

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 6/26/18 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Agenda Item #: 1.B**Title: Approve the List(s) of Claims and Bills Approved for Payment by the City Manager**

Council Question: Please provide a brief description of the following payments:

- A. \$838,464.71 to SANTA CLARA VLY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY for Engineering Services
- B. \$214,937.50 to SAVIANO CO INC. for Construction Services

Staff Response:

- A. This is a progress payment for the Route 237/101/Mathilda Interchange per a funding agreement between the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and the City of Sunnyvale executed in 2013 and amended on January 24, 2017 (RTC 16-1131).
- B. This is a progress payment to Saviano Co Inc. for the Park Tennis and Basketball Court Resurfacing pursuant to a contract awarded by Council on November 7, 2017 in the amount of \$410,000 (RTC 17-0969).

Agenda Item #: 1.D**Title: Approve Grant Acceptance and Budget Modification No. 52 to Appropriate \$698,625 from the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Railway-Highway Crossings (Section 130) for Grade Crossing Safety Improvements at Mary Avenue and Caltrain Track CPUC No. 105E-37.90, Federal DOT No. 755037V; and Authorize the City Manager to Execute All Grant Related Documents**

Council Question: "will implement advanced railroad preemption which will increase the warning time to clear tracks before the train gates go down...". Will this increase, decrease or leave the same, the time allocated for cars to cross Mary? I am trying to understand if this will impact car through-put at this intersection?

Staff Response: It should not affect vehicular throughput. To meet the desired standard, additional warning timing is needed for the gates to go down without abruptly terminating vehicular and pedestrian movements conflicting with the train. The City's traffic signal will get early notification of an approaching train so that railroad clearance traffic signal preemption routine can start earlier, and all the movements crossing rail road tracks are cleared before the train arrives. It would rather facilitate for both pedestrian and vehicular movement through the railroad track crossing.

Agenda Item #: 1.E**Title: Approve a Transportation/Traffic Impact Fee Reimbursement Agreement with Remington LLC for the Construction of Intersection Improvements at 1010 Sunnyvale Saratoga Road and Approve Budget Modification No. 51 to appropriate \$417,831 to a New Project, Improvements at Sunnyvale Saratoga Road and Remington Drive.**

Council Question: It seems that a Planning Commission decision has committed the City to an expenditure of about \$400,000 from capital reserves. While the intersection improvements were already identified by the City's Traffic Mitigation Program Study, I don't think the timing of the improvements and the timing of the expenditure had been set previously. In effect, this commitment of reserves did not go through the normal budget process. In the future, how can Council be made

aware that a particular Planning Commission decision could affect reserves? And when reviewing the budget, how can Council gain visibility into existing commitments like this one that may affect future reserves?

Staff Response: Timing of the development project occurred after the City's Traffic Mitigation Program Study. As part of the City's study, improvements and estimated cost for the intersection improvements for Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road & Remington Drive were identified and established for specific allocation of the TIF fund and not General Fund reserves. During Planning Application review, staff worked with the applicant's team to ensure cost for identified improvements would not exceed this specific allocation of the TIF fund and during project development to further define specific improvements as well.

However, in this case we required both the fee in one condition and provided for a credit for work done in another condition. Reimbursement for public improvements that exceed the nexus for a site is a fairly standard practice however not frequently used/needed. The City Council is provided with copies of Planning Commission reports and draft conditions of approval prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

The conditions of approval approved by the Planning Commission were recommended by staff as an opportunity to construct an identified transportation improvement (right turn lane) adjacent to a development. The right-turn lane improvement was not required of the development, therefore reimbursement of costs above their required TIF payment was recommended.

Agenda Item #: 1.F

Title: Accept the Highway Safety Improvement Program Grant of \$844,800, and Approve Budget Modification No. 53 to Appropriate the Grants to Fund the Advance Dilemma Zone Detection Project.

Council Question: Can you provide more information on the Advanced Dilemma-Zone Detection System?

Staff Response: Dilemma Zone is an advanced traffic signals Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology. Sunnyvale is one of the leading agencies who will be installing this technology on its traffic signals. The system enhances safety at signalized intersections by modifying traffic control signal timing to reduce drivers' difficulty when deciding to stop or proceed during a traffic signal clearance phase (Yellow and All Red). The clearance timings will be extended in real time if needed to proceed safely through the intersection. This ITS technology expects to minimize the red light running incidents and will help reduce rear ends and broadside collisions at the intersections. Federal Highway Administration studies have found that this system reduced red-light violations and severe-crash frequency by 58 and 39 percent respectively.

Council Question: What are the 11 intersections? Is the Advanced Dilemma-Zone Detection System - Is this the same type technology we had installed on Matilda to improve traffic through-put?

Staff Response: No. This will be a first of its kind project in Sunnyvale. The eleven intersections are:

1. Sunnyvale Saratoga and Alberta,

2. Sunnyvale Saratoga and Remington,
3. Mathilda and Almanor,
4. Fremont and Mary,
5. Central Expressway and Wolfe,
6. Wolfe and Evelyn,
7. Homestead and Hollenbeck,
8. Wolfe and Reed,
9. Mathilda and California,
10. Fair Oaks and Tasman, and
11. Fair Oaks and Old San Francisco.

Agenda Item #: 1.J

Title: Approve Budget Modification No. 54 to Appropriate \$250,000 to Fiscal Year 2017/18 for the All-Inclusive Playground Project

Council Question: The item says that this money was originally planned for the 2018/19 budget, but the agreement requires us to pay for it earlier than that, so it proposes accelerating the schedule and paying \$250k as part of the 2017/18 budget. The 2018/19 budget literally takes effect five days after Tuesday's vote. Does our agreement with the Magical Bridge Foundation really not permit us to wait five days for this to be paid out?

Staff Response: As payment of \$250,000 for the design costs has already occurred, the appropriation is needed in the current fiscal year to meet contract requirements and to back the expenditure of funds.

Council Question: Do we have an estimated Target Completion Date for the Fair Oaks Park and Magical Bridge work?

Staff Response: The project is anticipated to be completed ending of year 2020.

Agenda Item #: 3

Title: City Council Adoption of the FY 2018/19 Budget, Fee Schedule, and Appropriations Limit and Sunnyvale Financing Authority Adoption of the FY 2018/19 Budget

Council Question: BPAC May 17, 2018 Meeting Minutes - Page 3

Motion was made to add \$40k per year to to the program to fund SRTS program. What is this? Is this a recommendation to Council, or is BPAC doing budget work?

Staff Response: With the comments included from Commission review of the budget, they are forwarded to the City Council for consideration. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission recommended additional funding to enhance the Safe Routes to School Program (\$40,000). The continuation of the Coordinator position is included in the budget as part of Budget Supplement #8 which recommends ongoing funding for the existing Community Services Officer starting in FY 2019/20 (\$137,439) and one-time funding for a CSO vehicle, accessories, and mobile radio (\$43,951). This is in addition to the ongoing funding for the Safe Routes to School Coordinator position. This

additional program funding (\$40,000) is not included in the budget, however, could be included with City Council action and approval.

Council Question: Utility staff

A Sunnyvale resident recently asked me the following question:

"For the same volume of garbage Sunnyvale's cost is higher than Cupertino's. Also, it looks there are 157 city employees paid from our utility payment, and their annual salaries are very high. I have been told a water meter reader was paid \$160K, and a phone caller for customer service is paid \$220K. It is unbelievable if that is true. Would you please ask City Finance Department provides detailed information (including employees cost) and tell us why they want to make that much increase?"

If staff would respond, I'd appreciate it.

Staff Response: The City recovers its cost for providing solid waste services to the community through more than 300 rates, each for a particular service type, container and collection frequency provided to residential, business, and institutional customers. Sunnyvale has set solid waste rates based on cost of service for 25 years, longer than most cities. Cost of service for each rate is determined by periodic studies performed by an independent consulting firm that specializes in rate-setting. The cost of service analysis is updated every 3-5 years to take current services, costs and revenues into account.

Looking at just one or two of the 300 rates in comparison other agencies (e.g. the charge for the smallest residential garbage cart size (27-gallons) provided in Sunnyvale) can be misleading. However, the majority of residential customers subscribe to larger cart sizes (43 and 64 gallons). Doing a cost/gallon comparison for the 64-gallon cart shows the Sunnyvale rate as the second-lowest lowest in the county. Bottom line--the City recommends that customers select from among the three cart sizes based on the amount of garbage they need to dispose after yard trimmings, recyclable materials, and food scraps are diverted into their respective containers.

It is true that approximately 160 employees support the City's three utility operations. Between the Water Pollution Control Plant, Water and Sewer Collection system operations, regulatory compliance, solid waste management, and utility billing and meter reading there are 144 employees that are 100% supported by the utilities. In addition there are employees who provide support services to all city operations (e.g. Finance, Human Resources, Attorney, etc.) Employee salaries are public information and can be found on the City's website here:

<https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/government/jobs/salaries.htm>. A meter reader earns approximately \$75,000 annually and a customer service representative earns approximately \$76,000. The full cost (not their compensation, but what the employees cost the City) including insurances and pensions is approximately \$120,000.

Council Question: Grants

In addition, Council received and heard two request about increasing both neighborhood and community event grants and grants to agencies. The neighborhood and community event grants roll into the Library and Community Services Department. The grants agencies (\$100K per year since 2008) come from the General Fund. I was unable to find where they roll up into the 2018/19 budget. Would you kindly let me know where to find these three kinds of grants in the budget?

Staff Response: The budget includes \$100,000 annually in the General Fund as part of Project 819720 – Outside Group Funding Support. This funding is administered by the Community Development Department and is designed to supplement Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). This project can be found online in Volume II on page 869. In addition to this funding, \$17,000 is allocated in the Library and Community Services operating budget (626.08 - Community Resources and Division-Wide Support Service Delivery Plan) to fund neighborhood grants and community events. This line item can be found online in Volume I on page 392.

Council Question: **Missing \$38M**

One of my interns mapped the expenditures by department and the total summed to only \$255M. We will check our work tonight, but do you see offhand where the remaining \$52M expenditures are going so the total expenditures add up to \$293M?

<i>Department</i>	<i>2018/19 Expenditures</i>
CDD	\$ 19,844,091
DPS	\$ 93,302,766
DPW	\$ 44,752,364
Environmental Sciences	\$ 43,066,611
Finance	\$ 10,094,416
Human Resources	\$ 5,346,418
IT	\$ 9,875,655
LCS	\$ 20,472,569
Office of City Attorney	\$ 2,201,794
Office of City Manager	\$ 5,765,475
Grand Total	\$ 254,722,159

Staff Response: When comparing the \$293 million in the Budget Summary with the figures in the Department sections of the Operating Budget there are several adjustments necessary. First, internal service funds are excluded to avoid double counting of costs. Internal Service Fund funded costs are funded entirely through rental rates that are allocated in each department budget; therefore, the department costs directly budgeted in internal service funds are excluded. Second, costs related to capital projects are excluded from the figure since these positions are charging to budgeted projects and itemized separately in the Budget Summary. Third, SMaRT Station costs in Environmental Services Department are adjusted for to reflect Sunnyvale’s share of the SMaRT Station operating expenditures. A departmental breakdown of the \$293 million after these adjustments are made can be found online in Volume I on pages 30-31.

Agenda Item #: 5
Title: Proposed Utility Rate Increases for FY 2018/19 Rates for Water, Wastewater, and Solid Waste Utilities for Services Provided to Customers Within and Outside City Boundaries; Finding of CEQA Exemption Pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273

Council Question: The RTC says that we get 49.5% of water from SCVWD, 49.5% from SFPUC. However, the water rate survey has considerably different numbers - 42% from SFPUC, 44% from SCVWD, 8% from wells, and 6% recycled. Which is correct?

Staff Response: The rate survey reflects the incorrect mixture. The City has not been producing significant amounts of recycled water and is only running the wells at a very low flow to keep them fresh. The RTC is accurate, staff has attached a revised page for the survey.

Council Question: Also, the rate table shows us having two tiers of water usage for Residential and Mobile Home customers, based on volume. Since we cannot tier rates based on usage, can you remind me what the cost justification is for having those tiers?

Staff Response: The first tier reflects the cost of the City's cheaper water supply sources, provided by City Wells and the Santa Clara Valley Water District. The second tier reflects more expensive water provided by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. This methodology is supported by the last Water Cost of Service Study performed which brought the City into full compliance with the Capistrano ruling.

Council Question: Also, do we have any information about how Mountain View justifies charging \$10.99/ccf for the high end residential customers? It really looks like they haven't adjusted at all to the San Juan Capistrano ruling.

Staff Response: Staff does not have information as to how Mountain View cost justifies its water rates.

Council Question: Finally, once again, is it possible to get some sort of a breakdown of the rationale for each of the 4% water, the 10% wastewater, and the 2% solid waste increases? I can calculate $49.5\% * 70\% * 9.6\% = 3.3\%$ of the 4% water increase being attributed to SCVWD's rate increase, but that's all I can see.

Staff Response: For the 4% water increase, additional revenues of \$2.1 million would be generated. Major increased costs year over year can be attributed to SCVWD rate increase of \$1.2 million, BAWSCA and other membership fee increases of \$600,000, and other miscellaneous operational cost increases including electrical parts and supplies and overtime. The 10% wastewater is expected to generate an additional \$3.7 million in revenues. This increase can entirely be attributed to CIP projects and building reserves for future projects and debt issuance. The 2% solid waste increase will generate approximately \$1.0 million and can entirely be attributed to an increase in our solid waste contract which increased approximately \$1.25 million, year over year.

Council Question: What is the latest CPI for Sunnyvale?

Staff Response: The latest data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the San Francisco Area Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) through April 2018 shows a 3.2 percent year over year increase.

Council Question: In the context of the proposed FY 2018/19 wastewater rates, I would like to discuss at the Public Hearing the original WPCP renovation project fiscal scenarios which were approved by Council on August 23, 2016 and which I have summarized in the attached table. Can Staff please publish this table in its Response to Council Questions?

\$M	Spend	Spend	Spend	Start	End
	Sceanrio	Sceanrio	Sceanrio		
Per the Master Plan Adopted August 23, 2016	1	2	3		
Phase 1 – Headworks/Existing WPCP Rehab	183.2	183.2	183.2	2015	2020
Phase 2 – Initial CAS/Admin and Maintenance	226.8	226.8	226.8	2020	2025
Phase 3 – Support Facilities Upgrades	45.6	45.6	45.6	2025	2030
Subtotal	455.5	455.5	455.5		
Phase 4 – Second CAS Expansion	307.2	296.3	218.7	2030	2035
Phase 5 – Tertiary Treatment Upgrades	177.8	31.0	31.0	2035+	2042
Subtotal	485.0	327.4	249.8		
Total	940.6	782.8	705.2		
File #16-0663					
Master Plan CIP Fiscal Scenarios - Conventional Activated Sludge (CAS) Split Flow					
Total Program Costs (Escalated)					

City Response: The Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan Fiscal Scenarios presented to the City Council on August 23, 2016 (RTC No. 16-0663) is attached.

Council Question: I was surprised that the Staff report says “The first of those projects, the Wolfe Road Recycled Water Pipeline, is nearing completion and will begin providing recycled water for use at Apple’s new campus in the coming months.” I thought this project was complete. What is left?

Staff Response: The Wolfe Road Recycled Water Pipeline and associated pumping facilities are 100% complete and ready to be put into service to supply the Apple campus 2 (AC2) with recycled water. However, before the AC2 can be supplied with recycled water, the entire campus must undergo cross-connection testing to ensure that the potable water supply is not connected to that of recycled water. This a State Water Board requirement and Apple Corporation is driving the schedule of the cross-connection testing. City staff has been working with Apple and the State Water Board to facilitate the testing. Last Wednesday, June 20, 2018 testing started on the two parking structures. Over the next several months Apple will be providing City staff with a list of what to test next to minimize disruption to the new campus. There are more than 1,500 fixtures that are required to be tested. As soon as all the fixtures are tested, the State Water Board will issue the clearance to supply AC2 with recycled water. Until then there are currently no other customers that could utilize the Wolfe Road Recycled Water Pipeline.

Council Question: Staff makes a point that the SMaRT Station facility equipment can be maintained until the end of the current MOU.

When is the MOU complete? Have we already started the interjurisdictional planning for repair/rebuild of SMaRTStation (or only starting in FY19/20)?
Funding is provided for planning and inter- jurisdictional coordination through FY 2019/20, with design and construction following in FY 2020/21 through FY 2022/23

Staff Response: The MOU expires at the end of 2021. Work is already underway on SMaRT Station interjurisdictional planning, which also includes facility assessment and conceptual design development. This is being done with consultant team assistance provided under a contract awarded to HDR, Engineering, Inc. on October 17, 2017 (RTC 17-0866).

Agenda Item #: 7

Title: Introduce an ordinance amending Sunnyvale Municipal Code (SMC) Chapter 2.07 to add special requirements for approval of certain sale and lease agreements involving publicly accessible recreation and city service (PARCS) properties, and adopt a Resolution approving the list of PARCS properties subject to the requirements of the amended SMC Chapter 2.07

Council Question: Exhibit A of the resolution misspells "Wolfe" in entry 56. Also, why is entry 7 described as "SOC Vacant Lot" instead of "Charles Street Community Gardens", or something similar?

Staff Response: The misspelling of Wolfe (entry 56) in the Exhibit to Resolution A will be corrected upon adoption by the City Council.

Entry 7 has been described as "SOC Vacant Lot" in City real property records as it is a portion of a City owned parcel (APN 165-04-019), which includes a parking lot and the community gardens. Sustainable Community Gardens has an agreement with the City for the portion of the City owned parcel where the community gardens is located.

Council Question: Over the next several years, we will be adding multiple new parks to the City's inventory, which will require adding those properties to the designated list. What is the triggering event or mechanism that gets a new property added to the list?

Staff Response: Staff is working on developing a process for options to add properties to the list. This would include triggering events warranting a list modification. Staff will be prepared to discuss further at Tuesday's meeting.

Council Question: Would it be possible to require an affirmative vote of at least five councilmembers for any modification to sections 2.07.040, 2.07.050(b), or 2.07.060(b)(1)? These are the sections that specifically deal with PARCS property.

Staff Response: In order to modify the proposed Sunnyvale Municipal Code sections 2.070.040, 2.070.050(b), or 2.07.060(b)(1) to require an affirmative vote of at least five city councilmembers would conflict with provisions of Sunnyvale Charter Section 700, which governs the adoption of ordinances by the City Council. It states in relevant part:

Unless a higher vote is required by the other provisions of this Charter, the affirmative votes of at least four members of the City Council shall be required

for the enactment of any ordinance or resolution, or for the making or approving of any order for the payment of money.

This Charter section requires for an affirmative vote of four councilmembers to adopt an ordinance. To include a provision in the proposed sections referenced above that imposes a greater number of affirmative votes to adopt an ordinance to amend these provisions could only be accomplished with a charter amendment to change the language of Charter Section 700.

In summary, requiring a vote of at least five councilmembers to amend the above referenced sections would be in violation of Sunnyvale Charter Section 700 and cannot be included in the proposed ordinance.

Council Question: Can Staff please provide a brief description of each of the below properties, such as how or why the City owns the property and/or the operational purpose of the land. I am listing the APN of each of the properties and an approximate street location.

Council Question Properties List	Staff Response
309-51-001 Wolfe Road near E. Homestead Road	Wolfe Homestead well site (ESD)
323-21-038 Homestead Road near Kennewick Drive	Westmoor well site (ESD)
309-46-043 Homestead Road connecting to Londonderry Drive	Midblock Pedestrian and bike walkway from Londonderry to Homestead.
320-25-048 S. Mary Avenue at Cascade Drive	Not owned by the City. City only owns 320-25-001 which is a right of way excess (0.02 acres).
202-39-006 (as one example) Several parcels at the western edge of the City which appear to be associated with the Stevens Creek Trail	Drainage control sites (SCVWD has an easement over these parcels for drainage control and access to Stevens Creek).
202-15-077 Winstead Terrace	Right of way excess (0.02 acres)
323-10-013 Belfry Way	Right of way excess (0.03 acres)
209-16-005 Liquidambar Way	Water Pump site (ESD)
209-26-010 W. Olive Avenue at S. Murphy Avenue	Commercial building owned by the City currently lease to a Dental office
165-20-015 S. Mary Avenue at Bidwell Avenue	For the future right of way associated with Mary Avenue overcrossing
204-42-020 E. Arques Avenue at Schroeder Street	Schroeder water plant (ESD)
165-32-008 N. Mary Avenue near Corte Madera Avenue	Part of Mary Ave sits on this parcel
110-07-021 Hamlin Court	Hamlin Court Pump site (ESD)

Agenda Item #: 8
Title: CONTINUED FROM MAY 22, 2018 CITY COUNCIL MEETING Amend the Lawrence Station Area Plan: Select a Preferred Housing Study and Direct Staff to Complete Required Environmental Review.

Council Question: What plans are there currently for additional bike/ped improvements to Calabazas Creek?

Staff Response: Most of the Calabazas Creek is within the City of Santa Clara. Sunnyvale only has a small portion along El Camino Drain which connects to the Calabazas Creek. There is no project at this time for bike/pedestrian improvements on the trail within the City of Sunnyvale.

Agenda Item #: 9

Title: Review and Approve Recommendations from the Community Event and Neighborhood Grant Distribution Subcommittee and Approve Budget Modification No. 56 in the Amount of \$926 to Appropriate Funding to the Community Services Program budget from the Council Service Level Set Aside.

Council Question: If the CEGP and NGP funds up for discussion are to be a part of the 2018/19 budget, then why is it proposed to take the offset money out of the 2017/18 Council Service Level Set Aside Fund, instead of the 2018/19 set-aside? And why are we carrying over funds from the 2017/18 CEGP to the 2018/19 CEGP? We don't normally carry funds over from fund to fund in a new budget - we start a budget fresh. Wouldn't it be more in line with Sunnyvale's budget practices to take the entire \$1482.75 out of the 2018/19 Council set-aside?

Staff Response: The expenditures by the recipients will either wholly or partially spent in the current year, therefore the City is writing a check in the current fiscal year and the corresponding appropriation is needed. No carryover of funds is planned. Staff identified FY 2017/18 Council Service Level Set Aside Funds as the most logical source for the budget modification; however, an alternative would be made to bring forward FY 2018/19 Funds if Council prefers that approach.

Master Plan CIP Fiscal Scenarios - Conventional Activated Sludge (CAS) Split Flow
Total Program Costs (Escalated)

FINAL
5/16/2016

CIP Phase	Project Title (Descriptive)	Scenario 1 - Total CIP (Includes all potential projects)									Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Comments	
		% of Project Includ.	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5	Phases 1 - 3	Phases 4 - 5	Total (Ph. 1 - 5)	% of Project Includ.	Phases 1 - 3	Phases 4 - 5	Total (Ph. 1 - 5)	% of Project Includ.	Phases 1 - 3		Phases 4 - 5
PRIMARY TREATMENT																		
1	Primary Treatment Facility	100%	\$ 133,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 133,100,000	\$ -	\$ 133,100,000	100%	\$ 133,100,000	\$ -	\$ 133,100,000	100%	\$ 133,100,000	\$ -	\$ 133,100,000
1	Rehabilitation Primary Effluent Pipeline from Central Plant to Ponds	100%	\$ 2,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,800,000	\$ -	\$ 2,800,000	100%	\$ 2,800,000	\$ -	\$ 2,800,000	100%	\$ 2,800,000	\$ -	\$ 2,800,000
1	Rehabilitation Influent Pipelines to WPCP	100%	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	100%	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	100%	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000
SECONDARY TREATMENT																		
1	Existing Plant Rehabilitation - Split Flow	100%	\$ 43,300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,300,000	\$ -	\$ 43,300,000	100%	\$ 43,300,000	\$ -	\$ 43,300,000	100%	\$ 43,300,000	\$ -	\$ 43,300,000
2	Secondary Treatment Improvements - Split Flow Stage 1	100%	\$ -	\$ 125,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125,200,000	\$ -	\$ 125,200,000	100%	\$ 125,200,000	\$ -	\$ 125,200,000	100%	\$ 125,200,000	\$ -	\$ 125,200,000
4	Secondary Treatment Improvements - Split Flow Stage 2	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 86,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 86,600,000	\$ 86,600,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 86,600,000	\$ 86,600,000	70%	\$ -	\$ 60,600,000	\$ 60,600,000
4	Primary Effluent Diurnal Equalization and Emergency Storage	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,600,000	\$ 135,600,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 135,600,000	\$ 135,600,000	94%	\$ -	\$ 126,800,000	\$ 126,800,000
4	Active Retirement of Ponds	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,600,000	\$ 10,600,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 10,600,000	\$ 10,600,000	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2	AFT Pump Station and Pipeline	100%	\$ -	\$ 7,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,200,000	\$ -	\$ 7,200,000	100%	\$ 7,200,000	\$ -	\$ 7,200,000	100%	\$ 7,200,000	\$ -	\$ 7,200,000
5	Chemical Dosing (P-Removal)	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,200,000	\$ -	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 2,200,000	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TERTIARY TREATMENT																		
3	Filter Control Building (Includes Demolition of Existing)	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,900,000	\$ -	\$ 5,900,000	100%	\$ 5,900,000	\$ -	\$ 5,900,000	100%	\$ 5,900,000	\$ -	\$ 5,900,000
4	Filter Backwash Storage	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,800,000	\$ 11,800,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 11,800,000	\$ 11,800,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 11,800,000	\$ 11,800,000
5	Denitrification Filters	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,600,000	\$ -	\$ 63,600,000	\$ 63,600,000	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3	Chloramine Disinfection	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	100%	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	100%	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000
5	UV Disinfection	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,800,000	\$ -	\$ 20,800,000	\$ 20,800,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 20,800,000	\$ 20,800,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 20,800,000	\$ 20,800,000
5	Ozone Disinfection	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,800,000	\$ -	\$ 45,800,000	\$ 45,800,000	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	Membrane Filtration (MF) Improvements	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,200,000	\$ -	\$ 35,200,000	\$ 35,200,000	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SOLIDS FACILITIES																		
2	Digester Supernatant PS and Drainage Piping Upgrades	100%	\$ -	\$ 1,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,400,000	\$ -	\$ 1,400,000	100%	\$ 1,400,000	\$ -	\$ 1,400,000	100%	\$ 1,400,000	\$ -	\$ 1,400,000
2	Thickening and Dewatering Facility - Stage 1	100%	\$ -	\$ 52,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,100,000	\$ -	\$ 52,100,000	100%	\$ 52,100,000	\$ -	\$ 52,100,000	100%	\$ 52,100,000	\$ -	\$ 52,100,000
4	Thickening and Dewatering Facility - Stage 2	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,300,000	\$ 14,300,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 14,300,000	\$ 14,300,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 14,300,000	\$ 14,300,000
3	Digester No. 5	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,900,000	\$ -	\$ 10,900,000	100%	\$ 10,900,000	\$ -	\$ 10,900,000	100%	\$ 10,900,000	\$ -	\$ 10,900,000
3	FOG/Food Waste Facility	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,100,000	\$ -	\$ 2,100,000	100%	\$ 2,100,000	\$ -	\$ 2,100,000	100%	\$ 2,100,000	\$ -	\$ 2,100,000
4	Phosphorus Recovery Facility	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,900,000	\$ 10,900,000	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	Biosolids Post-Processing	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,200,000	\$ 32,200,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 32,200,000	\$ 32,200,000	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
COMBINED HEAT AND POWER																		
3	Cogeneration Upgrade	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,200,000	\$ -	\$ 21,200,000	100%	\$ 21,200,000	\$ -	\$ 21,200,000	100%	\$ 21,200,000	\$ -	\$ 21,200,000
SUPPORT FACILITIES																		
1	New Access to Bay Trails	100%	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ 600,000	100%	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ 600,000	100%	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ 600,000
1	Household Hazardous Waste Demolition/ Solid Waste Removal	100%	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000	100%	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000	100%	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000
2	Administration and Lab Building	100%	\$ -	\$ 26,300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,300,000	\$ -	\$ 26,300,000	100%	\$ 26,300,000	\$ -	\$ 26,300,000	100%	\$ 26,300,000	\$ -	\$ 26,300,000
2	Maintenance Building	100%	\$ -	\$ 7,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,400,000	\$ -	\$ 7,400,000	100%	\$ 7,400,000	\$ -	\$ 7,400,000	100%	\$ 7,400,000	\$ -	\$ 7,400,000
SUPPORT UTILITIES																		
2	Recycle Water Improvements (New Recycled Water PS)	100%	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000	100%	\$ 4,200,000	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000	100%	\$ 4,200,000	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000
2	Community Improvements	100%	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	100%	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	100%	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000
2	Landfill Gas Flare and Booster System Upgrades	100%	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ 400,000	100%	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ 400,000	100%	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ 400,000
2	Miscellaneous Civil Site/Support Utility Improvements	100%	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	100%	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	100%	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000
DEMOLITION																		
4	Demolition Fixed Growth Reactor (FGR) Pump Station	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 2,600,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 2,600,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 2,600,000
5	Demolition Fixed Growth Reactors (FGRs)	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,800,000	\$ -	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 6,800,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 6,800,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 6,800,000
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE																		
	Capital Replacement (1% of All New Construction)	100%	\$ 1,360,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,960,000	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 3,450,000	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 6,050,000	\$ 10,550,000	100%	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 6,050,000	\$ 10,550,000	100%	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 6,050,000	\$ 10,550,000
Total			\$ 183,160,000	\$ 226,780,000	\$ 45,560,000	\$ 307,200,000	\$ 177,850,000	\$ 455,500,000	\$ 485,050,000	\$ 940,550,000		\$ 455,500,000	\$ 327,350,000	\$ 782,850,000		\$ 455,500,000	\$ 249,750,000	\$ 705,250,000

Water Rate Survey											
CITY	EFFECTIVE DATE	MONTHLY RATE BLOCKS		UNIT RATE	MONTHLY METER RENTAL SIZE	MONTHLY CHARGE	SOURCE OF SUPPLY SUPPLIER	%	SPECIAL RATES	RECYCLED WATER	NOTES
		FROM	TO								
SANTA CLARA (Proposed)											
Residential & Commercial	07/01/18	1 +		ccf	6.01	Minimum Monthly Charge:	Ground water	55%		3.70	\$.93/ccf credit for irrigation use (recycled water only) \$.44/ccf credit for industrial use Water rates include \$2.61 WECA charge \$.26/ccf credit for agricultural use
						5/8x3/4	Hetch Hetchy & SCVWD	34%			
						1					
						1 1/2	Reclaimed (Irrigation)	11%			
						2					
						3					
						4					
						6					
						8					
						10					
SUNNYVALE (Proposed)											
Residential	7/1/2018	0 - 5		ccf	4.39		Hetch Hetchy	49.5%	No	4.37	Landscape 4.85
		6 +		ccf	5.36		SCVWD	49.5%			Recycled water production has been minimal due to renovations. Production will increase in the coming months as renovations are completed.
							Wells	1%			
Mobile Homes		0 - 5		ccf	4.39		Recycled	<1%			
		6 +		ccf	5.36						
Multi-Family		1 +		ccf	4.85						
Commercial		1 +		ccf	4.85						
Monthly Service Charges											
Meter Size		Residential	Multi-Family	Commercial							
5/8x 3/4		14.05	23.55	23.55							
3/4		19.81	34.04	34.04							
1		31.31	55.02	55.02							
1 1/2		60.06	107.47	107.47							
2		94.55	170.44	170.44							
3			338.30	338.30							
4			527.17	527.17							
6			1051.77	1051.77							
8			1681.31	1681.31							
10			4409.27	4409.27							