San Diego County Water Authority

Period Ending
August 31, 2016
Account Profile
Consolidated Investment Objectives

The investment policies and practices of the Board of Directors and the Treasurer for the San Diego County Water Authority are based upon limitations placed on it by governing legislative bodies. These policies have three primary goals:

1. To assure compliance with all Federal, State and Local laws governing the investment of monies under the control of the Treasurer.
2. To protect the principal monies entrusted to this organization.
3. To generate the maximum amount of investment income within the parameters of this Annual Statement of Investment Policy.

Chandler Asset Management Performance Objectives

Chandler's mandate is to invest in corporate and municipal securities with final maturities of 5 years or less.

The performance objective is to achieve a rate of return over a market cycle that equals or exceeds the return on a market index of similar duration and sector allocation.

Strategy

In order to achieve these objectives, Chandler invests in high quality corporate securities consistent with the investment policy and California Government Code.
### COMPLIANCE WITH INVESTMENT POLICY

Assets managed by Chandler Asset Management are in full compliance with State law and the Investment Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Corporate (MTNs)</td>
<td>AA- or better by one NRSRO; No ratings below A-</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Securities</td>
<td>A- or better by one NRSRO; 20% maximum; 5% max issuer</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Maturity</td>
<td>5 years maximum maturity</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Portfolio Characteristics

### San Diego County Water Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08/31/2016</th>
<th>05/31/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Maturity (yrs)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Duration</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Purchase Yield</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Market Yield</td>
<td>1.45 %</td>
<td>1.24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Quality**</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AA/Aa2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Market Value</td>
<td>30,572,737</td>
<td>30,438,734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* BAML 1-5 Yr US Corporate Rated AAA-AA Index

** Benchmark is a blended rating of S&P, Moody's, and Fitch. Portfolio is S&P and Moody's respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Name</th>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>% Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Bancorp</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>13.46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChevronTexaco Corp</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>13.36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>13.33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Hathaway</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>13.30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exxon Mobil Corp</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>13.29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Inc</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>13.13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procter &amp; Gamble Company</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>6.74 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart Stores</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>6.70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota Motor Corp</td>
<td>US Corporate</td>
<td>6.69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.00 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issuer Report
As of 8/31/2016
San Diego County Water Authority
Portfolio Compared to the Benchmark as of August 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration Distribution</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Benchmark*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.25</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
<td>0.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 - 0.50</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 - 1</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>26.4 %</td>
<td>27.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>46.9 %</td>
<td>31.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>20.1 %</td>
<td>22.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
<td>15.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* BAML 1-5 Yr US Corporate Rated AAA-AA Index
Investment Performance - Chandler Managed Portfolio

San Diego County Water Authority

Period Ending
August 31, 2016

Total Rate of Return
Annualized Since Inception
February 28, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>San Diego County Water Authority</th>
<th>BAML 1-5 Yr US Corporate Rated AAA-AA Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since Inception</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total rate of return: A measure of a portfolio's performance over time. It is the internal rate of return, which equates the beginning value of the portfolio with the ending value; it includes interest earnings, realized and unrealized gains and losses in the portfolio.
Construction Contract for the Carlsbad 6 Flow Control Facility Project

Engineering & Operations Committee Meeting
September 22, 2016
## Bid Summary

Advertised Bid Range: $3.1 to $3.9 Million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>BID AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kiewit Infrastructure West Co.</td>
<td>$2,786,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L.H. Woods &amp; Sons, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,293,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>J.F. Shea Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,357,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pulice Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,698,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SCW Contracting Corp.</td>
<td>$3,712,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Palm Engineering Construction Company, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,712,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NEWest Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>$3,836,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authorize the General Manager to award a construction contract to Kiewit Infrastructure West, Co. in the amount of $2,786,250 for the Carlsbad 6 Flow Control Facility project to replace the existing Carlsbad 1 facility.
Top Right of Way Encroachments

Engineering & Operations Committee Meeting
September 22, 2016
Top Encroachments

History

- 2004 - 53 significant encroachments identified and ranked per Board direction
- Since 2006 encroachment removal in E&O Committee Work Plan
- Status today
  - 26 removed
  - 11 authorized by special permit
  - 16 remain to be resolved
House Removed
2006
Salvage Yard
Before
16 top encroachments to be resolved in 5 to 7 years

Encroachments are progressively less significant
Deck
Top Encroachments
ROW Management

- Regular patrol and enforcement control new encroachments

- Since 2002, 9 lawsuits filed for new encroachments, all resolved in favor of Water Authority
Metroplitan Water District’s Treatment Fixed Charge

IMPORTED WATER COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 22, 2016
Agenda

Background
- 2016 process
- April 2016 Board action

Current Process
- Staff workgroup
- Timeline, participating agencies, facilitator

Key Issues
- Cost of Service
- Future spending
Background

- MWD’s 2016 budget and rate process
- Hinted about treatment fixed charge in February memo, but no details
- Fixed charge options presented later via PPTs
- Recommendation presented March 30
- Board did not approve staff recommendation in April
Background

- April 2016 board action
  - Define objective of new charge
  - Analyze alternatives for discussion in fall 2016
  - Possible new charge effective 1/1/2018

- July 2016 staff proposed staff workgroup
  - WA delegates argued board should be involved in framing policy issues and process
  - MWD deferred this role to workgroup
Workgroup Process

- Workgroup of member agency and MWD staff
  - 15 member agencies participating
  - Tom Chesnutt “facilitating”
  - Main focus of MWD staff is to increase fixed cost recovery – but slow to provide data to understand nature of costs and benefits

- First meeting invited general comments on “problem to be solved” and “defining success”
  - Important to “do it right” – member agencies want more time
  - Theme is “equity” – this works if based on costs but otherwise is political
Water Authority’s Focus

- Follow Cost of Service requirements
  - Cost-based rates
  - Proportionality of benefits
  - Supported by data

- Implications for future investments
  - Treatment cost is only 15% of MWD expenses
  - MWD proposing major supply projects costing billions of dollars
    - LACSD Recycled Water Program
    - California WaterFix
  - No discussion on which member agencies need the added water supply, nor “assurance” on who will be there to pay for it
Implementation of Governor’s Executive Order regarding Long-Term Water Use Efficiency and Strengthening Water Shortage Contingency Plans

Water Planning Committee
September 22, 2016

Presentation by:
Dana Friehauf, Water Resources Manager
Governor’s May 2016 Executive Order
Overview of Directives

- Eliminate water waste
- Strengthen local drought resilience
- Use water more wisely
- Improve agricultural water use efficiency and drought planning
- Reporting, compliance & enforcement
Strengthening Local Drought Resiliency

Outline of State Agencies’ Proposal

1. Require additional elements in Shortage Contingency Plan (included in Urban Water Management Plan)
   • i.e., communication strategy, financial elements

2. Conduct five-year supply/demand assessment annually
Main Comments

- Support enhancing shortage contingency plans
- Cannot require specific drought rate structure
- Cannot contain mechanism allowing state agency to mandate a single statewide reduction
- Assessment should reflect supplier’s historic dry conditions
- Response actions based on current conditions, not potential conditions at end of assessment period
Use Water More Wisely: New Water Use Targets

Outline of State Agencies’ Proposal

- Single agency-wide gpcd target for 2025 based on efficiency standards for:
  - Indoor residential
  - Outdoor irrigation
  - Water lost through leaks

- Propose that indoor CII “standard” not be volumetric

- Supplier would decide on actions necessary to comply with target
Use Water More Wisely: New Water Use Targets

Outline of State Agencies’ Proposal

Indoor Residential

- Set initial standard at 55 gpcd
  - Consistent with SBX7-7
  - Revise downward, based on water use studies, to 2025 standard

Main Comments

- Support initial standard of 55 gpcd
- Final standard must ensure sufficient wastewater flows for system operation
- Reevaluation of standard should be scientifically-based and consider plumbing codes and appliance standards
Use Water More Wisely: New Water Use Targets

Outline of State Agencies’ Proposal (cont.)

Outdoor Irrigation

- Use irrigable landscape area
- Initial ET adjustment factors consistent with Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance
- Potentially revise downward based on pilot studies

Main Comments

- Support irrigable area and initial MWELO ET factors
- Additional supplier resources needed to verify landscape area data and develop budget
- Uncertainty regarding how agricultural land will be treated
- Variances to account for special outdoor water uses
Use Water More Wisely: New Water Use Targets

Outline of State Agencies’ Proposal (cont.)

Commercial, Industrial, Institutional

- Non-volumetric standard for indoor CII use
- Audits and water management plans for reporting efficiency
- Dedicated CII irrigation accounts included in outdoor standard
  - Require dedicated irrigation meters by 2021 for landscapes that meet certain threshold

Main Comments

- Support non-volumetric standard
- Cost impact associated with installation of dedicated meter
- Difficulty in establishing uniform classifications
Reporting, Compliance, Enforcement: New Water Use Targets

Outline of State Agencies’ Proposal

- Compliance year: 2025
- Annual progress reporting: 2020 – 2024

- Suppliers not meeting 2025 targets, subject to SWRCB enforcement, which could include:
  - Information Orders
  - Conservation Orders
  - Cease & Desist Orders
  - Administrative Civil Liability penalties (fines)
**TENTATIVE Schedule**
Framework on New Water Use Efficiency Targets and Improved Shortage Contingency Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>TENTATIVE Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational Item at SWRCB Meeting</td>
<td>Oct 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Advisory Group Meeting #3</td>
<td>Oct 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Draft Release and Workshop</td>
<td>Nov 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comments Due</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAG and AAG Webinar</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report and Public Workshop</td>
<td>Jan 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposition 53

Legislation, Conservation, and Outreach Committee
September 22, 2016
Background on Proposition 53

- Request for title and summary filed by Dean Cortopassi – January 2015

- “No Blank Checks” initiative

- Required 365,880 valid signatures to qualify

- Qualified in November 2015 – designated as Proposition 53 on November 8 general election ballot
Proposition 53: Provisions

- Would require a statewide vote to approve the issuance of revenue bonds for any proposed revenue bond issuance that meets the following test:
  - Revenue bonds are sold by the state or a JPA created by the state or in which the state is a member
  - OR
  - Revenue bonds are sold for a project funded, owned, operated, or managed by the state
  - AND
  - Revenue bonds sold for a project total more than $2 billion
Proposition 53: Issues Identified

- Prop 53 does not define “project”
  - Courts would likely be required to define what constitutes a single project
  - Could affect scope of application of initiative

- Ambiguity in Prop 53 text
  - To whom does measure apply?
  - When can improvements be considered as stand-alone projects vs. a component of a larger project?

- Lack of clarify and confusion could create legal vulnerability for project proponents
Proposition 53: Proponents

Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
California Republican Party
San Diego Tax Fighters

www.stopblankchecks.com
Proposition 53: Opponents

www.noprop53.com
Staff Recommendation

- Adopt a Resolution opposing Proposition 53, the No Blank Checks initiative, appearing on the November 8, 2016 general election ballot
Sacramento: Year in Review

Legislation, Conservation, and Outreach Committee
September 22, 2016
Looking Back: 2016 Outlook

- Major water issues emerging
  - Water financing
    - Public goods charge/water tax
    - Proposition 218 reform
    - Funding disadvantaged community needs
  - Water markets/transfers
  - Drought – bringing the “Australia Experience” to California
  - Local water supply development
    - Recycling
    - Desalination
    - Stormwater management
Highlights from 2016 Legislative Session

- Significant legislative activity in the following areas:
  - Water use efficiency
  - Energy
  - Water Finance
  - Recycled water
  - Water transfers
  - Salton Sea

- Few efforts successfully navigated through legislative process
Highlights from 2016 Legislative Session

- Water use efficiency
  - AB 2515
  - Irrigation hardware performance standards
  - Submetering
  - Excessive water use
  - CEQA exemption for drought–related projects

- Energy
  - Energy storage
    - AB 33 – long–duration bulk energy storage
  - Oversupply of renewable energy resources
Highlights from 2016 Legislative Session

- Recycled water
  - Ocean discharges
  - Bottling of advanced purified drinking water
  - CEQA exemption for recycled water projects

- Water Finance
  - Local bond measures
  - Proposition 218 modifications

- Salton Sea
  - Revive the Salton Sea fund
  - Park bond funds for Salton Sea restoration
Number of Position Bills Over Past 10 Years

# of Position Bills

![Bar chart showing the number of position bills over the past 10 years with a peak in 2014.]
Major Issues Already on the 2017 State Legislative Session Horizon

- Elimination of ocean discharge
- Tiered water rates/Proposition 218 relief
- Long-term water use efficiency standards
- Energy transmission and distribution
## Upcoming Changes in San Diego Legislative Delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator</th>
<th>Termed Out/Vacating Office</th>
<th>Replacement Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assm. Toni Atkins</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Todd Gloria (D) – Unopposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assm. Brian Jones</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Randy Voepel (R) Mike Harrison (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Marty Block</td>
<td>2020/2016</td>
<td>Toni Atkins (D) John Renison (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assm. Shirley Weber (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Ben Hueso (2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Live WaterSmart Campaign Update

Legislation, Conservation and Outreach Committee

Sept. 22, 2016
Bill Stuffers

- More than 200,000 ordered by 12 member agencies

- English & Spanish

- Distribution in Sept/Oct
Partnerships

- San Diego Realtors Association
- California Restaurant Association – San Diego County
- San Diego County Office of Education

School outreach mailers

Door hangers for Realtors

Restaurant Week table tents

Learn to Live WaterSmart!
FREE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

sdcwa.org/teachers

A WaterSmart Checkup will help you Live WaterSmart indoors and outdoors.
Visit WaterSmartCheckup.org

WaterSmart Checkups are brought to you by the San Diego County Water Authority and its 24 member agencies. For more information, call (866) 183-1332.

WaterSmart San Diego County Water Authority

celebrate local
The California Restaurant Association | San Diego County Chapter
SAN DIEGO RESTAURANT WEEK
SEPTEMBER 25 - OCTOBER 2
SanDiegoRestaurantWeek.com

We’re doing our part to Live WaterSmart by serving water upon request

Find program and resources to help you live Watersmart at WaterSmartSD.org
Supported by the San Diego County Water Authority and its 24 member agencies.
San Diego Miramar College invites you to Live WaterSmart!

- Take shorter showers
- Wash full loads of laundry
- Turn off the faucet

Draft electronic ad for San Diego Community College District

Back to School Day at USD
Social Media

San Diego County Water Authority

Thanks to SDG&E for inviting us to share #LiveWaterSmart at the Waterwise Day employee fair in Kearny Mesa. Great event and great conversations about water-use efficiency.

Conservation Action and 44 others follow
Cleantech San Diego @cleantechsd Sep 12
Support #Imagineadaywithoutwater by sharing a photo that wouldn’t be possible w/o H20 in #sandiego

Imagine a Day Without Water
September 15, 2016

Conservation Garden liked
Padre Dam MWD @PadreDam Aug 24
It’s WaterSmartWednesday! #LiveWaterSmart by watering before 10am & after 5pm & don’t allow runoff when irrigating.

FOX 5 San Diego @fox5sandiego 1h
REMINDER: Turn off sprinklers this morning. Let rain do the work - @sdcwa says.
Forecast: fox5sandiego.com/weather

Rain on.
Sprinklers off.
Creating a plan is key to successfully converting a yard into a water-wise garden.

The first step is to observe and measure existing property to create a plot plan, which is essentially a map that shows the boundaries and physical features of the space that will be upgraded.

This crucial step is easier than you think. All that is needed is a tape measure, a clipboard, a pencil, a ruler and graph paper. Use the grids on the paper to keep the elements in scale,
Events and Promotions

• SDG&E WaterWise Day
• Rise San Diego Breakfast
• Sharp Healthcare Disaster Preparedness Expo
Multi-Cultural Outreach

Live WaterSmart!

Sống khôn ngoan với nước gồm những lưu ý chung thông minh và cách sử dụng nước cho hiệu quả dựa chúng ta đang trái qua một cổ hòn hân hay không. Hợp tác với nhau, chúng ta có thể giúp đảm bảo một nguồn nước dùng tin cậy để giữ San Diego County thêm vững và tươi đẹp ... kề cất bây giờ và cho thế hệ mai sau.

Để biết thêm các chương trình, các ưu đãi và các thông tin giúp bạn hoặc doanh nghiệp của bạn sống khôn ngoan với nước, hãy vào trang mang WaterSmartSD.org.

San Diego County Water Authority
In Development

• Partnerships (San Diego County Apartment Association, San Diego Tourism Authority)

• Media Event

• Sponsorships
Quick Comparison – FY15 v. FY16

- More contracts than 2015
  - FY 15 = 89
  - FY 2016 = 200

- Lower total contracts amount
  - FY 15 = ~ $65 million
  - FY 16 = ~ $56 million

- Money committed to small businesses
  - FY 15 = $41.2 million
  - FY 16 = $15.6 million
Quick Comparison – FY15 v. FY16

- Women/Minority Business – Submit Bids/Proposals
  - FY 15 = 98
  - FY 16 = 54

- Women/Minority Business Participation
  - FY 15 = 61
  - FY 16 = 46

- Women/Minority Dollars Awarded
  - FY 15 = $8.5 million
  - FY 16 = $6.8 million
Small Business Success FY16

- Construction
  - Nob Hill Improvements
    - 88% small
    - 29% M/W
Small Business Success FY16

- Professional Services
  - To Quench a Thirst
  - Grant Support
  - Asset Management Support

- Minority/Woman-Owned
  - Drupal Support
  - PeopleSoft Upgrade
# SCOOP Fiscal Year 2016 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Small</th>
<th>% M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Bidders</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Firms</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Awarded</td>
<td>$55,626,587</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall SCOOP participation goal for 2016 = 30%**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>% Small</th>
<th></th>
<th>% M/W</th>
<th>% M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>M/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primes</td>
<td>$8,709,979</td>
<td>$5,259,450</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs</td>
<td>$5,868,387</td>
<td>$3,612,300</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$2,861,258</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Subtotal</td>
<td>$14,578,366</td>
<td>$8,871,750</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$2,861,258</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primes</td>
<td>$22,415,942</td>
<td>$5,226,690</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$3,216,791</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs</td>
<td>$808,520</td>
<td>$124,860</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Services Subtotal</td>
<td>$23,224,462</td>
<td>$5,351,550</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$3,216,791</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primes</td>
<td>$2,233,689</td>
<td>$113,639</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$6,708</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs</td>
<td>$65,128</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Subtotal</td>
<td>$2,298,817</td>
<td>$113,639</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$6,708</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primes</td>
<td>$31,125,921</td>
<td>$10,486,140</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$3,216,791</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs</td>
<td>$6,676,907</td>
<td>$3,737,160</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$2,861,258</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Subtotal (Design Build, Construction and Professional Services)</td>
<td>$37,802,828</td>
<td>$14,223,300</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$6,078,049</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>$17,823,759</td>
<td>$1,362,455</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$685,363</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$55,626,587</td>
<td>$15,585,755</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>$6,763,412</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOOP Program

- Fiscal Year 2017 Goal – 20%
- Quarterly reports at LCO Committee