicles in the public right-of-way.
7. Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving and Christmas (San Mateo Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).
8. During construction, the project, where applicable, shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:
a. Stabilizing all denuded areas and maintaining erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30. Stabilizing shall include both proactive measures, such as the placement of hay bales or coir netting, and passive measures, such as revegetating disturbed areas with plants propagated from seed collected in the immediate area.
b. Storing, handling, and disposing of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.
c. Controlling and preventing the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.
d. Using sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering the site and obtaining all necessary permits.
e. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.
f. Delineating with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses.
g. Protecting adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.
h. Performing clearing and earth-moving activities only during dry weather.
i. Limiting and timing application of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.
J. Limiting construction access routes and stabilizing designated access points.
k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.
I. The contractor shall train and provide instructions to all employees and subcontractors regarding the construction best management practices.
m . The approved erosion and sediment control plan shall be implemented prior to the beginning of construction.
9. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all contractors are aware of all stormwater quality measures and implement such measures. Failure to comply with the construction BMPs will result in the issuance of correction notices, citations or a project stop order.
10. The project site is located within the Fitzgerald Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) Watershed and is considered a Construction Stormwater Regulated Site. Weekly construction inspections are required throughout the duration of land disturbance during the rainy season (October 1 to through April 30) for sites within the ASBS Watershed, as required by the State Water Resources Control Board General Exceptions to the California Ocean Plan with Special Protections adopted on March 20, 2012.
11. The project site is located within the Fitzgerald Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) watershed. Runoff and other polluted discharges from the site are prohibited. Development shall minimize erosion, treat stormwater from new/replaced impervious surfaces, and prevent polluted discharges into the ASBS or a County storm drain (e.g., car washing in a driveway or street, pesticide application on lawn).

## Applicant-Proposed Impact Avoidance Measures

11. If work is done during the local nesting season, March 1 through September 1 , a nesting bird survey must be performed along a 50 -foot-wide swath on both sides of the road. If an active nesting site is located, that area should be indicated with appropriate marking along the road edge and to a 50 -foot radius within the work zone, and project work in that area must be bypassed until nesting season is completed.
12. If significant rain fall does occur immediately before and/or during construction, all ditch areas and all other standing water in the construction zone must be inspected before the start of each day's work by a qualified biologist or zoologist. If any California red-legged frog is found, all work in the area must cease until the frog vacates the site.

## Coastside Fire Protection District

13. Approved signs and painted curbs or lines shall be provided and maintained to identify fire apparatus access roads and state the prohibition of their obstruction. Fire lanes shall be in accordance with Coastside Fire Protection District specification. Contact the Coastside Fire Protection District's Fire Prevention Bureau for those specifications.
14. Fire Department access shall be to shall be 20 feet wide, asphalt surface, and able to support a fire apparatus weighing $75,000 \mathrm{lbs}$. Where a fire hydrant is located in the access, a minimum of 26 feet is required for a minimum of 20 feet on each side of the hydrant. Fire access roads 20 to 26 feet in width shall require fire lane signs posted on both side of the roadway with the correct CVC every 75 feet of travel. Fire access roads shall have a minimum vertical clearance of $151 / 2$ feet. This access shall be provided from a publicly maintained road. Grades over $15 \%$ shall be paved and no grade shall be over 20\%. Road base shall be class 2 or equivalent compacted to $95 \%$. Asphalt road access shall be certified by an engineer as to the material thickness, compaction, all weather capability, and weight it will support. For roads approved less than 20 feet in width, turnouts will be required approximately every 400 feet.
15. Fire Department access shall be to within 150 feet of all exterior portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the buildings as measured by an approved access route around the exterior of the building or facility. Access shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide, all weather capability, and able to support a fire apparatus weighing $75,000 \mathrm{lbs}$. Where a fire hydrant is located in the access, a minimum of 26 feet is required for a minimum of 20 feet on each side of the hydrant. This access shall be provided from a publicly maintained road to the property. Grades over $15 \%$ shall be paved and no grade shall be over $20 \%$. When gravel roads are used, it shall be class 2 base or equivalent compacted to $95 \%$. Gravel road access shall be certified by an engineer as to the material thickness, compaction, all weather capability, and weight it will support.
16. Contact the Fire Marshal's Office to schedule a final Inspection prior to occupancy and final inspection by a building inspector. Allow for a minimum 72 -hour notice to the Coastside Fire Protection District at 650/726-5213.
17. All dead end roadways shall be terminated by a turnaround that meets the 2013 CFC and Coastside Fire Protection District Ordinance No. 2013-01.

## Public Works

18. The project shall comply with the San Mateo County Drainage Policy and the San Mateo Countywide National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Prior to the issuance of the building permit or planning permit (for Provision C3 Regulated Projects), the applicant shall submit a plan with construction details conforming with County standards, and a drainage analysis including narrative and calculations showing pre-development and post-development runoff onto and off of the parcel(s) demonstrating compliance with the Policy for review and approval by the Department of Public Works.
19. No proposed construction work within the County right-of-way shall begin until County requirements for the issuance of an encroachment permit, including review of the plans, have been met and an encroachment permit issued. The applicant shall contact a Department of Public Works Inspector 48 hours prior to commencing work in the right-of-way.
20. Prior to start of construction, applicant shall submit a fully signed O\&M agreement by all members of the HOA.

This approval may be appealed by the applicant or any aggrieved party on or before 5:00 p.m. on August 11, 2016, the tenth working day following this action by the Community Development Director. An appeal is made by completing and filing a Notice of Appeal, including a statement of grounds for the appeal, and paying the required applicable appeal fee with the Planning and Building Department. This project is not appealable to the California Coastal Commission.

Further information may be obtained by calling Steven Rosen, Project Planner, at 650/363-1814 or by email at srosen@smcgov.org.

FOR STEVE MONOWITZ COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR, By:


Dave Holbrbok, Senior Planner
DH:SR:pac - SBRAA0406 WPN.DOCX


Planning \& Building Department
455 County Center 2 and Floor
Mall Drop PLN122
Redwood City, California 94063
650/363-4161 Fax:650/363-4849
August 11, 2016

## NOTICE OF FINAL LOCAL DECISION

Pursuant to Section 6328.11.1(f) of the San Mate County Zoning Regulations

## CERTIFIED MAIL

California Coastal Commission
North Central Coast District Office
Attn: Renee Ananda
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105
county file no.: PLN2014-00316
OWNER: Sommafer Co. (Avi)
APPlICANT: Andreini Brothers. he.

Anat. $11,20 i 6$
The above listed Coastal Development Permit was conditionally approved by the County of San Mateo on $T^{\text {The County appeal period ended on. Local review is now complete. }}$
$\zeta$ July 27,2016
The permit IS NOT appealable to the California Coastal Commission.
If you have any questions about this project, please contact at -or-
$(650) 363-1837$
. Project Planner


## MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA

For Meeting Of: November 03, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens H. Heldmaier, General Manager

## SUBJECT: Unaudited Financial Statements - Executive Summary

Budget vs. Actual - Sewer July thru September, 2016 Variances over \$2,000:

- Overall Total Operating Income for the period ending September 30, 2016 was $\$ 1,267$ above budget. Total revenue received to date is \$18,267.
- 5190 Bank Fees, $\$ 2,460$ above Budget - Annual fee paid to U.S. Bank Global Trust Services.
- 5400 Legal, $\$ 3,332$ above Budget- General legal line item impacted for August and September.
- 5610 Accounting, $\$ 5,600$ below Budget - One invoice paid in the current fiscal year.
- 5620 Audit, $\$ 10,200$ below Budget - Audit has not been completed.
- 5630 Consulting, $\$ 6,625$ below Budget - Minimal activity to date. Budget is spread evenly between twelve months.
- 5640 Data Services, $\$ 2,087$ above Budget - Variance due to the payment of engineering data services for parcel management as it relates to the property tax roll.
- 5800 Labor, $\$ 3,279$ above Budget - Due to Management bonus.
- 6170 Claims, Property Damage, $\$ 2,500$ below Budget - No claims to date.
- 6200 Engineering, $\$ 6,228$ below Budget - Minimal activity to date. Budget is spread evenly between twelve months.
- 6600 Collection/Transmission, $\$ 2,500$ below Budget - No activity to-date. Budget is spread evenly between twelve months.
- 6940 \& 6950 SAM Maintenance, Collection Sys, $\$ 10,000$ below Budget \& 6950 SAM Maintenance, Pumping, $\$ 12,500$ below Budget (respectively) No activity to-date.
- Overall Total Operating Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2016 were $\$ 34,985$ below Budget.
- Total overall Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2016 were $\$ 52,219$ below budget. For a net ordinary income of $\$ 53,486$, budgeted vs. actual. Actual net ordinary loss is $(\$ 362,104)$.
- 7100 Connection Fees, $\$ 42,610$ above Budget - Three New Construction connections and one Remodel connection sold in September.



## MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA

For Meeting Of: November 03, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens H. Heldmaier, General Manager

- 7200 Interest Income, LAIF - $1^{\text {st }}$ FY quarter interest income has not yet been booked.
- 8000 CIP, $\$ 415,423$ below Budget - Minimal activity to-date.
- 9200 I-Bank Loan, $\$ 10,674$ below Budget Minimum activity to-date.

RECOMMENDATION:
This is for Board information only


# MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA 

For Meeting Of: November 03, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens H. Heldmaier, General Manager
Budget vs. Actual - Water July thru September, 2016 Variances over \$2,000:

- 4740 Testing Backflow, $\$ 3,298$ above Budget - Payments received for tests performed in past months.
- 4810 Water Sales, $\$ 30,919$ above Budget - Increase in sales and related payments received.
- Overall Total Operating Income for the period ending September 30, 2016 was $\$ 35,449$ above budget. Total revenue received to date is \$498,936.
- 5240 CDPH Fees, $\$ 3,875$ below Budget - To date, no invoices have been paid.
- 5400 Legal, $\$ 7,720$ below Budget - Legal costs have been held below expectation.
- 5530 Memberships, $\$ 4,245$ below Budget - Association memberships are typically paid at the beginning of the calendar year.
- 5610 Accounting, $\$ 5,600$ below Budget - One invoice paid in the current fiscal year.
- 5620 Audit, $\$ 17,700$ below Budget - Audit has not been completed.
- 5630 Consulting, $\$ 5,875$ below Budget - Consulting expenses have been misclassified to other accounts. The issue has been identified and will be corrected going forward. Line item is $\$ 2,289$ below budget.
- 5800 Labor, \$ 2,743 below Budget - Due to Management bonus.
- 6170 Claims, Property Damage, \$2,500 below Budget - No claims todate.
- 6185 SCADA Maintenance, $\$ 3,750$ below Budget - No activity to-date.
- 6400 Pumping, $\$ 17,863$ below Budget - PG\&E costs have been less than expected to date. A large catch up bill is typically received near the end of the calendar year.
- 6500 Supply, $\$ 6,378$ below Budget - No purchases made to date.
- 6600 Collection/Transmission, $\$ 17,356$ below Budget - Minimal activity todate.
- 6700 Treatment, $\$ 11,074$ below Budget - Minimal activity to-date.
- 6800 Vehicles, $\$ 2,327$ below Budget - Minimal activity to-date
- Overall Total Operating Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2016 were $\$ 49,561$ below budget.
- Total overall Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2016 were $\$ 97,553$ below budget. For a net ordinary income of $\$ 133,002$, budgeted vs. actual. Actual net ordinary income is $\mathbf{\$ 2 1 7 , 3 8 4}$.



# MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA 

For Meeting Of: November 03, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens H. Heldmaier, General Manager

- 7100 Connection Fees, $\$ 42,323$ above Budget - Three new construction connections and three new PFP connections sold in September.
- 7600 Bond Revenues, G.O. $\$ 287,609$ below Budget - County typically remits the first payment in October or November.
- 8000 CIP, $\$ 222,192$ above Budget - Majority of large invoices paid in connection with the $4^{\text {th }}$ street main replacement project.
- 9100 Interest Expense- GO Bonds, $\$ 214,713$ below Budget - Variance due to timing.
- 9150 SRF Loan, $\$ 18,992$ below Budget - Variance due to timing.

RECOMMENDATION:
This is for Board information only

9:33 AM
10/21/16
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Montara Water \& Sanitary District
Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Sewer
July through September 2016

$2,460.43$

| -458.00 |
| ---: |
| -450.00 |
| -180.31 |

-1,088.31
-500.01
$-1,373.13$
-125.01
1,493.46
1,368.45
$-500.01$
-1,287.51
4,619.99
3,332.48
$-1,258.03$
-150.36
$-524.99$
$-5,600.00$
-10,200.00
-6,624.99
2,086.50
187.50
24.82
$29,762.50$
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Montara Water \& Sanitary District
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July through September 2016
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## Montara Water \& Sanitary District

Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Sewer
July through September 2016

|  | Sewer |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jul - Sep 16 | Budget | \$ Over Budget |
| 6900 - Sewer Authority Midcoastside |  |  |  |
| 6910 - SAM Collections | 80,402.01 | 80,402.01 | 0.00 |
| 6920 - SAM Operations | 173,632.74 | 173,632.74 | 0.00 |
| 6940 - SAM Maintenance, Collection Sys | 0.00 | 9,999.99 | -9,999.99 |
| 6950 - SAM Maintenance, Pumping | 0.00 | 12,500.01 | -12,500.01 |
| Total $6900 \cdot$ Sewer Authority Midcoastside | 254,034.75 | 276,534.75 | -22,500.00 |
| Total 6000 - Operations | 269,075.13 | 304,059.72 | -34,984.59 |
| Total Expense | 380,371.03 | 432,590.26 | -52,219.23 |
| Net Ordinary Income | -362,104.27 | -415,590.25 | 53,485.98 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 7000 - Capital Account Revenues |  |  |  |
| 7100 - Connection Fees |  |  |  |
| 7110 - Connection Fees (New Constr) | 78,606.43 | 35,064.00 | 43,542.43 |
| $7120 \cdot$ Connection Fees (Remodel) | 11,567.40 | 12,500.01 | -932.61 |
| Total $7100 \cdot$ Connection Fees | 90,173.83 | 47,564.01 | 42,609.82 |
| 7200 - Interest Income - LAIF | 0.00 | 2,500.00 | -2,500.00 |
| Total $7000 \cdot$ Capital Account Revenues | 90,173.83 | 50,064.01 | 40,109.82 |
| Total Other Income | 90,173.83 | 50,064.01 | 40,109.82 |
| Other Expense |  |  |  |
| 8000 - Capital Improvement Program |  |  |  |
| Total 8000 - Capital Improvement Program | 21,114.91 | 436,437.51 | -415,322.60 |
| 9000 - Capital Account Expenses |  |  |  |
| 9125 P PNC Equipment Lease Interest | 4,177.05 | 5,017.42 | -840.37 |
| 9175 - Capital Assessment - SAM | 38,427.51 | 38,427.51 | 0.00 |
| 9200 - - Bank Loan | 2,134.81 | 12,808.84 | -10,674.03 |
| Total 9000 - Capital Account Expenses | 44,739.37 | 56,253.77 | -11,514.40 |
| Total Other Expense | 65,854.28 | 492,691.28 | -426,837.00 |
| Net Other Income | 24,319.55 | -442,627.27 | 466,946.82 |
| Net Income | -337,784.72 | -858,217.52 | 520,432.80 |

9:34 AM
10/21/16
Accrual Basis
Ordinary Incomexpense

4220
4220 - Cell Tower Lease
400 - Fees
4410 • Administrative Fee (New Constr)
4420 - Administrative Fee (Remodel)
4430 - Inspection Fee (New Constr)
4440 - Inspection Fee (Remodel)
Total $4400 \cdot$ Fees
4740 - Testing, Backflow
4810 - Water Sales, Domestic
4850 - Water Sales Refunds, Customer
4990 - Other Revenue

## Total Income

## Gross Profit

## Expense

000 - Administrative
5190 - Bank Fees
5200 - Board of Directors
5210 - Board Meetings
5220 - Director Fees
5230 - Election Expenses
Total 5200 - Board of Directors
5240 - CDPH Fees
5250 - Conference Attendance
5270 - Information Systems
5300 - Insurance
5320 - Property \& Liability Insurance
Total 5300 - Insurance
5350 - LAFCO Assessmen
5400 - Legal
$5420 \cdot$ Meeting Attendance, Lega
5430 - General Legal

## Total $5400 \cdot$ Legal

5510 - Maintenance, Office
5530 - Memberships
5540 - Office Supplies
5550 - Postage
5560 - Printing \& Publishing
5600 - Professional Services
$5610 \cdot$ Accounting
5620 . Audit
5630 - Consulting
5640 - Data Services
5650 - Labor \& HR Suppo
5660 - Payroll Services
5660 - Payroll Services
Total 5600 - Professional Service

## Montara Water \& Sanitary District

Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water
July through September 2016

| Water |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul - Sep 16 | Budget | \$ Over Budget |
| 8,571.87 | 8,375.01 | 196.86 |
| 974.00 | 1,125.00 | -151.00 |
| 0.00 | 225.00 | -225.00 |
| 920.00 | 1,062.51 | -142.51 |
| 0.00 | 200.01 | -200.01 |
| 1,894.00 | 2,612.52 | -718.52 |
| 6,548.00 | 3,249.99 | 3,298.01 |
| 480,919.04 | 450,000.00 | 30,919.04 |
| -499.56 | -750.00 | 250.44 |
| 1,503.04 |  |  |
| 498,936.39 | 463,487.52 | 35,448.87 |
| 498,936.39 | 463,487.52 | 35,448.87 |


| -458.01 |
| ---: |
| -450.00 |
| -180.32 |

-1,088.33
-3,875.01
-999.99 $-248.13$
-1,037.49
-6,682.50
-994.08
-4,245.00
$5,600,00$
-17,700.00
-5,874.99
-125.01
12.34
$-25,701.17$

9:34 AM
10/21/16
Accrual Basis

## Montara Water \& Sanitary District

Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water
July through September 2016
$5720 \cdot$ Telephone \& Internet
$5730 \cdot$ Mileage Reimbursement
$5740 \cdot$ Reference Materials
$5790 \cdot$ Other Adminstrative
$5800 \cdot$ Labor
$5810 \cdot$ CalPERS 457 Deferred Plan
$5820 \cdot$ Employee Benefits
$5830 \cdot$ Disability Insurance
$5840 \cdot$ Payroll Taxes
$5850 \cdot$ PARS
$5900 \cdot$ Wages
$5910 \cdot$ Management
$5920 \cdot$ Staff
$5930 \cdot$ Staff Certification
$5940 \cdot$ Staff Overtime
$5950 \cdot$ Staff Standby
Total $5900 \cdot$ Wages
$5960 \cdot$ Worker's Comp Insurance
Total $5800 \cdot$ Labor

## Total 5000 • Administrative

## $6000 \cdot$ Operations

6160 - Backflow Prevention

6180 - Communications
6185 - SCADA Maintenance
6180 - Communications - Other
Total $6180 \cdot$ Communications

## $6195 \cdot$ Education \& Training

$6210 \cdot$ Meeting Attendance, Engineering
6220 - General Engineering
6220 - General Engineering
6230 - Water Quality Engineering
Total $6200 \cdot$ Engineering
6320 - Equipment \& Tools, Expensed 6330 - Facilities
6335 - Alarm Services
6337 • Landscaping
6330 - Facilities - Other

## Total $6330 \cdot$ Facilities

$6370 \cdot$ Lab Supplies \& Equipment
400 - Pumping
6410 - Pumping Fuel \& Electricity
6420 - Pumping Maintenance, Generators
6430 - Pumping Maintenance, General
6440 - Pumping Equipment, Expensed

## Total $6400 \cdot$ Pumping

| Water |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul - Sep 16 | Budget | \$ Over Budget |
| 3,871.59 | 4,250.01 | -378.42 |
| 141.79 | 500.01 | -358.22 |
| 0.00 | 200.01 | -200.01 |
| 1,112.00 |  |  |
| 8,558.06 | 8,492.49 | 65.57 |
| 17,342.13 | 17,342.01 | 0.12 |
| 560.97 | 730.26 | -169.29 |
| 9,281.71 | 10,143.51 | -861.80 |
| 6,985.10 | 6,751.26 | 233.84 |
| 27,773.80 | 23,343.24 | 4,430.56 |
| 88,285.48 | 87,697.74 | 587.74 |
| 2,250.00 | 2,250.00 | 0.00 |
| 11,152.85 | 13,088.25 | -1,935.40 |
| 5,948.33 | 6,214.26 | -265.93 |
| 135,410.46 | 132,593.49 | 2,816.97 |
| 0.00 | 4,827.99 | -4,827.99 |
| 178,138.43 | 180,881.01 | -2,742.58 |
| 212,176.39 | 260,168.53 | -47,992.14 |
| 0.00 | 249.99 | -249.99 |
| 0.00 | 2,499.99 | -2,499.99 |
| 0.00 | 3,750.00 | -3,750.00 |
| 6,401.12 |  |  |
| 6,401.12 | 3,750.00 | 2,651.12 |
| 2,514.68 | 1,500.00 | 1,014.68 |
| 0.00 | 500.01 | -500.01 |
| 962.50 | 5,000.01 | -4,037.51 |
| 19,394.87 | 16,250.01 | 3,144.86 |
| 20,357.37 | 21,750.03 | -1,392.66 |
| 630.27 | 1,250.01 | -619.74 |
| 179.52 | 187.50 | -7.98 |
| 857.73 | 1,500.00 | -642.27 |
| 1,883.28 |  |  |
| 2,920.53 | 1,687.50 | 1,233.03 |
| 0.00 | 249.99 | -249.99 |
| 10,262.13 | 24,999.99 | -14,737.86 |
| 0.00 | 2,000.01 | -2,000.01 |
| 0.00 | 624.99 | -624.99 |
| 0.00 | 500.01 | -500.01 |
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## Montara Water \& Sanitary District

Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water
July through September 2016
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## Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water

July through September 2016

| Water |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul - Sep 16 | Budget | \$ Over Budget |
| 25,111.00 |  |  |
| 24,942.50 | 149,655.02 | -124,712.52 |
| 4,177.04 | 5,017.42 | -840.38 |
| 0.00 | 18,991.52 | -18,991.52 |
| 200.00 |  |  |
| 54,430.54 | 173,663.96 | -119,233.42 |
| 431,372.36 | 328,413.95 | 102,958.41 |
| -340,049.36 | 8,195.08 | -348,244.44 |
| -122,665.71 | 92,576.64 | -215,242.35 |

## ASSETS

Current Assets

## Checking/Savings <br> Sewer - Bank Accounts

Wells Fargo Operating - Sewer
LAIF Investment Fund
Capital Reserve
Connection Fees Reserve
Operating Reserve
Total LAIF Investment Fund
Total Sewer - Bank Accounts
Water - Bank Accounts
Wells Fargo Operating - Water
Capital Reserve
Operating Reserve
Restricted Cash
Acq \& Improv Fund Connection Fees Reserve Cost of Issuance GO Bonds Fund

Total Restricted Cash
Total Water - Bank Accounts
Total Checking/Savings
Accounts Receivable
Sewer - Accounts Receivable Accounts Receivable

Total Sewer - Accounts Receivable
Water - Accounts Receivable Accounts Receivable
Accounts Rec. - Backflow
Accounts Rec. - Water Residents Unbilled Water Receivables

Total Water - Accounts Receivable
Total Accounts Receivable
Other Current Assets
Maint/Parts Inventory
Total Other Current Assets
Total Current Assets

Fixed Assets

## Sewer - Fixed Assets

General Plant
Land
Other Capital Improv.
Sewer-Original Cos

Sewer-Original Cost Other Cap. Improv.
Total Other Capital Improv.
Seal Cove Collection System
Sewage Collection Facility Collection Facility - Org. Cost Collection Facility - Other

Total Sewage Collection Facility

Montara Water \& Sanitary District
Funds Balance Sheet
As of September 30, 2016
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Water
Unassigned $\quad$ тоTAL

| 0.00 |
| ---: |
| 0.00 |
| 0.00 |
| 0.00 |
| 0.00 |
| 0.00 |


| 0.00 | $2,705,463.57$ |
| ---: | ---: |
|  |  |
| 0.00 | $3,853,967.15$ |
| 0.00 | $152,756.00$ |
| 0.00 | $281,893.00$ |
| 0.00 | $4,288,616.15$ |
| 0.00 | $6,994,079.72$ |


| 0.00 | $630,454.76$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.00 | $398,249.00$ |  |
| 0.00 | $190,251.00$ |  |
|  |  | 436.13 |
| 0.00 | $157,000.00$ |  |
| 0.00 | 122.94 |  |
| 0.00 | $796,526.91$ |  |
| 0.00 |  | $954,085.98$ |
|  | 0.00 |  |
| 0.00 |  | $2,173,040.74$ |
|  |  | $9,167,120.46$ |

$$
\begin{array}{r}
30,024.56 \\
\hline 30,024.56
\end{array}
$$

| 0.00 |
| ---: |
| 0.00 |


| $29,913.90$ |
| ---: |
| $11,652.59$ |
| $111,908.03$ |
| $222,714.27$ |
| $376,188.79$ |
| $376,188.79$ |


| 0.00 | $29,913.90$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.00 | $11,652.59$ |  |
| 0.00 |  | $111,908.03$ |
| 0.00 |  | $222,714.27$ |
|  | 0.00 | $376,188.79$ |
|  |  |  |


| 0.00 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | $42,656.32$ |
| $0.024,104.28$ |  | $42,656.32$ |
| $2,591,885.85$ |  |  |


| $2,335,210.98$ | 0.00 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $5,000.00$ | 0.00 |
|  |  |
| $285,599.18$ | 0.00 |
| $2,564,810.39$ | 0.00 |
|  | 0.00 |
|  | 0.00 |
|  |  |
| $1,349,064.00$ | 0.00 |
| $3,991,243.33$ | 0.00 |
| $5,340,307.33$ | 0.00 |


| 0.00 | $2,335,210.98$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0.00 | $5,000.00$ |
| 0.00 | $685,599.18$ |
| 0.00 | $2,564,810.39$ |
| 0.00 | $3,250,409.57$ |
| 0.00 | $995,505.00$ |
|  |  |
| 0.00 | $1,349,064.00$ |
| 0.00 | $3,991,243.33$ |
| 0.00 | $5,340,307.33$ |

Accrual Basis
Treatment Facility
Accumulated Depreciation
Total Sewer - Fixed Assets
Water - Fixed Assets
General Plant
Land \& Easements
Surface Water Rights
Water Meters
Fixed Assets - Other
Accumulated Depreciation
Total Water - Fixed Assets

## Total Fixed Assets

Other Assets
Sewer - Other Assets
Joint Power Authority
SAM - Orig Collection Facilit
SAM - Expansion
Total Joint Power Authority
Total Sewer - Other Assets
Water - Other Assets
Due from Sewer
Bond Acquisition Cost OID
Bond Issue Cost

Total Water - Other Assets

Total Other Assets
Due From/(To)
Sewer
Water
Unassigned

Total Due From/(To)
TOTAL ASSETS

LIABILITIES \& EQUITY
Liabilities
Current Liabilities
Accounts Payable
Accounts Payable - Sewer
Accounts Payable - Water

Total Accounts Payable
Other Current Liabilities
Sewer - Current Liabilities Accrued Payables - Sewer Accrued Vacations Deposits Payable PNC Equip. Loan - S/T

Total Sewer - Current Liabilities

Montara Water \& Sanitary District
Funds Balance Sheet
As of September 30, 2016

| 244,539.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 244,539.84 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -7,394,155.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -7,394,155.00 |
| 4,776,817.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4,776,817.72 |
| 0.00 | 25,889,935.10 | 0.00 | 25,889,935.10 |
| 0.00 | 734,500.00 | 0.00 | 734,500.00 |
| 0.00 | 300,000.00 | 0.00 | 300,000.00 |
| 0.00 | 1,058,985.00 | 0.00 | 1,058,985.00 |
| 0.00 | 48,171.78 | 0.00 | 48,171.78 |
| 0.00 | -8,896,821.00 | 0.00 | -8,896,821.00 |
| 0.00 | 19,134,770.88 | 0.00 | 19,134,770.88 |
| 4,776,817.72 | 19,134,770.88 | 0.00 | 23,911,588.60 |


| 981,592.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1,705,955.08 | 0.00 |
| 2,687,547.08 | 0.00 |
| 2,687,547.08 | 0.00 |


| 0.00 | $981,592.00$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.00 | $1,705,955.08$ |  |
|  |  | $2,687,547.08$ |
| 0.00 | $2,687,547.08$ |  |


| 0.00 |
| ---: |
| 0.00 |
| 0.00 |
| 0.00 |
| $2,687,547.08$ |


| $146,418.50$ |
| ---: |
| $57,636.40$ |
| $61,691.45$ |
| $265,746.35$ |
| $265,746.35$ |


| 0.00 | $146,418.50$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.00 | $57,636.40$ |  |
| 0.00 | $61,691.45$ |  |
| 0.00 |  | $265,746.35$ |
| 0.00 | $2,953,293.43$ |  |


| $215,771.43$ |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $-215,771.43$ |  |
| 0.00 |  |
| 0.00 |  |
| ${0.00} \\ { }$ | $36,480,872.16$ |


| 19,969.90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 19,969.90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00 | 13,226.10 | 0.00 | 13,226.10 |
| 19,969.90 | 13,226.10 | 0.00 | 33,196.00 |
| -75.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -75.00 |
| 6,911.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6,911.83 |
| 12,155.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,155.00 |
| 32,354.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 32,354.58 |
| 51,346.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 51,346.41 |


| Water - Current Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accrued Payables - Water | 0.00 | 978.90 | 0.00 | 978.90 |
| Accrued Vacations | 0.00 | 10,719.62 | 0.00 | 10,719.62 |
| Deposits Payable | 0.00 | 8,559.85 | 0.00 | 8,559.85 |
| GO Bonds - S/T | 0.00 | 429,138.70 | 0.00 | 429,138.70 |
| PFP Water Deposits | 0.00 | 4,302.50 | 0.00 | 4,302.50 |
| PNC Equip. Loan - S/T | 0.00 | 32,354.57 | 0.00 | 32,354.57 |
| SRF Loan Payable X102-Current | 0.00 | 81,026.93 | 0.00 | 81,026.93 |
| SRF Loan Payable X109-Current | 0.00 | 158,287.99 | 0.00 | 158,287.99 |
| Total Water - Current Liabilities | 0.00 | 725,369.06 | 0.00 | 725,369.06 |
| Payroll Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Benefits Payable | 3,742.49 | 8,573.03 | 0.00 | 12,315.52 |
| Total Payroll Liabilities | 3,742.49 | 8,573.03 | 0.00 | 12,315.52 |
| Total Other Current Liabilities | 55,088.90 | 733,942.09 | 0.00 | 789,030.99 |
| Total Current Liabilities | 75,058.80 | 747,168.19 | 0.00 | 822,226.99 |
| Long Term Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer - Long Term Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Due to Water Fund | 146,418.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 146,418.50 |
| Accrued Vacations | 9,853.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,853.51 |
| I-Bank Loan | 812,574.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 812,574.49 |
| PNC Equip. Loan - L/T | 640,930.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 640,930.10 |
| Total Sewer - Long Term Liabilities | 1,609,776.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,609,776.60 |
| Water - Long Term Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Accrued Vacations | 0.00 | 9,969.14 | 0.00 | 9,969.14 |
| Deferred on Refunding | 0.00 | -224,756.00 | 0.00 | -224,756.00 |
| GO Bonds - L/T | 0.00 | 11,479,503.08 | 0.00 | 11,479,503.08 |
| PNC Equip. Loan - L/T | 0.00 | 640,930.13 | 0.00 | 640,930.13 |
| SRF Loan Payable - X102 | 0.00 | 210,105.41 | 0.00 | 210,105.41 |
| SRF Loan Payable - X109 | 0.00 | 3,541,174.66 | 0.00 | 3,541,174.66 |
| Total Water - Long Term Liabilities | 0.00 | 15,656,926.42 | 0.00 | 15,656,926.42 |
| Total Long Term Liabilities | 1,609,776.60 | 15,656,926.42 | 0.00 | 17,266,703.02 |
| Total Liabilities | 1,684,835.40 | 16,404,094.61 | 0.00 | 18,088,930.01 |
| Equity |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer - Equity Accounts |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Assets Net | 3,408,252.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,408,252.20 |
| Fund Balance - Unrestricted | 8,646,292.87 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8,646,292.87 |
| Retained Earnings | 25,577.76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,577.76 |
| Total Sewer - Equity Accounts | 12,080,122.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,080,122.83 |
| Water - Equity Accounts |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Assets Net | 0.00 | 2,868,858.70 | 0.00 | 2,868,858.70 |
| Restricted Debt Service | 0.00 | 1,384,997.90 | 0.00 | 1,384,997.90 |
| Unrestricted | 0.00 | -1,562,801.59 | 0.00 | -1,562,801.59 |
| Retained Earnings | 0.00 | -25,577.76 | 0.00 | -25,577.76 |
| Total Water - Equity Accounts | 0.00 | 2,665,477.25 | 0.00 | 2,665,477.25 |
| Equity Adjustment Account | 1,339,756.37 | 2,767,036.13 | 0.00 | 4,106,792.50 |
| Net Income | -337,784.72 | -122,665.71 | 0.00 | -460,450.43 |
| Total Equity | 13,082,094.48 | 5,309,847.67 | 0.00 | 18,391,942.15 |
| TAL LIABILITIES \& EQUITY | 14,766,929.88 | 21,713,942.28 | 0.00 | 36,480,872.16 |

Water - Current Liabilities

Total Water - Current Liabilities
Payroll Liabilities
Employee Benefits Payable
Total Payroll Liabilities
Total Other Current Liabilities
Total Current Liabilities
Long Term Liabilities
Sewer - Long Term Liabilities Due to Water Fund Accrued Vacations -Bank Loan PNC Equip. Loan - L/T

Total Sewer - Long Term Liabilities
Water - Long Term Liabilities Accrued Vacations Deferred on Refunding GO Bonds - L/T PNC Equip. Loan - L/T SRF Loan Payable - X102 SRF Loan Payable - X109

Total Water - Long Term Liabilities
Total Long Term Liabilities
Total Liabilities

Equity
Sewer - Equity Accounts
Capital Assets Net Fund Balance - Unrestricted Retained Earnings

Total Sewer - Equity Accounts
Water - Equity Accounts
Capital Assets Net Restricted Debt Service Unrestricted Retained Earnings

Total Water - Equity Accounts
Equity Adjustment Account Net Income

Total Equity
TOTAL LIABILITIES \& EQUITY

Montara Water \& Sanitary District
Funds Balance Sheet
As of September 30, 2016

Target $\quad$ O Over/Un Reserves $\begin{gathered}\text { \$ Over } \\ \text { Tar }\end{gathered}$
Sewer - Operations
Wells Fargo Operating - Sewer
Sewer - Reserve Accounts
LAIF -
Capital Reserve
Connection Fees Reserve
Operating Reserve
Sub-total
Water - Operations
Wells Fargo Operating - Water

## Water - Reserve Accounts

Wells Fargo Bank-
Capital Reserve
Connection Fees Reserve
Operating Reserve
Sub-total
Water - Restricted account
First Republic Bank - Water
First Republic Bank - Water
Acquistion \& Improvement Fund
Cost of issuance
Cost of issuance
GO Bonds Fund
Sub-total
Total Cash and equivalents

| July |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 9:44 AM 10/21/16 Accrual Basis | Montara Water \& Sanitary District Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Sewer <br> July 2016 through June 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
|  | Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | Oct 16 | Nov 16 | Dec 16 | Jan 17 | Feb 17 | Mar 17 | Apr 17 | May 17 | Jun 17 | Jul '16- Jun 17 | Budget | \$ Over Budget | \% of Budget |
| Ordinary Income/Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4220 - Cell Tower Lease | 2,857.30 | 2,857.30 | 2,857.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,571.90 | 33,500.00 | -24,928.10 | 25.59\% |
| 4400 Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4410 - Administrative Fee (New Constr) |  | 487.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 487.00 | 3,000.00 | -2,513.00 | 16.23\% |
| 4420 - Administrative Fee (Remodel) | 487.00 | 487.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 974.00 | 1,500.00 | -526.00 | 64.93\% |
| $4430 \cdot$ Inspection Fee (New Constr) |  | 460.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 460.00 | 2,500.00 | -2,040.00 | 18.4\% |
| 4440 - Inspection Fee (Remodel) | 566.00 | 460.00 | 530.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,556.00 | 3,500.00 | -1,944.00 | 44.46\% |
| 4460 - Remodel Fees | 341.00 | 682.00 | 106.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,129.00 | 7,000.00 | -5,871.00 | 16.13\% |
| Total $4400 \cdot$ Fees | 1,394.00 | 2,576.00 | 636.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,606.00 | 17,500.00 | -12,894.00 | 26.32\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4610 - Property Tax Receipts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 235,000.00 | -235,000.00 |  |
| 4710 - Sewer Service Charges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,969,726.00 | -1,969,726.00 |  |
| 4720 - Sewer Service Refunds, Customer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -4,000.00 | 4,000.00 |  |
| 4760 - Waste Collection Revenues | 1,344.31 | 2,571.11 | 1,169.43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,084.85 | 21,000.00 | -15,915.15 | 24.21\% |
| 4810 - Water Sales, Domestic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4990 - Other Revenue |  | 4.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.01 |  |  |  |
| Total Income | 5,595.61 | 8,008.42 | 4,662.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18,266.76 | 2,272,726.00 | -2,254,459.24 | 0.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Profit | 5,595.61 | 8,008.42 | 4,662.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18,266.76 | 2,272,726.00 | -2,254,459.24 | 0.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5000 - Administrative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5190 - Bank Fees | 2,803.19 | 350.36 | 681.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,835.42 | 5,500.00 | $-1,664.58$ | 69.74\% |
| 5200 - Board of Directors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5210 - Board Meetings |  | 167.00 | 125.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 292.00 | 3,000.00 | -2,708.00 | 9.73\% |
| 5220 - Director Fees |  | 112.50 | 262.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 375.00 | 3,300.00 | -2,925.00 | 11.36\% |
| 5230 - Election Expenses |  |  | 819.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 819.68 | 4,000.00 | -3,180.32 | 20.49\% |
| Total 5200 - Board of Directors |  | 279.50 | 1,207.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,486.68 | 10,300.00 | $-8,813.32$ | 14.43\% |
| 5250 - Conference Attendance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,000.00 | -2,000.00 |  |
| 5270 - Information Systems |  | 126.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 126.87 | 6,000.00 | $-5,873.13$ | 2.12\% |
| 5300 - Insurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5310 - Fidelity Bond |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500.00 | -500.00 |  |
| $5320 \cdot$ Property \& Liability Insurance | 1,918.47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,918.47 | 1,700.00 | 218.47 | 112.85\% |
| Total $5300 \cdot$ Insurance | 1,918.47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,918.47 | 2,200.00 | -281.53 | 87.2\% |
| $5350 \cdot$ LAFCO Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,000.00 | -2,000.00 |  |

# Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Sewer 

July 2016 through June 2017

5400 - Legal
5420 - Meeting Attendance, Legal
5430 - General Legal
Total $5400 \cdot$ Legal
5510 - Maintenance, Office
5550 - Postage
$5560 \cdot$ Printing \& Publishing
5600 - Professional Services
$5610 \cdot$ Accounting
5620 - Audit
5630 - Consulting
5640 - Data Services
5650 - Labor \& HR Support
5660 - Payroll Services
Total 5600 - Professional Services
5710 - San Mateo Co. Tax Roll Charges
5720 • Telephone \& Internet
5730 - Mileage Reimbursement
5740 - Reference Materials

## 5800 - Labor

5810 - CaIPERS 457 Deferred Plan

## 582 - Employee Benefits

5830 - Disability Insurance
5840 - Payroll Taxes
5850 - PARS
5900 - Wages
5910 - Management
5920 - Staff
5930 - Staff Certification
5940 - Staff Overtime
5950 - Staff Standby
Total 5900 - Wages
5960 - Worker's Comp Insurance
Total 5800 - Labor

| July 2016 through June 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | Oct 16 | Nov 16 | Dec 16 |  | Feb 17 | Mar 17 | Apr 17 | May 17 | Jun 17 | Jul '16-Jun 17 | Budget | \$ Over Budget | \% of Budget |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 500.00 | 587.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,087.50 | 9,500.00 | -8,412.50 | 11.45\% |
|  | 4,457.50 | 5,162.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,620.00 | 20,000.00 | -10,380.00 | 48.1\% |
|  | 4,957.50 | 5,750.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,707.50 | 29,500.00 | -18,792.50 | 36.3\% |
|  | 391.98 | 350.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 741.98 | 8,000.00 | -7,258.02 | 9.28\% |
|  | 1,488.07 | 361.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,849.65 | 8,000.00 | -6,150.35 | 23.12\% |
|  | 100.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.00 | 2,500.00 | -2,400.00 | 4.0\% |
|  | 37.91 | 40.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78.26 | 3,000.00 | -2,921.74 | 2.61\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1,900.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,900.00 | 30,000.00 | -28,100.00 | 6.33\% |
|  |  | 2,800.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,800.00 | 13,000.00 | -10,200.00 | 21.54\% |
|  | 375.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 375.00 | 28,000.00 | -27,625.00 | 1.34\% |
|  |  | 3,586.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,586.50 | 6,000.00 | -2,413.50 | 59.78\% |
| 187.50 |  | 187.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 375.00 | 2,250.00 | -1,875.00 | 16.67\% |
| 73.94 | 74.95 | 75.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 224.83 | 800.00 | -575.17 | 28.1\% |
| 261.44 | 449.95 | 8,549.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,261.33 | 80,050.00 | -70,788.67 | 11.57\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,500.00 | -2,500.00 |  |
| 29.98 | 1,347.12 | 1,292.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,669.70 | 11,000.00 | -8,330.30 | 24.27\% |
|  |  | 23.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.03 | 1,500.00 | -1,476.97 | 1.54\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200.00 | -200.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,134.69 | 1,254.27 | 1,627.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,016.74 | 15,117.00 | -11,100.26 | 26.57\% |
| 2,865.14 | 2,865.14 | 2,865.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,595.42 | 34,382.00 | -25,786.58 | 25.0\% |
|  | 113.37 | 113.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 226.74 | 1,479.00 | -1,252.26 | 15.33\% |
| 1,327.53 | 1,101.00 | 973.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,402.20 | 16,521.00 | -13,118.80 | 20.59\% |
| 1,087.07 | 1,144.84 | 1,498.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,730.21 | 13,768.00 | -10,037.79 | 27.09\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7,391.78 | 7,391.78 | 12,988.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27,771.86 | 93,373.00 | -65,601.14 | 29.74\% |
| 9,332.41 | 10,221.20 | 10,076.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29,629.72 | 118,444.00 | -88,814.28 | 25.02\% |
| 150.00 | 150.00 | 150.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 450.00 | 1,800.00 | -1,350.00 | 25.0\% |
| 478.96 | 155.35 | 39.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 674.12 | 2,339.00 | -1,664.88 | 28.82\% |
| 17,353.15 | 17,918.33 | 23,254.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58,525.70 | 215,956.00 | -157,430.30 | 27.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,649.00 | -3,649.00 |  |
| 23,767.58 | 24,396.95 | 30,332.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78,497.01 | 300,872.00 | -222,374.99 | 26.09\% |

## Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Sewer

## Total 5000 • Administrative

## 6000 - Operations

170 - Claims, Property Damag
6195 • Education \& Training
6200 - Engineering
$6210 \cdot$ Meeting Attendance, Engineerin
6220 - General Engineering
Total $6200 \cdot$ Engineering

6320 - Equipment \& Tools, Expensed

## 330 . Facilitie

6335 - Alarm Services
6337 - Landscaping
6330 - Facilities - Other
Total 6330 - Facilities

## $6400 \cdot$ Pumping

6410 • Pumping Fuel \& Electricity
Total $6400 \cdot$ Pumping
6600 - Collection/Transmission
6660 - Maintenance, Collection System Total $6600 \cdot$ Collection/Transmission

## 6800 - Vehicles

6810 - Fuel
6820 - Truck Equipment, Expensed
6830 - Truck Repairs
Total 6800 - Vehicles
6900 - Sewer Authority Midcoastside
6910 - SAM Collections
6920 - SAM Operations
6940 - SAM Maintenance, Collection Sys
6950 - SAM Maintenance, Pumping
Total 6900 - Sewer Authority Midcoastside

$$
\text { July } 2016 \text { through June } 2017
$$

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $10,000.00$ $-10,000.00$ <br> $1,000.00$ $-1,000.00$ |  |  |
| $1,253.00$ | $5,519.00$ | 0.09 |  |  | $2,000.00$ | $-2,000.00$ |
| $1,253.00$ | $5,519.00$ | 0.09 | $6,772.09$ | $50,000.00$ | $-43,227.91$ | $13.54 \%$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | Oct 16 | Nov 16 | Dec 16 | Jan 17 | Feb 17 | Mar 17 | Apr 17 | May 17 | Jun 17 | Jul '16-Jun 17 | Budget | \$ Over Budget | \% of Budget |


| $28,780.66$ | $33,926.21$ | $48,589.03$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$|  | $111,295.90$ | $475,122.00$ | $-363,826.10$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 444.30 | 518.82 | 391.80 | $1,354.92$ | $5,340.00$ | $-3,985.08$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 190.00 | 190.00 | 350.00 | $2,400.00$ | $-2,020.00$ |
|  |  | $1,441.00$ | $15.83 \%$ |  |  |
| 444.30 | 708.82 | $2,022.80$ | $1,441.00$ |  |  |


| $2,368.80$ | $2,723.57$ | $5,092.37$ | $27,000.00$ | $-21,907.63$ | $18.86 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2,368.80$ | $2,723.57$ | $5,092.37$ | $27,000.00$ | $-21,907.63$ | $18.86 \%$ |


| $10,000.00$ | $-10,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $10,000.00$ | $-10,000.00$ |


|  | 800.00 | -800.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 160.00 | -160.00 |  |
|  | 400.00 | -400.00 |
| $1,360.00$ | $-1,360.00$ |  |


| 26,800.67 | 26,800.67 | 26,800.67 | 80,402.01 | 321,608.00 | -241,205.99 | 25.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 57,877.58 | 57,877.58 | 57,877.58 | 173,632.74 | 694,531.00 | -520,898.26 | 25.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 40,000.00 | -40,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 50,000.00 | -50,000.00 |  |
| 84,678.25 | 84,678.25 | 84,678.25 | 254,034.75 | 1,106,139.00 | -852,104.25 | 22.97\% |


| 9:44 AM <br> 10/21/16 <br> Accrual Basis |  | Reve | nue \& | ntara pend July |  <br> ures <br> 16 thro | Sanit Budg ugh Ju | ary Di et Vs <br> 201 | strict Act | ual - | Sewe |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOT |  |  |
|  | Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | Oct 16 | Nov 16 | Dec 16 | Jan 17 | Feb 17 | Mar 17 | Apr 17 | May 17 | Jun 17 | Jul '16- Jun 17 | Budget | \$ Over Budget | \% of Budget |
| Total $6000 \cdot$ Operations | 86,375.55 | 93,274.87 | 89,424.71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 269,075.13 | 1,216,239.00 | -947,163.87 | 22.12\% |
| Total Expense | 115,156.21 | 127,201.08 | 138,013.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 380,371.03 | 1,691,361.00 | -1,310,989.97 | 22.49\% |
| Net Ordinary Income | -109,560.60 | $-119,192.66$ | $-133,351.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -362,104.27 | 581,365.00 | -943,469.27 | -62.29\% |
| Other Income/Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $7000 \cdot$ Capital Account Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $7100 \cdot$ Connection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7110 - Connection Fees (New Constr) |  | -433.57 | 79,040.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78,606.43 | 140,256.00 | -61,649.57 | 56.05\% |
| $7120 \cdot$ Connection Fees (Remodel) | 1,927.60 | 963.80 | 8,676.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11,567.40 | 50,000.00 | -38,432.60 | 23.14\% |
| Total $7100 \cdot$ Connection Fees | 1,927.60 | 530.23 | 87,716.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 90,173.83 | 190,256.00 | -100,082.17 | 47.4\% |
| 7200 - Interest Income - LAIF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,000.00 | -10,000.00 |  |
| 7700 - Interest, Employee Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 7000 - Capital Account Revenues | 1,927.60 | 530.23 | 87,716.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 90,173.83 | 200,256.00 | -110,082.17 | 45.03\% |
| Total Other Income | 1,927.60 | 530.23 | 87,716.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 90,173.83 | 200,256.00 | -110,082.17 | 45.03\% |
| Other Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8000 - Capital Improvement Program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8075 - Sewer | 6,845.00 | 13,941.91 | 328.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21,114.91 | 1,745,750.00 | -1,724,635.09 | 1.21\% |
| Total 8000 - Capital Improvement Program | 6,845.00 | 13,941.91 | 328.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21,114.91 | 1,745,750.00 | -1,724,635.09 | 1.21\% |
| 9000-Capital Account Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9125- PNC Equipment Lease Interest | 840.38 | 1,672.69 | 1,663.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,177.05 | 19,598.00 | -15,420.95 | 21.31\% |
| 9175 - Capital Assessment - SAM | 12,809.17 | 12,809.17 | 12,809.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 38,427.51 | 153,710.00 | -115,282.49 | 25.0\% |
| 9200 - -Bank Loan | 2,134.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,134.81 | 25,201.00 | -23,066.19 | 8.47\% |
| Total 9000 - Capital Account Expenses | 15,784.36 | 14,481.86 | 14,473.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44,739.37 | 198,509.00 | -153,769.63 | 22.54\% |
| Total Other Expense | 22,629.36 | 28,423.77 | 14,801.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65,854.28 | 1,944,259.00 | -1,878,404.72 | 3.39\% |
| Net Other Income | -20,701.76 | -27,893.54 | 72,914.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24,319.55 | -1,744,003.00 | 1,768,322.55 | -1.39\% |
| Net Income | -130,262.36 | -147,086.20 | -60,436.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -337,784.72 | -1,162,638.00 | 824,853.28 | 29.05\% |

Ordinary IncomelExpense Income

4220 - Cell Tower Lease
4330 - Engineering Review
4400 - Fees
4410 - Administrative Fee (New Constr)
4420 - Administrative Fee (Remodel)
$4430 \cdot$ Inspection Fee (New Constr)
4440 • Inspection Fee (Remodel)
Total 4400 - Fees
4610 - Property Tax Receipts
4740 . Testing, Backflow
4760 - Waste Collection Revenues
4810 - Water Sales, Domestic
4850 - Water Sales Refunds, Customer
4990 - Other Revenue

## Total Income

## Gross Profit

Expense
5000 - Administrative
5190 - Bank Fees
5200 - Board of Directors 5210 - Board Meetings 5220 - Director Fees 5230 - Election Expenses

Total 5200 - Board of Directors
5240 - CDPH Fees
5250 - Conference Attendance

## 270. Information Systems

5300 - Insurance
5310 - Fidelity Bond
5320 - Property \& Liability Insuranc
Total $5300 \cdot$ Insurance

Montara Water \& Sanitary Distric
Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water
July 2016 through June 2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | Oct 16 | Nov 16 | Dec 16 | Jan 17 | Feb 17 | Mar 17 | Apr 17 | May 17 | Jun 17 | Jul '16-Jun 17 | Budget | \$ Over Budget | \% of Budget |


| 2,857.29 | 2,857.29 | 2,857.29 | 8,571.87 | 33,500.00 | -24,928.13 | 25.59\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 974.00 |  | 974.00 | 4,500.00 | -3,526.00 | 21.64\% |
|  |  |  |  | 900.00 | -900.00 |  |
|  | 920.00 |  | 920.00 | 4,250.00 | -3,330.00 | 21.65\% |
|  |  |  |  | 800.00 | -800.00 |  |
| 148,457.14 | 1,894.00 |  | 1,894.00 | 10,450.00 | -8,556.00 | 18.12\% |
|  |  |  |  | 235,000.00 | -235,000.00 |  |
|  |  | 6,548.00 | 6,548.00 | 13,000.00 | -6,452.00 | 50.37\% |
|  | 150,557.73 | 181,904.17 | 480,919.04 | 1,800,000.00 | -1,319,080.96 | 26.72\% |
|  | -499.56 |  | -499.56 | -3,000.00 | 2,500.44 | 16.65\% |
|  | 152.50 | 1,350.54 | 1,503.04 |  |  |  |
| 151,314.43 | 154,961.96 | 192,660.00 | 498,936.39 | 2,088,950.00 | -1,590,013.61 | 23.89\% |
| 151,314.43 | 154,961.96 | 192,660.00 | 498,936.39 | 2,088,950.00 | -1,590,013.61 | 23.89\% |


| 1,256.24 | 502.91 | 804.66 | 2,563.81 | 10,000.00 | -7,436.19 | 25.64\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 166.99 | 125.00 | 291.99 | 3,000.00 | -2,708.01 | 9.73\% |
|  | 112.50 | 262.50 | 375.00 | 3,300.00 | -2,925.00 | 11.36\% |
|  |  | 819.67 | 819.67 | 4,000.00 | -3,180.33 | 20.49\% |
|  | 279.49 | 1,207.17 | 1,486.66 | 10,300.00 | -8,813.34 | 14.43\% |
|  |  |  |  | 15,500.00 | -15,500.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4,000.00 | -4,000.00 |  |
|  | 126.87 |  | 126.87 | 1,500.00 | $-1,373.13$ | 8.46\% |
|  |  |  |  | 500.00 | -500.00 |  |
|  |  |  | 1,918.46 | 2,700.00 | -781.54 | 71.05\% |
| $1,918.46$ |  |  | 1,918.46 | 3,200.00 | -1,281.54 | 59.95\% |

# Montara Water \& Sanitary Distric 

Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water
July 2016 through June 2017

## TOTAL

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | Oct 16 | Nov 16 | Dec 16 | Jan 17 | Feb 17 | Mar 17 | Apr 17 | May 17 | Jun 17 | Jul '16-Jun 17 | Budget | \$ Over Budget | \% of Budge |


| $5350 \cdot$ LAFCO Assessment |  |  |  |  | 2,500.00 | -2,500.00 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5400 - Legal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5420 - Meeting Attendance, Legal |  | 500.00 | 587.50 | 1,087.50 | 8,500.00 | -7,412.50 | 12.79\% |
| 5430 General Legal |  | 4,017.50 | 4,300.00 | 8,317.50 | 60,000.00 | -51,682.50 | 13.86\% |
| Total 5400. Legal |  | 4,517.50 | 4,887.50 | 9,405.00 | 68,500.00 | -59,095.00 | 13.73\% |
| 5510 - Maintenance, Office |  | 391.98 | 613.95 | 1,005.93 | 8,000.00 | -6,994.07 | 12.57\% |
| 5530 - Memberships |  | 255.00 |  | 255.00 | 18,000.00 | -17,745.00 | 1.42\% |
| 5540 - Office Supplies |  | 1,488.06 | 361.59 | 1,849.65 | 8,000.00 | -6,150.35 | 23.12\% |
| $5550 \cdot$ Postage |  | 570.00 | 318.17 | 888.17 | 6,000.00 | -5,111.83 | 14.8\% |
| $5560 \cdot$ Printing \& Publishing |  | 111.36 | 40.35 | 151.71 | 2,000.00 | -1,848.29 | 7.59\% |
| 5600 - Professional Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5610 \cdot$ Accounting |  |  | 1,900.00 | 1,900.00 | 30,000.00 | -28,100.00 | 6.33\% |
| 5620 - Audit |  |  | 2,800.00 | 2,800.00 | 20,500.00 | -17,700.00 | 13.66\% |
| 5630 - Consulting |  | 375.00 |  | 375.00 | 25,000.00 | -24,625.00 | 1.5\% |
| 5640 - Data Services |  |  | 3,586.49 | 3,586.49 |  |  |  |
| 5650 - Labor \& HR Support | 187.50 |  | 187.50 | 375.00 | 2,000.00 | -1,625.00 | 18.75\% |
| 5660 - Payroll Services | 73.95 | 74.94 | 75.94 | 224.83 | 850.00 | -625.17 | 26.45\% |
| Total $5600 \cdot$ Professional Services | 261.45 | 449.94 | 8,549.93 | 9,261.32 | 78,350.00 | -69,088.68 | 11.82\% |
| 5720 - Telephone \& Internet | 29.97 | 1,732.10 | 2,109.52 | 3,871.59 | 17,000.00 | -13,128.41 | 22.77\% |
| 5730 - Mileage Reimbursement |  | 45.05 | 96.74 | 141.79 | 2,000.00 | -1,858.21 | 7.09\% |
| 5740 - Reference Materials |  |  |  |  | 800.00 | -800.00 |  |
| 5790 - Other Adminstrative | 1,112.00 |  |  | 1,112.00 |  |  |  |
| 5800 - Labor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5810 - CaIPERS 457 Deferred Plan | 2,529.45 | 2,883.96 | 3,144.65 | 8,558.06 | 33,970.00 | -25,411.94 | 25.19\% |
| 5820 - Employee Benefits | 5,780.71 | 5,780.71 | 5,780.71 | 17,342.13 | 69,368.00 | -52,025.87 | 25.0\% |
| 5830 - Disability Insurance |  | 280.45 | 280.52 | 560.97 | 2,921.00 | -2,360.03 | 19.21\% |
| 5840 - Payroll Taxes | 3,131.43 | 3,208.58 | 2,941.70 | 9,281.71 | 40,574.00 | -31,292.29 | 22.88\% |
| 5850 - PARS | 2,052.14 | 2,315.19 | 2,617.77 | 6,985.10 | 27,005.00 | -20,019.90 | 25.87\% |
| 5900 - Wages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5910 - Management | 7,391.76 | 7,391.76 | 12,990.28 | 27,773.80 | 93,373.00 | -65,599.20 | 29.75\% |
| 5920 - Staff | 26,704.42 | 31,295.80 | 30,285.26 | 88,285.48 | 350,791.00 | -262,505.52 | 25.17\% |
| 5930 - Staff Certification | 750.00 | 750.00 | 750.00 | 2,250.00 | 9,000.00 | -6,750.00 | 25.0\% |
| 5940 - Staff Overtime | 4,082.98 | 4,020.68 | 3,049.19 | 11,152.85 | 52,353.00 | -41,200.15 | 21.3\% |
| 5950 - Staff Standby | 2,003.78 | 2,010.97 | 1,933.58 | 5,948.33 | 24,857.00 | -18,908.67 | 23.93\% |
| tal | 40,932.94 | 45,469. | 49,008.31 | 135,410.46 | 530,374.00 | 394,963.5 | 25.53 |

# Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water 

July 2016 through June 2017

5960 - Worker's Comp Insurance total 5800 - Labor

Total 5000 - Administrative

## 6000 . Operations

6160 - Backflow Prevention
6170 - Claims, Property Damage
6180 - Communications
$6185 \cdot$ SCADA Maintenance
6180 - Communications - Other
Total 6180 - Communications
$6195 \cdot$ Education \& Training
6200 - Engineering
$6210 \cdot$ Meeting Attendance, Engineering
6220. General Engineering

6230 . Water Quality Engineering
Total 6200 - Engineering
6320 - Equipment \& Tools, Expensed

## $330 \cdot$ Facilitie

6335 - Alarm Services
6337 - Landscaping
$6330 \cdot$ Facilities - Other
Total 6330 - Facilities
$6370 \cdot$ Lab Supplies \& Equipment 6400 - Pumping
$6410 \cdot$ Pumping Fuel \& Electricity
$6420 \cdot$ Pumping Maintenance, Generators
6430 - Pumping Maintenance, General
6440 - Pumping Equipment, Expensed
Total $6400 \cdot$ Pumping


6500 - Supply
6510 - Maintenance, Raw Water Mains

6,028.60

6520 - Maintenance, Wells
6530 . Water Purchases
Total 6500 - Supply
July 2016 through June 2017

| Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | $\text { Oct } 16$ | $\text { Nov } 16$ | Dec 16 | $\text { Jan } 17$ | $\text { Feb } 17$ | $\text { Mar } 17$ | $\text { Apr } 17$ | $\text { May } 17$ | $\text { Jun } 17$ | Jul '16-Jun 17 | TOTAL |  | \% of Budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Budget | \$ Over Budget |  |
| 89.73 |  | 3.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 93.22 | 10,000.00 | -9,906.78 | 0.93\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40,000.00 | -40,000.00 |  |
| 6,118.33 |  | 3.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,121.82 | 50,000.00 | $-43,878.18$ | 12.24\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,000.00 | -1,000.00 |  |
| 255.19 |  | 1,417.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,672.88 | 55,000.00 | -53,327.12 | 3.04\% |
|  |  | 108.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 108.35 | 25,000.00 | -24,891.65 | 0.43\% |
| 2.78349.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.78 | 1,000.00 | -997.22 | 0.28\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 349.24 | 10,000.00 | -9,650.76 | 3.49\% |
|  |  | 4,136.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,136.05 | 2,500.00 | 1,636.05 | 165.44\% |
| 607.21 |  | 5,662.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,269.30 | 94,500.00 | -88,230.70 | 6.63\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 388.92 |  | 2,950.54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,339.46 | 30,000.00 | -26,660.54 | 11.13\% |
|  |  | 69.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69.18 | 4,000.00 | -3,930.82 | 1.73\% |
|  | 1,043.42 | 473.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,517.36 | 30,000.00 | -28,482.64 | 5.06\% |
| 1,432.34 |  | 3,493.66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,926.00 | 64,000.00 | -59,074.00 | 7.7\% |
| 65.39 |  | 1,262.41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,327.80 | 9,000.00 | -7,672.20 | 14.75\% |
| 598.21 |  | 461.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,059.84 | 8,000.00 | -6,940.16 | 13.25\% |
|  |  | 9.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 113.10 | 1,000.00 | -886.90 | 11.31\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,000.00 | -5,000.00 |  |
|  | 702.27 | 470.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,172.94 | 14,000.00 | -12,827.06 | 8.38\% |
|  | 105.94 | 6,366.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,472.39 |  |  |  |
| 52.50 | 28,791.67 | 40,532.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69,376.35 | 475,750.00 | -406,373.65 | 14.58\% |
| 59,057.29 | 99,200.03 | 123,295.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 281,552.74 | 1,454,924.00 | -1,173,371.26 | 19.35\% |
| 92,257.14 | 55,761.93 | 69,364.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 217,383.65 | 634,026.00 | -416,642.35 | 34.29\% |

## Other Income/Expense

Other Income
$7000 \cdot$ Capital Account Revenues

$$
7100 \text { Connection Fees }
$$

7110 - Connection Fees (New Constr)

9:47 AM
10/21/16
Accrual Basis

7120 - Connection Fees (Remodel) 7130 - Conn. Fees, PFP (New Constr) Total $7100 \cdot$ Connection Fees

7600 - Bond Revenues, G.o. Total 7000 - Capital Account Revenues

Total Other Income
Other Expense
8000 - Capital Improvement Program
8075 . Sewer
8100 - Water
Total $8000 \cdot$ Capital Improvement Program

9000 - Capital Account Expenses
9075 - PFP Connection Expenses
9100 - Interest Expense - GO Bonds
9125 - PNC Equipment Lease Interest
9150 - SRF Loan
9210 - Conservation Program/Rebates
Total 9000 - Capital Account Expenses

Total Other Expense

Net Other Income

Net Income

Montara Water \& Sanitary Distric
Revenue \& Expenditures Budget vs. Actual - Water

$$
\text { July } 2016 \text { through June } 2017
$$

| July 2016 through June 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jul 16 | Aug 16 | Sep 16 | Oct 16 | Nov 16 | Dec 16 | Jan 17 | Feb 17 | Mar 17 | Apr 17 | May 17 | Jun 17 | Jul '16- Jun 17 | Budget | \$ Over Budget | \% of Budget |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,000.00 | -3,000.00 |  |
|  |  | 35,357.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35,357.00 | 65,000.00 | -29,643.00 | 54.4\% |
|  |  | 91,323.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91,323.00 | 196,000.00 | -104,677.00 | 46.59\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,150,436.00 | -1,150,436.00 |  |
|  |  | 91,323.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91,323.00 | 1,346,436.00 | -1,255,113.00 | 6.78\% |
|  |  | 91,323.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91,323.00 | 1,346,436.00 | -1,255,113.00 | 6.78\% |


| $11,722.12$ | $365,219.70$ | $376,941.82$ | $619,000.00$ | $-242,058.18$ | $60.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11,722.12$ | $365,219.70$ | $376,941.82$ | $619,000.00$ | $-242,058.18$ | $60.9 \%$ |


| 25,111.00 |  |  | 25,111.00 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 24,942.50 |  | 24,942.50 | 295,734.00 | -270,791.50 | 8.43\% |
| 840.37 | 1,672.69 | 1,663.98 | 4,177.04 | 19,598.00 | -15,420.96 | 21.31\% |
|  |  |  |  | 37,247.00 | -37,247.00 |  |
|  |  | 200.00 | 200.00 |  |  |  |
| 840.37 | 51,726.19 | 1,863.98 | 54,430.54 | 352,579.00 | -298,148.46 | 15.44\% |
| 840.37 | 63,448.31 | 367,083.68 | 431,372.36 | 971,579.00 | -540,206.64 | 44.4\% |
| -840.37 | -63,448.31 | -275,760.68 | -340,049.36 | 374,857.00 | -714,906.36 | -90.71\% |
| 91,416.77 | -7,686.38 | -206,396.10 | -122,665.71 | 1,008,883.00 | -1,131,548.71 | -12.16\% |



# MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA 

For Meeting Of: November 3, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: Clemens Heldmaier, General Manager


SUBJECT: SAM Flow Report for September 2016

The Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM) has prepared the following attached reports for the SAM Board of Directors and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board:

- Flow Report for September 2016.
- Collection System Monthly Overflow Report - September 2016.

The Average Daily Flow for Montara was 0.212 MGD in August 2016. There was no reportable overflow in September in the Montara System. SAM indicates there were 0.02 inches of rain in September 2016.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review and file.

Attachments

Attachment C
Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside
Monthly Collection System Activity/SSO Distribution Report, September 2016


Reportable SSOs


|  | Number of S.S.O.'s Mear/100 Miles |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | HMB | GCSD | MWSD | SAM |
| September 2016 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| nth Moving Total | 18.2 | 8.1 | 21.1 | 29.6 | 13.7 |
| Category 1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 |
| Category 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Category 3 | 17.2 | 8.1 | 21.1 | 25.9 | 13.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miles of Sewers | 104.5 | 37.0 | 33.2 | 27.0 | 7.3 |
|  |  | $35.4 \%$ | $31.8 \%$ | $25.8 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
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## MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA

For Meeting Of: November 3, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: Clemens Heldmaier, General Manager


SUBJECT: Review of Current Investment Portfolio

The District's Investment Policy and Guidelines requires that the Board review the status of the current investment portfolio. The following summarizes the status of these accounts:
$>$ The District has most of its idle sewer funds deposited in the State of California's Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF). The Monthly Average interest rate for February was 0.634 for September 2016.
> The District has one checking account with Wells Fargo Bank for Water and Sewer Funds that is largely backed by Federal securities.

## RECOMMENDATION:

District staff attempts to cash manage idle funds in LAIF as long as possible before transferring to the Wells Fargo checking accounts for disbursements.

## MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA

For Meeting Of: November 3, 2016

TO:


## SUBJECT: Connection Permit Applications Received

As of November 3, 2016 the following new Sewer Connection Permit applications were received since the last report:

| Date of <br> Application | Property <br> Owner | Site Address | Home <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

As of November 3, 2016 the following new Water (Private Fire Sprinkler) Connection Permit applications were received since the last report:

| Date of <br> Application | Property <br> Owner | Site Address | Home <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

As of November 3, 2016 the following new Water Connection Permit applications were received since the last report:

| Date of <br> App. | Property <br> Owner | Site Address | Home <br> Size | Type of <br> Connection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

RECOMMENDATION:
No action is required. This is for Board information only.


SUBJECT:

# MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA 

For Meeting Of: Novmber 3rd, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens Heldmaier, General Manager


Monthly Water Production Report
The attached two charts summarize the monthly water production for the District.
The first shows a consolidated from all sources by month. The second shows each water source the District uses, both wells and surface water. The production is shown in gallons of water produced.

## RECOMMENDATION:

No action is required. These reports are provided for the Board's information only.

Attachments: 2

## TOTAL PRODUCTION 2016 (Gallons)



MONTHLY WATER PRODUCTION 2016



SUBJECT:

# MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA 

For Meeting of: November 3rd, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens Heldmaier, General Manager
Rain Report
The attached chart shows the monthly rainfall at Alta Vista Treatment Plant for the current and prior water years along with seven-year average rain fall.

## RECOMMENDATION:

No action is required. These reports are provided for the Board's information only.

Attachments: 2

Monthly Rainfall Report Oct 2015 - Sept 2016


## Annual Cumulative Rainfall




SUBJECT: Monthly Solar Energy Report
The attached chart summarizes the monthly solar production at the Alta Vista Array. Since the installation of the solar panels the District produced 38412 kWh and saved 65316 lbs of CO2.

RECOMMENDATION:
No action is required. This information is provided for the Board's information only.

Attachments: 1

## SOLAR ENERGY PRODUCED IN 2016 (kWh)




SUBJECT:

## MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA

For Meeting Of: November 3, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens Heldmaier, General Manager Monthly Public Agency Retirement Service Report for August 2016.

The District has received the monthly PARS report for August 2016.

Contributions are calculated on a bi-weekly basis, and contributions are made on a monthly basis.

The following monthly reports are submitted as consent agenda items on a monthly basis.

RECOMMENDATION:
This is for Board information only.
Attachment

MONTARA WATER \& SANITARY DISCTRICT

## Monthly Account Report for the Period <br> 8/1/2016 to 8/31/2016

PARS REP Program
Clemens Heldmaier
General Manager
Montara Water \& Sanitary Disctrict
8888 Cabrillo Highway
Montara, CA 94037

| Source | Account Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Beginning Balance as of 8/1/2016 | Contributions | Earnings | Expenses | Distributions | Transfers | Ending Balance as of 8/31/2016 |
| Employer Contribution | \$406,935.21 | \$7,123.69 | \$1,222.33 | \$186.27 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$415,094.96 |
| Totals | \$406,935.21 | \$7,123.69 | \$1,222.33 | \$186.27 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$415,094.96 |

## Investment Selection

Capital Appreciation Index PLUS

## Investment Objective

The primary goal of the Capital Appreciation objective is growth of principal. The major portion of the assets are invested in equity securities and market fluctuations are expected.

Investment Return

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annualized Return |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Month | 3-Months | 1-Year | 3-Years | 5-Years | 10-Years | Plan's Inception Date |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0.30 \%$ | $3.84 \%$ | - | - | - | - | 3/8/2016 |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
## MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT RETIREMENT ENHANCEMENT PLAN

Statement of Plan Account
for the Period 8/01/2016 to 8/31/2016

PLAN ID: P7-REP15A

CLEMENS HELDMAIER
GENERAL MANAGER
MONTARA WATER \& SANITARY DISTRICT
PO BOX 370131
MONTARA, CA 94037

VALUATION FOR THE MONTH ENDING 8/31/2016
CURRENT
PERIOD

IMPORTANT INFORMATION
Zontributions are applied to your plan account based upon the data received Erom your agency by our office, and confirmed by actual deposits made to the PARS Trust based upon reports we receive from US Bank, The PARS Trustee. Zontributions will be listed on this statement only if these deposits were received in the PARS Trust during the valuation month for which this statement zovers.
[t is not the responsibility of PARS to monitor the timeliness of your agency's olan contributions. If there exists any discrepancies between the data received from your agency and the actual deposits made into the PARS Trust, we vill attempt to reconcile those discrepancies prior to the monthly valuation of the plan. In certain cases there may be a need to delay the monthly raluation of the plan in order to further investigate those discrepancies, vhich may involve contacting your agency for more information. If there are naterial discrepancies your agency will be notified as soon as possible. ?lease contact Michael Hambel at mhambel@pars.org or (800)540-6369 x125 if you have any questions.
?ARS is not licensed to provide and does not offer tax, accounting, legal or actuarial advice.

August 2016 PARS Statement

## Detail Information

PARS Beginning Balance as of August 1, 2016

## Contributions:

| July 15, 2016 Calculation |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Wages | $\$ 25,710.73$ |
| Employer $-6.5 \%$ | $\$ 1,671.20$ |
| Employee $-8.25 \%$ | $\$ 2,121.14$ |
| Contributions Subtotal |  |
|  |  |
| July 31, 2016 Calculation | $\$ 22,585.47$ |
| Wages | $\$ 1,468.06$ |
| Employer $-6.5 \%$ | $\$ 1,863.30$ |
| Employee $-8.25 \%$ |  |
| Contributions Subtotal |  |
| Rounding |  |
| Total Contributions thru July |  |

## Earnings

Expenses
PARS Ending Balance as of August 31, 2016
\$ 406,935.21

|  |  | Fund Impact - PARS Wages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sewer \$ 8,584.29 $\$ 857.98$ | Water $\begin{array}{r} \$ 17,126.45 \\ \$ \quad 1,113.22 \end{array}$ | Total $\begin{aligned} & \$ 25,710.73 \\ & \$ 1,671.20 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sewer } \\ & \$ 8,139.90 \\ & \$ \quad 529.09 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Water $\begin{array}{r} \$ 14,445.58 \\ \$ \quad 938.96 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total $\begin{array}{r} \$ 22,585.47 \\ \$ \quad 1,468.06 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| \$ | 3,331.36 |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |
| \$ | 7,123.69 |  |  |  |
|  | \$1,222.33 |  |  |  |
| \$ | (186.27) |  |  |  |
| \$ 415,094.96 |  |  |  |  |



MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA

For Meeting Of: November 3, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens Heldmaier, General Manager


| SUBJECT: | Review and Possible Action Concerning Alta <br> Vista Road Improvements. |
| :--- | :--- |

This item was first presented at the September 1, 2016 meeting. The Board of Directors asked legal counsel to prepare an agreement for the below described engagement with the AV neighborhood association.

Under Jim Sayre's leadership, the bordering property owners propose to improve the road to acceptable standards. The owners' contractor has received a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) for the work. A condition of the CDP is that the owners establish a homeowners association to maintain the road in the future. Mr . Sayre is spearheading formation of the homeowners association.

The AV Road improvement project will be a private project funded by the bordering owners. In that regard, the CDP acknowledges that the road is a private road. (Historically, the County has never maintained the road.) The proposed improvements include widening and paving the surface, adding turnouts to increase emergency access, and installing drainage features. MWSD is an incidental beneficiary of the improvements because they will substantially improve access to the AV site and vicinity.

District staff and Director Huber have been in contact with Mr. Sayre throughout the planning process. The estimated total project cost is over \$180,000. At this time the AV neighborhood is asking the District to indicate that it would participate financially with one-time contribution of \$40,000 payable after completion of the project. The payment would equate to the value received by the District in the form of the improved access to the AV site and elimination of the periodic and uncertain costs of maintenance historically undertaken by the District.

RECOMMENDATION: Review the draft agreement, adopt Resolution next in order authorizing execution of agreement at appropriate time.

Attachments

# RECORDING REQUESTED BY, AND WHEN RECORDED, MAIL TO: 

Montara Water and Sanitary District
c/o David E. Schricker, Attorney
Law Offices of David E. Schricker, P.C.
563 S. Murphy Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
$\overline{\text { SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE }}$

EXEMPT FROM RECORDING FEES
PURSUANT TO GOV. CODE SEC. 6103

## AGREEMENT

for

## IMPROVED PROPERTY ACCESS FUNDING

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into as of October $\qquad$ 2016, by and between the MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT, a public agency located in the County of San Mateo, California ("District") and the ALTA VISTA ROAD PROPERTY OWNERS, an unincorporated non-profit association ("Association").

## RECITALS

WHEREAS, Association is comprised of the owners of real property bordering Alta Vista Road more particularly described in Exhibit "A," attached hereto and incorporated herein ("AV Road"); and

WHEREAS, the members of Association are listed in Exhibit " $B$," attached hereto and incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, AV Road is a private roadway, so designated by the County of San Mateo; and

WHEREAS, AV Road is a steep narrow dirt road that perennially experiences drainage and erosion problems that make vehicular passage difficult and dangerous, particularly during the wet weather season; and

WHEREAS, AV Road has been maintained to varying degrees by the abutting property owners, District's corporate predecessors and District, but has remained in substandard condition for many years; and

WHEREAS, District owns and operates two (2) water storage tanks, a water production well and a surface water treatment plant at its Alta Vista site ("AV Site") located in the vicinity of AV Road by which vehicular access to the AV Site is provided; and

WHEREAS, Association proposes to improve AV Road to safety engineered roadway standards ("Improvements") as set forth in those certain plans entitled, "Alta Vista Road - Roadway Improvements," prepared by Clifford Bechtel and Associates, Inc. ("Improvement Plans"), a copy of which is attached to that certain Coastal Development Permit dated July 27, 2016 entitled, "Coastal Development Permit for the asphalt paving of Alta Vista Road and installation turnouts [sic] and drainage features as necessary." issued to Association's general contractor by the County of San Mateo, California ("CD Permit"), a copy of which is on file in District's Administrative Offices, to which copy reference is hereby made for the full particulars thereof and incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, District will benefit from the Improvements because its access to the AV Site will be significantly improved, particularly with regard to passage of heavy vehicles transporting equipment, materials and supplies; and

WHEREAS, District has determined that the value of the benefit is equal to the amount hereinafter provided;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

## 1. Construction of Improvements; Notification of Completion.

Association hereby represents to, and assures, District that Association has entered into an agreement with a duly licensed general contractor for construction of the Improvements in accordance with the Improvement Plans. Upon completion of construction of the Improvements Association shall notify District in writing thereof. Upon such notification District shall inspect the Improvements and determine if they have been constructed to District's satisfaction in substantial conformance with the Improvement Plans, accompanying specifications and the CD Permit (collectively, "Improvement

Documents"). If District determines that they have not been so constructed, the parties shall confer regarding measures necessary to complete the construction and Association shall thereupon cause to be accomplished such changes, additions, or other work necessary to complete construction in accordance with the Improvement Documents.
2. Payment. Upon determination by District's General Manager that the Improvements have been constructed in substantial conformance with the Improvement Documents, District shall pay Association Forty Thousand and No One Hundredths Dollars $(\$ 40,000.00)$ by check issued to Association's Agent (hereinafter identified), said sum representing the value to District of its improved access to the AV Site established by the Improvements.
3. Maintenance. Association represents and acknowledges that its members collectively have agreed to and assumed certain obligations for maintenance, repair and replacement of AV Road and appurtenances thereto or portions thereof as set forth in the CD Permit and permits and documents referenced therein. Association agrees that District has no obligation, and shall not have any obligation whatsoever, to maintain, repair or replace AV Road and appurtenances thereto or any portion thereof either under this Agreement or otherwise. Notwithstanding the foregoing, District shall be responsible for repairing any damage to AV Road after construction of the Improvements and maintained by Association that is caused by District's passage of its heavy vehicles or equipment over and across AV Road operated in a negligent or intentionally destructive manner or that have unusual weight or characteristics that are beyond the engineered design of the Improvements.
4. Unobstructed Access. Association and its members jointly and severally agree that District does and shall have unobstructed vehicular and pedestrian access over and across AV Road to the AV Site and environs. Association shall take no action, activity, conduct or behavior in derogation of District's aforesaid right.
5. Non-assignability. Neither party shall subcontract, assign, sell, mortgage, hypothecate or otherwise transfer this agreement or its or their interests or obligations in this Agreement in any manner, without the express
prior written consent of the other party, which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld.
6. Status. Association is an independent contractor and Association, its officers, employees, agents and members shall not be deemed to be officers, employees, agents or representatives of District in the performance of Association's duties and obligations hereunder. District's payment hereunder is limited to, and solely represents, acquisition of the benefits conferred by the Improvements upon District's access to the AV Site and District has no membership or other interest, express or implied, in Association.
7. Joint and Several Liability. Association and its individual members shall be, and are, jointly and severally liable for Association's performance and obligations hereunder.
8. Association's Agent. James Sayre, signatory hereto, represents and warrants that he is the duly appointed agent and representative of Association, fully authorized to sign this Agreement for and on behalf of Association.
9. Notices. Notices required or convenient for performance hereunder shall be written, unless otherwise specified in writing, and shall be delivered personally, deposited with the United States Postal Service, first-class postage prepaid in an envelope addressed as follows, or by facsimile as follows:

To District: General Manager
Montara Water and Sanitary District
8888 Cabrillo Highway
P.O. Box 370131

Montara, CA 94037
By facsimile: (650) 728-8556

To Association: James Sayre, Agent
Alta Vista Road Property Owners Association
P.O. Box 370635

Montara, CA 94037
By facsimile:
10. Hold Harmless; Indemnification. Association shall defend, hold harmless and indemnify District, its governing board, officers, employees, agents
and consultants from any and all claims, lawsuits, causes of action and liability of any nature or kind for injuries to persons or damage to property arising from the acts or omissions of Association, its governing body, officers, employees, agents, contractors or consultants in the performance or failure to perform any of its or their obligations, express or implied, under this Agreement. The duty to indemnify shall include the duty to defend as set forth in Civil Code Section 2778.
11. Insurance. Association hereby warrants and guarantees to District that it has taken out and maintained, or has required its general contractor and such other parties with whom or with which it has contracted or otherwise engaged to perform work or services for the construction of the Improvements, to take out and maintain, insurance coverage for general liability, Workers' Compensation, vehicular and such other coverage as may be appropriate for the risks involved in such construction and in amounts corresponding to such risks.
12. Successors. This Agreement and the duties and obligations hereunder shall be binding upon, and the benefits hereof shall accrue to, the successors and assigns of Association and District, respectively.
13. Entire Agreement; Waivers. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties pertaining to its subject matter and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous agreements, representations and understandings of the parties. No waiver of any of the provisions of this agreement shall be implied, nor shall an express waiver of one provision be deemed to constitute a waiver of any other provision, irrespective of the similarities of such provisions; nor shall a single waiver of one provision constitute a continuing waiver thereof. No waiver shall be binding unless acknowledged in writing by the party making the waiver.
14. Amendments. This agreement may be amended, modified, or supplemented by subsequent agreement of the parties approved and executed in the same manner as this agreement.
15. Paragraph Headings. Paragraph headings herein are for convenience of reference, only, and shall not be deemed to affect the meaning or interpretation of the paragraphs headed thereby.
16. Attorney's Fees. If any action is brought by either of the parties hereto arising out of the performance or failure to perform any of their respective
obligations or to determine their rights, the prevailing party shall be entitled to and recover, in addition to costs of suit, its or their reasonable attorneys fees.
17. Governing Law. The performance of the parties hereunder and the interpretation of the terms and conditions hereof shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties have signed this Agreement as of the date first hereinabove written.

MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY
DISTRICT, a public agency located in the County of San Mateo, California (District)

By $\qquad$
President

Countersigned: $\qquad$
Secretary

ALTA VISTA ROAD PROPERTY
OWNERS, an unincorporated non-profit association ("Association")

By $\qquad$
Agent

CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF NOTARY PUBLIC
A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California )
County of San Mateo )
On $\qquad$ 20 $\qquad$
before me $\qquad$ , Notary Public, personally appeared $\qquad$
who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

## Exhibit A

## Alta Vista Road

That portion of the 30 -foot wide roadway shown as Alta Vista Road, bounded by its intersection with Linda Vista Road and its intersection with the southerly end of Reservoir Road, as said roads are shown on the map of "Second Addition to Montara" filed in Volume 6 of Maps at Page 28 in Records of the County of San Mateo, State of California.

# Members, Alta Vista Road Property Owners Association 

Robert and Janet Resch 860 Alta Vista Road Montara, California<br>Gary and Nancy Bertolini 820 Alta Vista Road<br>Montara, California<br>James and Lucia Sayre 810 Alta Vista Road Montara, California<br>Jordan and Leanne Langer 815 Alta Vista Rd.<br>Montara, California<br>Stella Kwak Johnson<br>957 Vallecitos Road<br>Montara, California<br>Peter Rudisill<br>Robin Best<br>770 Alta Vista Road Montara, California<br>Charles Westbrook 775 Alta Vista Road Montara, California.<br>Robin Lloyd 732 Alta Vista Road Montara, California



# MONTARA WATER AND SANITARY DISTRICT AGENDA 

For Meeting Of: November 3, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Clemens Heldmaier, General Manager

## SUBJECT: Review and Possible Action Concerning Unveiling of OpenGovernment Online Platform.

In an effort to continue the Districts history of transparency with its rate payers, the District has decided to join the 1,200 plus public agencies in utilizing the services of OpenGov. OpenGov's premise is tondrive operational excellence and build luckily trust through the development of a platform that powers the budget process, drives accurate management reporting across the organization, and informs elected officials and citizens with open data.

Since engaging the services of OpenGov, District staff has begun the process of uploading historical data as well as current fiscal year data in order to further access accurate financial and performance data. Peter Medina with Maze \& Associates will provide a presentation of the District's custom platform developed by OpenGov.

## RECOMMENDATION:

This is for Board Information only.


SUBJECT: Receive Update on Diversion Structure Improvements.

We are pleased to announce the completion of the announced access improvements at the Districts surface water diversion line. Despite encountering a few environmental obstacles (bees, rain, and dusky footed woodrat) District staff was able to assist with the staging, and installation of the walkways and stair case keeping the project within budget. Due to the before mentioned wildlife encounters a bio-monitor was required as a term of the contract, however those costs were able to be significantly augmented by District staff. Before the project began, an in house training provided by GGNRA allowed for a member of staff to become deputized and bio-monitor for portions of the project.

Although the bee hive was directly in our working zone, we completed the project without having to relocate or kill any bees. The direction received from GGNRA was to hire an exterminator. However, we received some community input from local bee keepers that was very helpful information so as to not upset the hive.

## RECOMMENDATION:

For Board information only.




[^0]:    Information as provided by US Bank, Trustee for PARS; Not FDIC Insured; No Bank Guarantee; May Lose Value
    Past performance does not guarantee future results. Performance returns may not reflect the deduction of applicable fees, which could reduce returns. Information is deemed reliable but may be subject to change.
    Investment Return: Annualized rate of return is the return on an investment over a period other than one year multiplied or divided to give a comparable one-year return.
    Account balances are inclusive of Trust Administration (unless invoiced), Trustee and Investment Management fees

