

Residential Irrigation Efficiency Implementation Program

**City of Temecula and Portions of the City of
Murrieta and Southwest Riverside County, CA**

FINAL PROJECT REPORT



**U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
Agreement Number R12AP35361**



Rancho California Water District

42135 Winchester Rd.
P.O. Box 9017
Temecula, CA 92589-9017

December 31, 2014

1. Recipient Information

Rancho California Water District
P.O. Box 9017
42135 Winchester Rd.
Temecula, CA 92589-9017

Contacts:

Denise Landstedt (951) 296-6916
Justin Haessly (951) 296-6942
Bill Stephens (951) 296-6921

2. Final Funding Information

	Project Expenditures
Non-Federal Entities	
1. Rancho California Water District	\$190,010.17
2. Eastern Municipal Water District	\$5,570.00
3. Rainbird	\$9,500.00
<i>Non-Federal Subtotal</i>	\$205,080.17
Other Federal Entities	\$0
Bureau of Reclamation	\$1,131.54
Total Project Funding	\$206,211.71

3. Project Summary

The purpose of the Residential Irrigation Efficiency Implementation Program (RIEIP) was to encourage 500 high water users who exceeded their water budget allocations to participate in a cost-effective program in the hopes of reducing their water consumption. The identified customers were mailed a do-it-yourself Water Right Test Kit that included educational and instructional aides that would help assist them on how to recognize, repair and schedule an efficient irrigation system. Customers who continued to exceed their water budget allocation were then offered a professional site irrigation audit that would identify site-specific irrigation system retrofits and repairs. Customers who accepted a site irrigation audit were then given a detailed report of needed repairs, which included a list of pre-qualified irrigation contractors who were capable of making the specialized repairs and improvements.

Upon completion of the recommended improvements and repairs, financial incentives were provided to customers up to 100% of approved retrofit equipment costs and paid upon verification of the repairs. The labor cost were divided up over a 12-month period, and added to the customer's water bill as their portion of participation.

RCWD conducted substantial and extensive outreach and marketing efforts for the RIEIP including direct letter mailings, post card reminders, direct phone calls, and

website advertisements. These efforts were conducted not only to remind and encourage the 500 customers who received a Water Right Test Kit to use the kit to its fullest potential, but also to inform customers that irrigation system retrofit assistance was available to customers who needed it. Despite these efforts, only two customers decided to participate in the irrigation system retrofit component of the Project. During conversations with customers who decided to forgo participation in the irrigation system retrofit component of the Program, RCWD staff encountered an overall apathy among them when it came to improving their water use efficiency. Staff believes that the main contributing factor for this apathy had to do with the time of year during which the Program was implemented and outreach efforts were conducted. The program was implemented during the fall and winter months, when even during a drought year, irrigation water requirements are far lower than during summer months, water bills are generally much lower than during summer months (even if higher tiered rates are being paid), and customers do not think their outdoor watering habits are problematic. RCWD staff believes that if the Program were to be implemented during the spring and summer months of 2015, customer water bills, combined with the statewide media messaging associated with California's current drought, participation would be substantially higher.

Those who participated in the program benefited from the onsite irrigation audits that allowed the contractor to identify potential irrigation upgrades, which included upgrading of the irrigation controller to a Smart Weather Based unit, realignment of irrigation spray heads, and the replacement of more efficient nozzles.

4. Final Project Description

The District began implementation of a budget based tiered rate structure in 2009, which included development of water budgets for each residential water service account. For the RIEIP, these water budgets were compared to water usage histories on an account-by-account basis to identify 500 customers whose water usage exceeds their water budget and who were most likely to benefit from water use efficiency improvements. The sites identified through this effort were then offered two tiers of technical assistance.

Tier I assistance intended to help customers employ do-it-yourself strategies for evaluating their current irrigation scheduling practices and for identifying opportunities for reducing application of irrigation water without performing any irrigation system retrofits. Tier II assistance was offered to customers when Tier I assistance was not effective, which included site consultation services in addition to financial incentives for irrigation system retrofits.

For Tier I assistance, District staff contacted qualified customers by phone and by mail to gauge their interest in participating in the RIEIP. Interested customers received a Water Right Test Kit through direct mail. Each kit contained five catch cans, educational aides, an instructional video, and an easy-to-use scheduling guide to help the customer program an efficient irrigation schedule directly into existing irrigation timers. District staff monitored water usage at sites receiving Tier I assistance.

For those sites continuing to show usage in excess of the water budget after receiving Tier I assistance, Tier II assistance was offered. Tier II assistance included a pre-retrofit site consultation to identify and recommend appropriate, site-specific irrigation system retrofits. Following the site consultation, a report detailing the recommended irrigation system retrofits and a list of pre-qualified irrigation contractors was provided to the customer, who was then responsible for coordinating the retrofit. Once the site retrofit was complete, a post-retrofit site consultation was conducted to verify retrofit expenditures to approve incentives up to 100 percent of approved costs, ensure retrofit quality, and offer any additional suggestions for improving irrigation efficiency. The financial incentive was provided only after consumption fell within the sites' water budget.

The following provides a brief description of work completed in each element of each of the three implementation categories: 1) Pre-Implementation Planning; 2) Implementation; and 3) Administration of Implementation Activities:

Task 1. Pre-Implementation Planning

3.1 Water Budget Establishment

District staff measured irrigated area for residential properties within the District's service area, using GIS aerial imagery and infrared data. This data was used in conjunction with real time, microclimate-specific evapotranspiration (ET_o) data and plant water requirement data to provide properties with monthly water budgets using an established formula.

***Deliverable:** GIS maps for participating sites with irrigated acreage and water budget information*

3.2 Site Identification

Site water budgets were compared to site usage to determine usage that exceeds the calculated water budgets. A list of qualified sites that showed the largest disparity between calculated budget and usage was developed for participation in the RIEIP.

***Deliverable:** List of potential qualified water service accounts*

3.3 Develop Assistance and Educational Materials

Technical assistance and education outreach materials were prepared, including a Water Right Test Kit, an instructional video pertaining to proper use of the test kit, an irrigation scheduling guide, and materials related to irrigation system design and plant material selection. These materials were distributed to customers listed as a qualified site for Tier I assistance.

***Deliverable:** Technical assistance and outreach materials*

3.4 Contractor Procurement

A contractor was secured to perform Tier II assistance activities, which included pre-retrofit site consultations and specific recommendations for irrigation system

retrofits. The selection of the contactor was chosen through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. A list of seven prospective contractors received the RFP, and five contractors responded. The proposals were reviewed and evaluated based on the following criteria:

- **Qualifications:** Provide company background, organizational information, work qualifications, details of experience, skills, know-how, staff training and qualifications.
- **Approach:** Present clear understanding of requirements, provide work plan methodology.
- **Understanding:** Offer knowledge and a working understanding in general landscape, irrigation and auditing principles.
- **Familiarity:** Familiar with appropriate irrigation system, retrofits and devices.
- **Ability:** Demonstrate capability to adjust, program and educate customers on the overall function, adjustments and scheduling features of irrigation controllers.
- **Schedule:** Supply detailed program timeline and reporting examples.
- **Budget:** Provide detailed costs regarding program administration, and labor.

The submitted proposals were scored, with the results shown in the chart below (a legend is shown on the next page). RCWD entered into an agreement with the selected contractor, Mission Resource Conservation District (RCD), on May 15, 2013.

Name	A	B	C	D	E	Weight	Weighted Rating				
							A	B	C	D	E
Qualifications	4	5	5	5	5	1.50	6	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5
Approach	3	4	3	4	4	1.25	3.75	5	3.75	5	5
Understanding	3	3	3	4	4	1.50	4.5	4.5	4.5	6	6
Familiarity	4	4	4	4	4	1.50	6	6	6	6	6
Ability	4	4	4	4	4	1.25	5	5	5	5	5
Schedule	4	3	4	3	4	1.00	4	3	4	3	4
Budget	4	3	1	5	2	1.00	4	3	1	3	2
Weighted Total							33.3	34	31.75	35.5	35.5

Legend: A through E represents the names of the proposers:

- ❖ A: Conserve
- ❖ B: Water Wise
- ❖ C: AquaSave
- ❖ D: Mission RCD
- ❖ E: Norris Consulting

Deliverable: Signed contract with the selected contractor

Task 2. Implementation

2.1 Tier I Assistance Implementation

District staff contacted qualified customers from Task 1.2 by phone and by mail to gauge their interest in participating in the RIEIP. Staff assisted these customers with employing do-it-yourself strategies for evaluating their current irrigation scheduling practices and identifying opportunities to conserve water without performing any irrigation system retrofits.

Interested customers were also sent a Water Right Test Kit through direct mail. Each kit contains five catch cans, educational aides, an instructional video, and an easy-to-use scheduling guide to help the customer program an efficient irrigation schedule directly into existing irrigation timers.

District staff monitored water usage at sites receiving Tier I assistance to assess water savings that resulted from Project implementation. To do this, staff looked at usage data extracted from the billing system for periods of time both before and after Tier 1 Assistance implementation. Results of this analysis are detailed in the deliverable provided for Task 2.3.

Deliverable: List of customers receiving Tier I assistance

2.2 Tier II Assistance Implementation

Customers for whom Tier I assistance was not successful were offered site consultations. Site consultations included a site visit by the program contractor to provide specific recommendations for irrigation system retrofits to result in decreased outdoor water consumption. For customers implementing recommended irrigation system retrofits, the contractor conducted a post-retrofit site visit to verify expenditures and retrofit quality.

Deliverable: List of customers receiving Tier II assistance

2.3 RIEIP Assessment of Performance Measures

A net water savings report was prepared to measure the difference between site water consumption before and after customer participation with an adjustment for differences in weather conditions between pre- and post-participation usage periods.

Deliverable: Report detailing net water savings

2.4 Provide Incentives

Financial incentives were provided to customers for irrigation system retrofits based on approved equipment costs and verification of water consumption reduction (e.g., site consumption must be less than water budget to receive the financial incentive). To process the incentive payment, supporting documentation was required, including receipts and invoices. Incentives were paid up to 100% of qualified equipment (that which resulted in water savings) costs for approved projects not including labor costs for installation. Alternatively to receiving an incentive, installation labor costs were financed on the customers' water bill when requested.

Deliverable: Receipts for retrofit equipment and incentive payment documentation

Task 3. Administration of Implementation Activities

3.1 Facilitate RIEIP Activities

Program administration included all of the following: Coordination of customer participation; oversee site consultation contractor activities; advertise the program; coordinate distribution of technical assistance and educational outreach materials; manage customer applications; send approval letters indicating acceptable retrofit equipment and the potential incentive amounts; track contractor audit schedules and conduct random site visits during irrigation system audits for quality control purposes, and review audit reports and verify reasonableness of site retrofit recommendations.

Deliverable: RIEIP participation application materials and approval letters

5. Accomplishment of Project Goals

The purpose of the RIEIP is to make more efficient use of existing local water supplies through implementation of cost-effective outdoor water use efficiency measures with the intent of enhancing local water supply availability and reducing per capita water consumption for residential customers within the District's service area.

The following RIEIP goals and objectives are described with each defined outcome:

- a. Developed accurate water allocations/budgets for 36,738 residential customers through GIS imagery and infrared data analysis.
- b. Compared water allocations/budgets to water usage histories on a site-by-site basis to identify 500 customers who are most likely to benefit from water use efficiency improvements.
- c. Targeted 500 identified sites for various levels of technical assistance and educational outreach including do-it-yourself strategies and direct assistance.
- d. Provided financial incentives equal to 100% of approved irrigation system equipment costs to qualified residential customers for irrigation system hardware retrofits.
- e. Reduced water consumption at participating sites by 800 acre feet over a ten-year period.

6. Amount of Water Conserved, Marketed or Better Managed

(Responding to the questions below, rely on the best data or information available. Actual field measurements should be used whenever possible (e.g., baseline data or post-project data derived from measuring devices, diversion records, seepage tests, etc.). Where actual field measurements are not available, water savings (or amounts marketed or better managed) may be estimated based on studies, other similar improvement projects, or anecdotal evidence.)

A. RCWD Total Water Supply (average annual available in AF/Y)

Average annual supply over 10-15 years is approximately 75,000 AF/Y. However, the recent drought conditions, specifically in the past three years, have limited supply. The average annual supply in the past 3 years is approximately 66,300 AF/Y. Total RCWD water supply includes imported treated, groundwater, and recycled water.

B. Amount and Calculation of Water Conserved, Marketed or Better Managed as a Result of the RIEIP

Water Management Benefit	Method of Performance Measurement	Estimated Benefits (AF/Year)	Actual Benefits (AF/Year)
Makes More Water Available Through Conservation	<p>Without accurate water budget data for all 36,738 residential sites, the District has still identified 549 acre feet of water per year (AF/Y) applied in excess of water budgets for 500 residential customers. Over the estimated 10-year life of the project, this would equal 5,490 acre feet (AF) of water savings.</p> <p>For documenting actual net annual water savings resulting from RIEIP implementation, the following formula was used:</p> $NWS = [(WC_{pre}/ET_{pre}) - (WC_{post}/ET_{post})] \times 65$ <p>where,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWS = Net Water Savings WC_{pre} = Pre-participation water consumption WC_{post} = Post-participation water consumption ET_{pre} = Pre-participation Evapotranspiration ET_{post} = Post-participation Evapotranspiration 65 = inches of annual Evapotranspiration <p>Water consumption data was extracted from the District's billing system, which collects daily reads through a fixed computer network from telemetry equipment connected to propeller driven water meters. As is indicated in the formula, percent change in ET (evapotranspiration) between pre- and post-implementation time periods was used to adjust water savings to account for changes in weather.</p>	549 AF/Y	80 AF/Y

Water Management Benefit	Method of Performance Measurement	Estimated Benefits (AF/Year)	Actual Benefits (AF/Year)
Reduces Per Capita Use	<p>To estimate reduced per capita usage resulting from RIEIP implementation, total estimated annual water savings (549 AF) was converted from AF/Y to gallons per day and divided by the number of residents (GPCD) in RCWD's service area in the year 2010 as shown here:</p> <p>Convert AF/Y to gallons per day (GPD): 549 AF conserved per year = 1.5 AF conserved per day = 488,777 GPD conserved</p> <p>Divide GPD conserved by number of RCWD water users: 488,777 GPD conserved / 133,213 residents = 3.7 GPCD</p> <p>Following RIEIP implementation, actual reduced per capita usage was quantified according to the following formula:</p> $\Delta PCU = NWS / SR$ <p>where, ΔPCU = Per Capita Usage Change in gallons per day NWS = Net Water Savings in gallons per day SR = Total current # of residents in RCWD's service area</p>	3.7 GPCD Reduction	0.54 GPCD Reduction
Improves Water Supply Reliability	It is expected that water made available through conservation would be available on an annual basis throughout the 10-year life of the project.	Each year for 10 years	Each year for 10 years
Provides Technical Training and Assistance	Performance for this project benefit was measured in terms of the number of people assisted/trained/educated. 500 households were targeted, and at an average of 3.2 people per site, this is equal to 1,600 people.	1,600 people	1,600 people
Provides Water Conservation Education	Performance for this project benefit was measured in terms of the number of people assisted/trained/educated. 500 households were targeted, and at an average of 3.2 people per site, this is equal to 1,600 people.	1,600 people	1,600 people

a. Calculation Information/Data

Describe the information/data being relied on to calculate/estimate the project benefits. State how that data/information was obtained, if appropriate. Provide any other information necessary to explain how the final calculation/estimate of project benefits was made.

Water consumption information was extracted from the District's billing system, which collects daily consumption data through a fixed computer network from telemetry equipment connected to propeller driven water meters. The pre- and post-Project participation consumption data was compared and adjusted according to differences in weather conditions between the two periods. Net water savings was estimated based on the following formula:

$$NWS = [(WC_{pre}/ET_{pre}) - (WC_{post}/ET_{post})] \times 65$$

where,

- NWS = Net Water Savings
- WC_{pre} = Pre-participation water consumption
- WC_{post} = Post-participation water consumption
- ET_{pre} = Pre-participation Evapotranspiration
- ET_{post} = Post-participation Evapotranspiration
- 65 = inches of annual Evapotranspiration

b. Reliability of Information/Data

As appropriate, include an explanation of any concerns or factors affecting the reliability of the data/information relied on.

The data used to quantify project benefits is dependable, and there are no concerns regarding its reliability.

c. Supporting Data Attached

Briefly list and describe, then attach, any relevant data, reports or other support relied on in the calculation/estimate of project benefits, if available.

Following is a summary of the Water Savings:

# Participating Customers	ET Adjusted Pre-Participation Water Consumption (AF)	ET Adjusted Post-Participation Water Consumption (AF)	Net Water Savings
497	531	451	80

C. Use of Conserved Water

Explain where the water saved, better managed, or marketed as a result of the project is going, e.g., used by the recipient, in stream flows, available to junior water users, etc.

Water conserved as a result of this project was not pumped from its sources. The sources include the California Bay Delta, the Colorado River, and the District's local aquifer. For each acre foot of water conserved, approximately one third would have originated in the local aquifer, and two thirds would have been imported. Of that import water, about two thirds would have originated in the Colorado River watershed, and the remainder in the Bay Delta.

D. Future Tracking of Project Benefits

State whether and how RCWD plans to track the project benefits (water saved, marketed or better managed) in the future. If no actual field measurements are currently available to support the estimate of project benefits, state whether actual

field measurements will become available in the future. If so, state whether RCWD is willing to provide such data to Reclamation on a voluntary basis once available.

RCWD has no plans to track the Project benefits in the future beyond the current Project benefits identified; however, should Reclamation request that an analysis of water savings be conducted in the future, RCWD would provide the analysis.

7. Amount of Renewable Energy Added

If the project included a renewable energy component, describe the amount of energy the system is generating annually. Provide data/reports in support of the calculation.

The RIEIP does not have a renewable energy component.

8. Project Collaboration, Stakeholder Involvement or Formation of Partnerships

Describe the collaboration involved in the project, and the role of any cost share or other types of partners. List the additional entities that provided support [financial or otherwise].

The Project included the distribution of Water Right Test Kits, which included tools to help Project participants save water. Five hundred kits were provided by Eastern Municipal Water District, the District's wholesale water agency, and were valued at a total of \$5,570. Additionally, Rainbird, an irrigation equipment manufacturer, created a technical assistance video that was included as a supplement to the Water Right Test Kit. Costs for the production of this video were \$9,500. Lastly, the Program's two Tier 2 assistance recipients contributed 50% of the labor costs required for implementing their irrigation system retrofits.

9. Other Pertinent Issues Regarding the Residential Irrigation Efficiency Implementation Project

Water Savings that were estimated to result from the Project prior to its implementation were higher than those actually realized after implementation. The reason for this was the apparent lack of interest among those water customers targeted for participation, for the reasons stated in Section 3 Program Summary. Despite RCWD's rigorous marketing efforts, which included letter mailing, post card mailing, direct phone calls, and website advertisements, only two of the 100 customers targeted for irrigation system retrofits decided to participate in Tier 2 assistance.

Although the low participation caused the Project's water savings to fall short of its targets, it also caused the budget provided by Reclamation for Project implementation to not be fully spent. Therefore, when one considers the following comparison between the Project's actual water savings and its actual cost to Reclamation, the Project remains cost effective.

Cost to Reclamation	Water Savings (AF)	Cost/AF
\$1,131.54	80	\$14.14

The District has only requested reimbursement from Reclamation for \$1,131.54 of the \$55,000 funding share shown in the agreement. This is explained more fully in Section 12 Final Project Costs.

10. Feedback to Reclamation Regarding the Water Conservation Field Services Program

When a proposal includes a funding split that is different from a 50/50 split between the Recipient Funding and Reclamation Funding across all Budget Items, Reclamation should consider this funding proposal split and discuss with the proposer before automatically changing the split to 50/50 for the agreement. There may be a good reason not to split costs in all Budget Items, which is the case for this project, as discussed in Section 12 Final Project Costs.

11. Attachments – Provided upon request

Since the Project is District-wide at multiple private property locations, maps, drawings, or photos are not feasible to provide. The Final Project Costs are shown in the next section. All items listed as follows and all deliverables noted in each task in Section 4 above will be provided upon Reclamation's request.

- a. RIEIP Participation Tracking Sheet
- b. Customer Reports
- c. Customer Return on Investment/Approval Letter
- d. Contractor Invoices
- e. Irrigation Check list
- f. Water Right Test Kit Letter
- g. Water Right Test Kit Insert
- h. Phone Script

12. Final Project Costs

The District has requested reimbursement from Reclamation for only \$1,131.54 of the \$55,000 funding share shown in the agreement. The District's proposed budget included a cost share split that was not 50% Recipient Funding/50% Reclamation Funding across all Budget Items. Rather, the District proposed to request Reclamation Funding in Supplies/Materials and Contractual to capture the costs associated that directly benefit our customers. When Reclamation prepared the funding agreement, the costs were split 50%/50% and indicated that we could request reimbursement as proposed, not necessarily as shown in the agreement. Therefore, for the periods requesting reimbursement we did not request reimbursement for Salaries and Wages, Fringe and Indirect Costs, and would later request Reclamation Funding for Supplies/Materials and Contractual costs as customers participated. However, as discussed earlier, low participation ensued and the program costs were not realized. Therefore, no additional Reclamation funding was requested. The Final Project Cost table is shown on the following page.

Residential Irrigation Efficiency Implementation Project
 Agreement No. R12AP35361
 Project Completion Report

Budget Item Description	Computation						Recipient Funding	Other Funding	Reclamation Funding	Total Cost
	FY 11/12		FY 12/13		FY 13/14					
	\$/Hrs or Unit	Quantity (Hrs or Units)	\$/Hrs or Unit	Quantity (Hrs or Units)	\$/Hrs or Unit	Quantity (Hrs or Units)				
Salaries and Wages										
Steven Bell, Intern					\$ 12.5000	172.00	\$ 2,150.00			\$ 2,150.00
William Stephens, Sr. Water Resources Planner			\$ 48.8955	11.00	\$ 51.6352	115.50	\$ 6,501.72			\$ 6,501.72
Justin Haessly, Conservation/Water Use Efficiency Analyst					\$ 45.5400	6.00	\$ 273.24			\$ 273.24
Krisma Crowell, Engineering Services 1	\$ 28.1855	224.50	\$ 29.9093	186.00			\$ 11,890.77			\$ 11,890.77
Kim Kerckhoff, Engineering Services 2	\$ 29.1002	94.00	\$ 39.7498	94.75			\$ 6,501.71			\$ 6,501.71
Erica Peter, Engineering Services 3	\$ 21.9000	102.50	\$ 23.2229	311.50			\$ 9,478.68			\$ 9,478.68
Lil Rajkovich, Engineering Services 4	\$ 29.1005	66.50	\$ 29.8961	70.00			\$ 4,027.91			\$ 4,027.91
Corry Smith, Engineering Services 5	\$ 34.0723	58.75	\$ 37.3439	54.50			\$ 4,036.99			\$ 4,036.99
Salaries and Wages Subtotal		546.25		727.75		293.50	\$ 44,861.02			\$ 44,861.02
Fringe Benefits	Basis									
FY11/12 All staff are full time employees	\$ 15,244.74	72.91%					\$ 11,114.94			\$ 11,114.94
FY12/13 All staff are full time employees	\$ 21,229.17	77.71%					\$ 16,497.19			\$ 16,497.19
FY13/14 All staff are full time employees	\$ 8,387.11	72.91%					\$ 6,115.04			\$ 6,115.04
Fringe Benefits Subtotal	\$ 44,861.02						\$ 33,727.17			\$ 33,727.17
Travel										
N/A										
Equipment										
N/A										
Supplies/Materials										
Water Right Test Kits (Eastern Municipal Water District)	\$ 11.14	500						\$ 5,570.00		\$ 5,570.00
Site Consultation Contractor (per site)	\$ 926.54	1					\$ 402.50	\$ 524.04	\$ 926.54	\$ 926.54
Supplies/Materials Subtotal							\$ 402.50	\$ 5,570.00	\$ 524.04	\$ 6,496.54
Contractual/Construction										
Water Budget Contractor (per hour)	\$ 40.00	283					\$ 10,716.50		\$ 607.50	\$ 11,324.00
Site Consultation Contractor (per site)	\$ 121.50	10					\$ 1,215.00			\$ 1,215.00
Instructional Video Contractor (Rainbird)	\$ 9,500.00	1						\$ 9,500.00		\$ 9,500.00
Contractual/Construction Subtotal							\$ 11,931.50	\$ 9,500.00	\$ 607.50	\$ 22,039.00
Other										
Adjustment Due to Funding (n/a for final costs)										
Other Subtotal										
Total Direct Costs							\$ 90,922.19	\$ 15,070.00	\$ 1,131.54	\$ 107,123.73
	Basis	Final	Provisional							
FY11/12 Indirect Costs: 207.23% of Salaries and Wages	\$ 15,244.74	207.23%					\$ 31,591.67			\$ 31,591.67
FY12/13 Indirect Costs: 236.07% of Salaries and Wages	\$ 21,229.17	236.07%					\$ 50,115.70			\$ 50,115.70
FY13/14 Indirect Costs: 207.23% of Salaries and Wages	\$ 8,387.11		207.23%				\$ 17,380.61			\$ 17,380.61
Total Indirect Costs							\$ 99,087.98			\$ 99,087.98
Total Project Costs							\$ 190,010.17	\$ 15,070.00	\$ 1,131.54	\$ 206,211.71