



PO Box 915
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
775-586-1610 ext 21

BOARD MEETING AGENDA

January 16, 2014

**10:00 AM
(estimated duration 2 hours)**

**The Parasol
Meiling Room
948 Incline Way
Incline Village, Nevada
Call in information: 712-432-0360, code 341249#**

Agenda Items	<u>Page #</u>
1. Call to Order	
2. Supervisor Roll Call	
3. Approval of the Agenda: This is the tentative schedule for the meeting. The Board reserves the right to take items in a different order to accomplish business in the most efficient manner. The Board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration. The Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay the discussion relating to an item on the agenda at anytime.	
4. Public Interest Comments (No Action)	
5. For Possible Action: Review and Approval of Letter of Support for the Farm Bill.	1 - 2

Posted: Nevada Tahoe Conservation District Administrative Office, Douglas County Clerk, Washoe County Clerk, NV Division of Conservation Districts.

Members of the public who are disabled and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting are requested to telephone the NTCD Administrative Office at (775) 586-1610 x21 three days prior to the Board meeting. Please contact Mark Thorpe at PO Box 915, Zephyr Cove, NV 89448; or email mthorpe@ntcd.org; or phone 775-586-1610 #21 to obtain supporting material for the agenda. Supporting material may also be found at <http://ntcd.org/html/board.php>

CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar consists of items 5 and 6 below. Items appearing on the Consent Calendar are items that can be adopted with one motion unless pulled by a Supervisor or a member of the public. Members of the public who wish to have a consent item placed on the Administrative Agenda shall make that request during the public comment section at the beginning of the meeting and specifically state why they are making the request. When items are pulled for discussion, they will be automatically placed at the beginning of the Administrative Agenda or may be continued until another meeting.

Motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

- | | <u>Page #</u> |
|---|---------------|
| 6. Agency Reports, Discussion/Possible Action | |
| a. For Possible Action: NRCS report | |
| b. For Possible Action: NACD report. | |
| c. For Possible Action: Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Conservation District Program report. | |
| d. For Possible Action: NvACD report. | |
| e. For Possible Action: Staff report. | |
|
 | |
| 7. Discussion/Possible Action (Business) | |
| a. For Possible Action: Approval of the Board of Supervisors meeting minutes for December 19, 2013. | 3 - 6 |
| b. For Possible Action: Summary of Staff responses to the Conservation District Evaluation Guide. | 7 - 10 |

Posted: Nevada Tahoe Conservation District Administrative Office, Douglas County Clerk, Washoe County Clerk, NV Division of Conservation Districts.

Members of the public who are disabled and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting are requested to telephone the NTCD Administrative Office at (775) 586-1610 x21 three days prior to the Board meeting. Please contact Mark Thorpe at PO Box 915, Zephyr Cove, NV 89448; or email mthorpe@ntcd.org; or phone 775-586-1610 #21 to obtain supporting material for the agenda. Supporting material may also be found at <http://ntcd.org/html/board.php>

ADMINISTRATIVE CALENDAR

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS PULLED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION:

Item(s) pulled from the Consent Calendar will be heard at this time.

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| | <u>Page #</u> |
| 8. For Possible Action: Approval of Agreements with NDSL (Nevada Division of State Lands), NDEP (Nevada Division of Environmental Protection), and NDOT (Nevada Department of Transportation) for the Incline Village Green Streets project. | 11 - 12 |
| 9. For Possible Action: Update regarding the dispute with Contractor on the Glenbrook Creek Restoration project. | |
| 10. For Possible Action: Approval of the NTCD financial reports for December 2013. Details will be provided at the Board meeting. | |
| 11. Supervisor's Comments | |
| 12. Public Interest Comments | |
| 13. Motion to Adjourn | |

Posted: Nevada Tahoe Conservation District Administrative Office, Douglas County Clerk, Washoe County Clerk, NV Division of Conservation Districts.

Members of the public who are disabled and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting are requested to telephone the NTCD Administrative Office at (775) 586-1610 x21 three days prior to the Board meeting. Please contact Mark Thorpe at PO Box 915, Zephyr Cove, NV 89448; or email mthorpe@ntcd.org; or phone 775-586-1610 #21 to obtain supporting material for the agenda. Supporting material may also be found at <http://ntcd.org/html/board.php>

December 9, 2013

2013 The Honorable Debbie Stabenow,
Chairwoman
Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Nutrition and Forestry
328A Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC, 20510

The Honorable Frank D. Lucas,
Chairman
House Committee on Agriculture
1301 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC, 20515

The Honorable Jeff Denham,
Committee Member

The Honorable Gloria Negrete McLeod,
Committee Member

The Honorable Ed Royce,
Committee Member

The Honorable Jim Costa
Committee Member

The Honorable Harry Reid
Senate Majority Leader

The Honorable Dean Heller
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural
Resources

The Honorable Mark Amodei
House Committee on Natural Resources

The Honorable Steven Horsford
House Committee on Natural Resources

Dear Farm Bill Conferee,

As the House and Senate continue their conferencing of the 2013 Farm Bill, the undersigned groups, representing locally led conservation across the states of Nevada and California, urge you to work together to quickly pass this legislation. Our nation's farmers and landowners deserve to have long-term certainty to effectively and efficiently manage their land, resources and businesses for the years ahead. Not only do Farm Bill Conservation programs play a key role in supporting clean air, clean water and productive soils, they also help producers avoid unnecessary regulation, and support our nation's long-term economic and food security.

We support efforts in the Farm Bill to help protect grasslands, wetlands, healthy soil and clean water by re-coupling basic soil and water conservation compliance measures to premium subsidies for crop insurance. This measure ensures that conservation compliance provisions continue to cover all income support, including eligibility for crop and revenue insurance

premium subsidies. We also encourage you to provide incentives to actually lower the cost of crop insurance to producers who use conservation practices the Secretary determines to provide resilience to weather events. We believe such an incentive would lead to increased adoption of conservation and result in savings to the Treasury as fewer claims would have to be paid out.

Finally, we urge you to ensure a strong commitment to Technical Assistance funding in the Conservation Title of the Farm Bill. Technical Assistance funds are critical to effective implementation of conservation programs.

We thank you for your efforts to complete the 2013 Farm Bill, and we strongly urge you to support these provisions. Doing so will help to ensure long term farm productivity by protecting our nation's vital natural resources.

Signed:

Placer County Resource Conservation District

251 Auburn Ravine, Suite 107

Auburn, CA 95603-3719

California Nevada Chapter Soil and Water Conservation Society

1907 N. Gateway Blvd. Suite 101

Fresno, CA 93727



Po Box 915
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448
775-586-1610 x21

NTCD Board Minutes
December 19, 2013
The Douglas County Library, Board Room
233 Warrior Way, Zephyr Cove, NV
10:00 AM Start Time

Present:

Supervisor Smith
Supervisor Perlman-Whyman (via telephone)
Supervisor Sarnoff
Supervisor McCarthy
Supervisor Endicott
Supervisor Penzel

Staff/Others

D. Martin, District Manager
M. Thorpe, Administrator
W. Loftis, NRCS
J. Locurto, CDP (via telephone)
R. Roy, SWCS (via telephone)

Absent:

Supervisor Freeman and Supervisor Berkbigler

1. Call to Order by Chair Smith.
2. Supervisor Roll Call: see above
3. Approval of the Agenda: Supervisor Sarnoff moved to approve the Agenda, seconded by Supervisor Endicott, motion carried unanimously.
4. Public Interests Comments: Rob Roy of SWCS reported the tour given at the conference this past summer was a great addition to the conference. He is looking for support of the Farm Bill, especially three points of interest: Approve Farm Bill ASAP; conservation compliance for federal subsidies of crop insurance regarding wetlands; and a strong commitment to conservation technical assistance funding, instead of a user fee. At the next Board meeting there will be an agenda item (if needed), for approval of support of these three points and the Farm Bill. Supervisor Perlman-Whyman stated NACD is also in support of these points and the Farm Bill. Supervisors Perlman-Whyman and McCarthy recommended adding the NV delegation of Reid, Heller, Horsford, and Amodei to the letter of support.

5. For Possible Action: Discussion/Possible Action regarding the dispute with Contractor on the Glenbrook Creek Restoration project. District Manager Martin handed out a copy of a letter mailed to Campbell Construction on December 18, stating the District does not agree with Campbell's request for additional payment. The dispute was reviewed by the District's attorney and a Washoe County engineer, and both agree the District has a strong case. The dispute could go to dispute resolution, which can be expensive and a potential cost to the District's general fund. No Board action will be taken until the contractor responds to the letter.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Items 6a, 6c, and 7b were pulled from the consent calendar for further discussion.

Supervisor McCarthy moved to approve the Consent Calendar (items 6b, 6d, 6e, and 7a with all other items pulled), seconded by Supervisor Sarnoff, motion carried unanimously.

6. Agency Reports, Discussion/Possible Action
 - a. Moved to Administrative calendar.
 - b. For Possible Action: NACD report. No report provided.
 - c. Moved to Administrative calendar.
 - d. For Possible Action: NvACD report. No report provided.
 - e. For Possible Action: Staff report. No report provided.
7. Discussion/Possible Action (Business)
 - a. For Possible Action: Approval of the Board of Supervisors meeting minutes for November 21, 2013.
 - d. Moved to Administrative calendar.

ADMINISTRATIVE CALENDAR

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS PULLED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

Item 6a) For Possible Action: NRCS report. W. Loftis of NRCS reported his office has moved to a smaller office. Projects tied to SNPLMA funding are wrapping up. They should be completed by the summer of 2014. The first measurement for snow survey is February 1, 2014. Supervisor McCarthy reported LTRA2 received sponsorship from the Nevada delegation, but not California's delegation. There is a slim chance LTRA2 goes forward. There is no mechanism for funding, or a prospect for funding.

Item 6c) For Possible Action: Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Conservation District Program (CDP) report. J. Locurto of CDP reported, in addition to the Supervisor handbooks, there is training available for Supervisors. CDP is still working on the sage grouse initiative. CDP is interviewing for the Ely conservation specialist, this position should be filled by February 1, 2014. Supervisor Perlman-Whyman would like each Board member to complete the Conservation District Evaluation Guide, and go over the results at the next Board meeting.

Item 7b) For Possible Action: Approval of the NTCD financial reports for November 2013. As of 11/30/13, the District's Fund balance was \$88,300. This represents the District's available spendable resources, or assets less liabilities. November had a deficit of \$4,448. November's deficit was due to: 5.5 weeks of unbillable time (vacations, three holidays, and grant writing), NvACD meeting expenses, NACD annual dues, and a new computer purchase (all expenses were budgeted). Administrator Thorpe stated A/R is kind of ugly, but everything past due is being processed for payment; and A/R should be in good shape by the end of December. Supervisor Endicott moved to approve the November 2013 financial reports, seconded by Supervisor McCarthy, motion carried unanimously.

8. For Possible Action: Approval of Agreement with NHC for SLRP 2 project. NHC was an excellent partner during Phase 1; therefore the District would like to use NHC for Phase 2. Supervisor Sarnoff moved to approve the agreement, seconded by Supervisor Endicott, motion carried unanimously.
9. For Possible Action: Conservation District Evaluation Guide. There was much discussion regarding the usefulness of the guide. Other items of discussion: some questions are difficult to answer; the guide may be more useful to smaller districts; even though we have a staff, the Board should be involved with outreach and have some responsibilities, the Tahoe Partnership was an example of how the Board can help; and the District has limited resources to perform outreach activities. It was recommended the District Manager collect the Staff's responses to the Guide, and report the findings at the next Board meeting.
10. Supervisor Comments: Supervisor McCarthy reported she still is the Executive Director at the Tahoe Science Consortium, but has cut her time by 50%. And she recently was appointed the Director of the Academy for the Environment at UNR, which will be primarily Great Basin related. There might be some opportunities for the District to partner with other organizations in the Great Basin.

11. Public Interest Comments: District Manager Martin handed out information, and possible grant opportunities, on “Quantifying the Potential for a low-cost, Distributed Stormwater Detention System using LIDAR and remotely sensed data” and “Green Infrastructure Technical Assistance Program 2014 Request for Letters of Intent”. Administrator Thorpe reported he has been working on new personnel policies for the District with the help of POOL/PACT. The new policies will be on the next Board meeting agenda for approval. Also, because the Affordable Care Act does not allow smaller organizations (like the District) to pool together for health insurance rate purposes, the District renewed its health insurance policy with Saint Marys until November 30, 2014, for a small increase of less than 1% in premiums. This allows the District more time to evaluate its health insurance options, which will be very different and expensive in 2014.
12. Motion to Adjourn: Supervisor Penzel moved to adjourn, seconded by Supervisor Endicott, motion carried unanimously.



PO Box 915
400 Dorla Court
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
Phone (775) 586-1610
Fax (775) 586-1612

Memorandum

January 9, 2014

To: NTCD Board
From: Doug Martin, District Manager
Subject: Summary of Issues, Conservation District Evaluation Guide

At the request of the Chair of the NTCD Board, the following is a summary of issues and potential areas of support regarding district operations and efforts. Attached to this is an evaluation guide as prepared by the District Manager. This memorandum addresses the three areas outlined in the evaluation guide.

- 1) Planning for service is an important and key component of the operations of the district. Especially in the areas of supporting our partners with key services which in turn is imperative to securing grant funding to support the district.
 - a. As specified in the evaluation guide the district has high ratings in the areas of coordination with agencies and key groups, planning and range of resources to meet needs as identified by partners.
 - i. The district meets regularly with the those parties involved with erosion and sedimentation issues including Washoe and Douglas Counties, the State of Nevada, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Divisions of Environmental Protect and State Lands, as well as basin coordination groups such as the Stormwater Quality Improvement Committee and TRPA.
 - ii. The District has developed resources that are key to meeting and maintaining important components of TMDL and Stream Restoration Projects that are needed by the multiple jurisdictions and having this pool is more efficient and cost effective to these jurisdictions. This is demonstrated in the district's workloads that are funded by multiple agencies such as the Burke/Rabe Complex project funded jointly by NDOT, Douglas County and USFS EC funds as well as the Sediment Load Reduction Project funded through the collective pool of NDOT, Washoe and Douglas Counties, US EPA, NDEP, NDSL and the USFS EC funds.
 - iii. The resource needs of the basin are calculated by a combination of TRPA planning documents as well as the TMDL studies. These efforts have identified that stormwater management is the key to Tahoe clarity. These issues have mandatory compliance provisions which mean that they are fundable and thus staffing at the district focuses on these issues. As to other resource needs, there are many, but the efforts of the districts in these areas are limited as other groups are involved in these efforts and little or no grant funds are available or potentially available unless the district is prepared to compete against a partner. An example is the program supporting fire defensible space assistance, this is managed by

- local fire protection districts and NTCD involvement would not be as effective as the local resource already in place
- b. Lower ratings are given in the area of outreach and communication in a general sense.
 - i. The District had a program funded 6 years ago called the Nevada Tahoe Partnership which was funded by a congressional earmark. This project allowed the district to meet regularly with representatives of the communities, prepare newsletters, attend outreach meetings and hold semi-annual events regarding issues as identified by the local participants. This project served an important need; yet without funding and staffing the District Operations staff can not support this activity. High marks in exposure were obtained by this project but low output of new grants was generated as a result of the project. The possibility of congressional earmarks to support this type of project is unlikely.
 - ii. The District conducts targeted outreach when it is support by our grant work. The current Community Watershed Project has several outreach activities included development of web pages to inform the public of the development of key components of the project. Also the TYC project is heavily geared to having outreach in regard to planting and propagation of TYC.
 - 2) Organizing for service is conducted at a staff level and is communicated to the board in the form of proposed grants, and grants obtained.
 - a. The mission of the district is focused on the need of the communities in relation to erosion and sediment management and the staffing at the district includes several hydrologists, specialized modelers and GIS technical staff and a professional engineer with expertise in stormwater, project management and stream restoration.
 - b. A formal system of evaluation and merit performance is used to track staff.
 - c. Staff has excellent knowledge of the rules and legislation associated with erosion and sediment management.
 - d. Board members are not provided training or job descriptions, but a new program has been developed by the State Conservation Coordination Program.
 - 3) Measuring service is in large part maintained through continuation of grants coming to the district. In that area the district is doing an excellent job in retention of work. With the reduction of funding at a level approaching 50% over the past 4 years, the district has had only a 25% reduction in grant funds for staffing and was status quo over the past year.
 - a. Measuring is also completed through communication with partners and funders through their process of tracking grant performance.

Overall, within the constraints of budgets the district does an excellent job of providing service to those that have resource needs in the area of stormwater management and erosion control. Board support to operations has consisted especially in the areas of grant acquisition and fiscal advice and support, especially when addressing impacts of dispute resolution.

One area that can be implemented to raise board involvement with operations would be floating participation at District operations meeting where resources, budgets and tasks are the topics of the meeting.

Conservation District Evaluation Guide

The intent of this evaluation is to rate your Conservation District's effectiveness in accomplishing its objectives within the community.

To properly utilize this Conservation District Evaluation Guide, each Board Member and Conservation District Employee should rate your District's Program individually, then collectively and gain consensus on the overall Conservation District's evaluation ratings. This process allows for the Conservation District Board and its employees to become aware of the Conservation District's strengths and weaknesses, and to identify individual areas which may need to be addressed.

For each item rate your district's efforts from 0 (lowest) to 5 (highest)

I. PLANNING FOR SERVICE	RATING (0-5)
A. Annual planning of district operations involves other agencies, organizations and/or individuals, and enlists their continuing participation beyond plan development.	<u>5</u>
B. The annual work plan is regularly reviewed and evaluated during the year.	<u>5</u>
C. The district long range plan is updated and details direction and priorities in such areas as programs, finances, facilities and equipment, staffing, community relations, board development, resource issues, potential solutions, objectives are readily identifiable in the district annual plan of work and correlate closely with actions to be taken.	<u>5</u>
D. The district annual plan of work includes a broad range of environmental concerns that reflect resource needs and issues within the district.	<u>5</u>
E. Current resource inventories are used in the district.	<u>5</u>
F. The use of communication vehicles such as district newsletters, TV and radio stations are clearly set forth. District has developed a public relations plan.	<u>3</u>
G. The annual plan of work clearly defines education activities with Schools, Churches, Civic Groups, and other organizations in the district.	<u>3</u>
H. The district board members annually discuss the various memorandums of understanding their district has with other governmental agencies. They identify activities requiring consideration and each year review at least one memorandum of understanding with an appropriate agency representative.	<u>4</u>
I. The annual plan of work includes budgeted funds for carrying out district goals	<u>5</u>
J. The district has prepared a work load analysis of hours required to carry out its annual plan activities.	<u>5</u>
II. ORGANIZING FOR SERVICE	RATING (0-5)
A. Members agree upon the basic mission/purposes of the board.	<u>5</u>
B. District has written goals which are identified by geographical distribution as they relate to location of problems and priorities.	<u>4</u>
C. The district has a structure of active working committees, subcommittees, and task forces (so that all work does not have to take place in full board meetings)	<u>4</u>
D. District needs (technical, educational and managerial from federal, state, and local sources) are analyzed and efforts made to secure staff as needed to effectively carry out district objectives.	<u>5</u>
E. District staff has job descriptions, annual performance reviews, and training plans.	<u>5</u>
F. The district officials and staff periodically assess their working relationship (respective roles and responsibilities) and redefine the relationship as necessary.	<u>5</u>
G. The service of other groups and individuals are used to assist in district operations: Youth; Associate District Officials; Citizens Committee Members.	<u>2</u>
H. At least one goal is set forth that will provide district officials in a working knowledge of state and federal legislation that may be of concern to the district.	<u>3</u>
I. The district makes contact with, or provides significant input into, activities of their public officials (local, state, federal)	<u>3</u>
J. District participates in national, regional and state funding or in available technical assistance programs.	<u>4</u>

K.	Principles for action are clearly defined and based on the district's long range program.	3
L.	The district plans for effective management of all its funds, facilities and equipment.	4
M.	Meetings are held on a defined schedule that fits the needs of the board and the program. (meetings are neither too frequent nor too infrequent)	4
N.	The district invites all cooperating agencies to meet regularly with the district governing body.	5
O.	The public is given notice of district meetings and open meeting laws are followed closely.	5
P.	Meeting design and procedures encourage full participation, active involvement, and personal leadership of members.	3
Q.	Members understand the board's responsibilities, limits of authority, and legal basis of operation.	4
R.	A written board member job description defines member roles and responsibilities.	3
S.	District members carry out their responsibilities -- coming to meetings prepared, completing assignments, talking with other groups, etc.	4
T.	The district conducts a comprehensive orientation program for new members.	1
U.	Each year district officials participate in board training and education in order to improve their knowledge and skills in critical areas.	1
V.	The district has identified the information that its members need, the form/format for the information, the time schedule for providing it to members, and who is responsible for providing it.	3
W.	The district has clear operating rules or procedures to guide its operation.	5
X.	The district has up-to-date policies in essential areas, and policies are organized for easy reference.	4
Y.	The District uses problem-solving and decision-making tools and methods.	5
Z.	The district uses a wide variety of approaches (in addition to meetings) to ensure effective communication among members and staff.	3

III. MEASURING SERVICE

RATING (0-5)

A.	The district planned and implemented the following major projects this year: (0-5 points for each mechanism of ten major projects)	
1.	<u>Stormwater Load Reduction Plan (SLRP)</u>	
2.	<u>Bucke Creek / Lake Meadows</u>	
3.	<u>Glenbrook Creek Restoration</u>	
4.	<u>Rosewood Creek Restoration</u>	
5.	<u>EPA Community Watershed Partnership</u>	
6.	<u>NBEP BMP Retrofit</u>	
B.	District board activities and cooperative efforts are reflected in both the annual plan and report.	5
C.	Annual report was well planned and well distributed.	5
D.	District utilized civic leaders and organizations.	4
E.	State and National associations were budgeted for and paid.	3
F.	At least one board member represented the district regularly in state, area, and regional meetings.	5
G.	District newsletter was regular and well distributed.	1
H.	The district periodically evaluates the program that it operates (i.e., defining the issues to be evaluated, the information it needs, and the standards for effectiveness)	5
I.	The district assesses board needs and addresses priority problems and issues that are identified.	5

If your district scored a 3 or less on any of the above service elements, this is an indication of specific areas that your Conservation District may need to address.



PO Box 915
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448
775-586-1610 x21

PROJECT SUMMARY

INCLINE VILLAGE GREEN STREETS PROJECT

NTCD Program: Water Resources Group

Contractual Parties: Nevada Tahoe Conservation District (NTCD); Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT); Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) and Nevada Division of State Lands (NDSL)

Contract Amount: \$183,000 (\$80,000 NDOT; \$53,000 NDEP; \$50,000 NDSL)

Effective Dates: November 1, 2013 – December 31, 2016

Project Summary: The Incline Village Green Streets project seeks to install at least 5 rain gardens in the NDOT Right-of-Way (ROW) of State Route (SR) 28 and adjacent public land (if available) to treat (by bio-infiltration) stormwater runoff in high load reduction potential catchments. Preliminary modeling suggests substantial fine sediment load reduction is possible for NDOT through implementation and maintenance of the project. NTCD is partnering with NDOT and the Incline Village Rotary Club to implement the Incline Village Green Streets Project.

Scope of Services Summary: This project will install at least 5 rain gardens in the NDOT ROW of SR 28 and adjacent public land if available to treat stormwater runoff. Project tasks include the following: 1) Identify and rank treatment locations based on pollutant load reduction potential, connectivity, topography and engineering considerations; 2) Create 100% Design Plans, Specifications, Engineer's Estimates and Design Reports for implementing the project; 3) Obtain all necessary permits for implementation of the project; 4) Prepare final bid documents, informally bid and select contractor for construction of the project per design plans and specifications; 5) Construct per design plans and specifications; and 6) In partnership with Incline Village Rotary Club, revegetate, irrigate and maintain the project for two growing seasons following construction.

Incline Village Green Streets									
Category	Total Hours	Rate	NDSL License		NDEP 319	Total Cash Budget	In-Kind Contribution	Total Budget	Total Budget
			Plate Funds	NDOT					
PE	495	up to \$46.67	\$4,667.00	\$13,254.28	\$5,180.37	\$23,101.65		\$23,101.65	
WRG ES III	430	up to \$47.51	\$7,839.15	\$5,226.10	\$7,364.05	\$20,429.30		\$20,429.30	
WRG ES III	30	up to \$44.63	\$669.45	\$0.00	\$669.45	\$1,338.90		\$1,338.90	
WRG ES III	120	up to \$41.07	\$1,642.80	\$1,642.80	\$1,642.80	\$4,928.40		\$4,928.40	
Wages (salary and fringe)			\$14,818.40	\$26,123.18	\$14,866.67	\$49,798.25		\$49,798.25	
Personnel Costs		15.91%	\$2,367.61	\$3,261.50	\$2,363.76	\$7,992.91		\$7,992.91	
Travel (vehicle mileage)		Approved State Rate \$0.50		\$400.40	\$610.39	\$1,210.79		\$1,210.79	
Equipment						\$0.00		\$0.00	
Supplies and recurring costs			\$500.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,000.00	\$4,500.00		\$4,500.00	
Rotary Club in-kind		80 hrs @ \$18.82				\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	
Sub-total			\$17,673.61	\$25,735.18	\$20,030.76	\$63,431.66	\$1,500.00	\$64,931.66	
Overhead & Administration		37.5%	\$6,626.50	\$9,646.94	\$7,511.54	\$23,786.98		\$23,786.98	
Permits			\$250.00	\$250.00		\$500.00		\$500.00	
Contracts (Survey, Material Testing)			\$1,500.00	\$2,000.00	\$669.46	\$4,600.00		\$4,600.00	
Construction (including materials)			\$23,644.56	\$42,377.86	\$24,756.24	\$86,791.07		\$86,791.07	
TOTAL			\$50,000.00	\$80,000.00	\$53,000.00	\$183,000.00	\$1,500.00	\$184,500.00	