



## Budget Narrative

**Applicant Name: Lane Council of Governments**

**EasyGrants Number: 942**

**Organization Type (from Question 1D on BTOP application): State, Local or Other Government**

**Proposed Period of Performance: February 2010 to June 2013**

**Total Project Costs: \$10,488,505**

**Total Federal Grant Request: \$8,375,000**

**Total Matching Funds (Cash): \$203,745**

**Total Matching Funds (In-Kind): \$1,909,760**

**Total Matching Funds (Cash + In-Kind): \$2,113,505**

**Total Matching Funds (Cash + In-Kind) as Percentage of Total Project Costs: 20.15%**

---

### **1. Administrative and legal expenses**

**- List breakout of position(s), time commitment(s) such as hours or level-of-effort, and salary information/rates with a detailed explanation, and additional information as needed.**

The Administrative expenses will be provided by LCOG personnel and contractors, such as engineers who assisted in the preliminary design of the proposed network.. Administrative expenses are limited to the pre-application costs.

	units	time measure	total
Administrative costs	total		\$ 39,000
Pre-application costs	total		\$ 39,000

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**



The Regional Fiber Consortium has provided funds to cover a portion of the cost of the application (\$39,000). This is the only cash match for project administration.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

No in kind match will be used for administrative expenses.

**2. Land, structure, rights-of-way, appraisals, etc.**

**- Provide description of estimated costs, proposed activities, and additional information as needed.**

This project will involve some, but relatively little land acquisition. The total cost is projected to be \$30,000, of which \$18,000 will be an in-kind match.

The only land necessary to acquire will be for the regeneration sites along the route from Eugene to Klamath Falls. As a part of the project planning, we have identified the sites and made arrangements for locating the regeneration facilities. In Oakridge, the first site, the property owner, the City of Oakridge, has agreed to provide a no-cost ten year lease of the property, with a right of renewal. The lease is valued at \$18,000, the value of similar leases made by Oakridge for other regeneration facilities at the same site. At the next regeneration site, in Chemult, we have made arrangements to locate the regeneration equipment in the Oregon Department of Transportation facilities. The cost of this is included in the cost of the installation of equipment in Chemult, rather than a land cost because it will involve the installation of racks in an existing facility for a minimal cost of probably less than \$500 a year. For the third regeneration site, we have made arrangements with the Klamath Tribes to lease a small area of land at the Klamath Tribal headquarters. The tribes are willing to consider the possibility of a donation of the land, but had not made that determination yet, so the possible lease cost of the land is included as an expense.

In Klamath Falls, the end of the Eugene to Klamath Falls run, the fiber will be terminated in an existing interconnection facility. This facility has rack space already available. The project will either rent rack space or work out an exchange of rack space for connectivity to Eugene. The cost of this rental, again, a relatively small amount, is included in the cost of developing the Klamath Falls site.

In Eugene, the project will construct an interconnection facility. The only interconnection facility in Eugene that currently has the necessary attributes of proximity to the other providers and to the internet connectivity in Eugene is Oregon Hall at the University of Oregon. This facility is at capacity and the University is seeking a place where several of the existing tenants can relocate. The project will construct a new interconnection site to supplement the site at the University of Oregon. This site will either be located in a building owned by the Lane Council of Governments at 859 Willamette Street, or at a site already partially leased by the Lane Council of Governments, the Lane County Public Service Building at 125 E. 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Either way, the acquisition will be a low cost lease of space, not a land or right of way acquisition. The small cost of this is included in the price of the interconnection facility.



**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

No cash matching funds are budgeted for this item. While not included as match, a portion of the initial revenues of the project will be spent on the necessary pole attachments and leases to the fiber laterals. Because LCOG is partnering with the electrical utilities (EWEB, SUB and Douglas Fast Net) that control the poles in most of the project area, the actual amount of pole leases is projected to be relatively small.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

The agreed donation of space in Oakridge of a land lease for a regeneration facility is included as an in-kind match donation. This lease, which is valued at \$18,000 is similar to, and is priced similar to other regeneration leases entered into by the City of Oakridge.

### **3. Relocation expenses and payment**

**- Provide explanation for the relocation, description of the person involved in the relocation, method used to calculate costs, and additional information as needed.**

No relocation will be necessary, thus there are no expenses for this item.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

### **4. Architectural and engineering fees**

**- Provide description of estimated fees, explanation of proposed services, and additional information as needed.**

The architectural and engineering fees are projected to total \$424,000. This cost is based on quotes of hourly time from some of the projected engineers, and estimates based on information from other jobs. There is a match of \$6,000 in cash and \$20,000 in in-kind included in the total.

The only architectural charges will be for the modification of an existing building for the interconnection facility in Eugene. This will involve modification of a vacant space to accommodate the installation of racks and power supplies to buildings already containing similar equipment.

The engineering of the system will involve several people, who will design separate portions, or will collaborate on the design. These people will not be licensed engineers, but they will instead be professionals with years of experience in the design and installation of fiber optic systems and the equipment that will be used. The resumes of the most important of them have already been submitted as a part of the application.



These professionals charge varying amounts for their services. The highest of the charges have been used to calculate the costs for these services. It is likely that the project will be able to obtain their services for lower than the estimated price. In addition to the design professionals, a portion of the estimated engineering cost has been set aside for supervision of the design work of these professionals. This service will be provided by an LCOG employee, Dan Mulholland.

Personnel	Hourly Rate	Hours	Cost
Greg Sickler	\$ 107.00	790	\$ 84,530
Steve Ditmar	\$ 106.00	840	\$ 89,040
Architectural work on interconnection	\$ 105.40	150	\$ 15,810
Douglas Fast Net Design	\$ 108.60	700	\$ 76,020
EWEB Design	\$ 125.00	300	\$ 37,500
SUB Design	\$ 102.00	100	\$ 10,200
Engineering Supervision (Dan Mulholland)	\$ 82.00	820	\$ 67,240
Stephen Diercoff	\$ 112.00	300	\$ 33,600
Average rate / total hours and cost	106.00	4000	\$ 424,000

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

One part of the cash match, identified in the tables as the LCOG PAN extensions will draw upon cash that LCOG has available to extend services to public institutions in the Eugene and Springfield area. This will be used as a part of the project to cover a portion of the cost of the project. A portion of the total cash available for this aspect of the project was set aside for design of the route (\$6,000).

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**



The City of Eugene is providing an in-kind match in the form of \$200,000 for a portion of the construction in Eugene. A portion of this (\$20,000) was set aside for the final design of the path.

## **5. Other architectural and engineering fees**

**- Provide description of estimated fees, explanation of proposed services, and additional information as needed.**

There are no other architectural and engineering fees contemplated.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

## **6. Project inspection fees**

**- Provide description of estimated fees, explanation of proposed services, and additional information as needed.**

These costs are not calculated separately. They are included in the engineering fees since the project designers will also be used to inspect the project construction work. Where the construction work is done by the same contractors used on design (Douglas Fast Net, for example) the project inspection was included as a cost of other designers, primarily by Greg Sickler, who is familiar with the Douglas Fast Net work.

As a part of the project, Lane Council of Governments personnel will oversee and inspect the installation of the outside plant and the equipment. These are not fees paid to others, but are considered to be a part of the construction and equipment costs.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

There is no separate calculation of matching funds for this category.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

There is no separate calculation of matching funds for this category.

## **7. Site work**



**- Provide description of estimated fees, explanation of proposed services, and additional information as needed.**

No specific site work is required.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

**8. Demolition and removal**

**- Provide description of estimated fees, explanation of proposed services, and additional information as needed.**

No Demolition or Removal is required.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

**9. Construction**

**- Provide description of estimated fees, explanation of proposed services, state whether the work is being completed by the applicant or an outside contractor, and additional information as needed.**

This area is the major component of the project. The project will consist of the acquisition and construction of hundreds of miles of fiber optic cable. The construction costs projected for this project were based on the recent construction experience of engineers and construction supervisors in the locations where the fiber will be installed. The engineers who assisted in the project design were able to give a preliminary estimate of the amount of underground installation that will be required, as well as using their experience to estimate the cost of acquisition of the fiber optic cable.

Total Construction Cost	\$ 8,407,380
Federal Funding: Fiber Construction	\$ 5,051,270
Federal Funding: Building Construction	\$ 1,236,770
Federal Funding: Construction Management	\$ 88,835



Local Match: Cash	\$ 158,745
Local Match: in-kind	\$ 1,871,760

LCOG will bring to the project miles of fiber optic cable, leased from the Regional Fiber Consortium, making up a backbone of fiber that will connect most of the service areas back to the Eugene Springfield area, where they will all be interconnected and will be connected to the internet. The elements of the backbone that constitute the majority of the match contribution have already been constructed. This backbone runs from Eugene north to Junction City and east to Springfield where it splits into three paths, one north to Coburg, and one south to Melrose, where it will connect with donated fiber from Douglas Fast Net that will take it south to Winston, from where additional backbone will be constructed. The route will also go from Springfield east and then south to Klamath Falls.

The match backbone from the Consortium and from Douglas Fast Net has already been constructed. The additional backbone south of Winston will be constructed by a contractor, Douglas Fast Net. The laterals, which constitute a major part of the project and which will connect the strategic institutions with the fiber backbone will all be constructed by outside contractors. LCOG will hire the contractor that will provide the greatest value to the project. In some areas this contractor has already been identified. With regard to the construction of the laterals and backbone in Douglas County (for Sutherlin, Myrtle Creek, Riddle, Canyonville and Days Creek) Douglas Fast Net will certainly be the most cost effective construction contractor, given that they have experience with construction in Douglas County and will be providing service on the network once the project is complete. The same reasons apply to the construction in Eugene and Springfield, where the incumbent utilities will be providing the backbone from with the proposed laterals will be constructed.

The construction of the laterals on other parts of the route will be put out to bid. For these contractors, as well as for Douglas Fast Net, EWEB and SUB, the cost of the fiber and the cost of construction or installation of the fiber will be contracted with the designated construction agent.

Lane Council of Governments personnel will supervise construction and deal with the several contractors. These costs will include soliciting and contracting with telecommunications providers, who will then participate in the final design of the cable plant. The costs will also include contracting for construction of the cable plant, and then overseeing the construction and dealing with payments to the contractors.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

Source of match							
	Cost element				Value	Cash	in kind
Consortium	Consortium staff payments for project work				\$ 30,000	\$30,000	



Eugene							
	Interconnection grant				\$ 54,745	\$ 54,745	
	Peering point grant				\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	
LCOG							
	PAN Funds				\$ 54,000	\$ 54,000	
Total					\$ 158,745	\$158,745	

The Regional Fiber Consortium has committed \$10,000 a year in project administration costs for a total of \$30,000.

The City of Eugene awarded LCOG two grants for the development of telecommunications resources in Eugene. One grant, for \$54,745 is for the development of better connections in downtown Eugene, the second, for \$20,000 is for the development of a peering point, or interconnection point in Eugene. These funds will be used for the administrative costs of developing the project aspects in Eugene.

The Lane Council of Governments will provide \$54,000 for what is labeled as PAN construction funds. The total contribution of PAN funds will be \$60,000, of which \$6,000 is allocated to engineering. These funds will be used to construct the laterals in Springfield that connect some of the strategic institutions in Springfield. The amount shows the cash match to be applied, after subtracting the small amount for engineering this portion of the project.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

The bulk of the match for this project comes in the in-kind contributions made in this category. LCOG will obtain by lease from the Regional Fiber Consortium the network backbone connecting Eugene with Springfield, Junction City, Coburg, and the points south of Springfield and east of Springfield. LCOG will acquire from Douglas Fast Net fiber connections from the end of the Consortium fiber in Melrose through Roseburg south to the end of the Douglas Fast Net network in Winston.

Several values could be placed on this fiber. If the replacement construction cost was used the fiber could be valued in the multiples of millions of dollars. All of it acquired from the Consortium is buried fiber. Instead, LCOG has chosen to value most of the fiber at a price determined by the U.S. government. At one time the Consortium leased fiber from the Bonneville Power Administration. The BPA provided this fiber at what it said was a discount of its market rate, at a rate for “public interest fiber.” In calculating the value of the match, LCOG used this value of \$22 per fiber per mile per month for most of the fiber contribution. The fiber within the urban area of Eugene and Springfield, up to Coburg, were given a higher value because of the greater cost of construction in urban areas, and the scarcity of the fiber.

Source of match	Cost element	fibers	miles	value/ month	Value	Cash	in kind
Consortium							
	4 fiber from Eugene to K falls	4	173	22	\$913,440		\$913,440
	2 fiber backhaul	2	40	22	\$105,600		\$105,600



	Lowell-Will. Pass					
	4 fiber from Eugene to Melrose	4	85	22	\$448,800	\$448,800
	2 fiber backhaul from Sutherlin	2	15	22	\$ 39,600	\$ 39,600
	8 strands connectivity in Eugene	8	2	40	\$ 38,400	\$ 38,400
	2 strands to Coburg	2	15	40	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000
Eugene						
	Eugene police station connection *				\$ 180,000	\$180,000
Douglas Fast Net						
	4 fiber from Melrose to Winston	4	14	22	\$ 73,920	\$ 73,920
Total					\$1,871,760	\$1,871,769

\* Note: The total value of this contribution is \$200,000, but 10 percent has been subtracted for engineering.

The City of Eugene has pledged in-kind assistance for the construction of fiber laterals in Eugene. This lateral will connect one public safety facility and several medical facilities. It will also pass several business centers where additional connections may be made.

## 10. Equipment

**- Provide list of equipment with description, number of units, unit cost, state whether it is being purchased or leased, and additional information as needed.**

The equipment purchased will be designed specifically to suit the distances and the types of users that will be connected by way of the laterals. Some of the equipment can be passive optical equipment because the distances are short enough and the user installed equipment will be able to generate the signals. For much of the system Wave Division equipment will be used, to allow multiple users use with the maximum of security. This will allow direct connections between some users, such as the medical facilities in Eugene and Springfield, while also allowing other multiple other users to use a different Lambda with VPN software. For the long haul distances, especially on the route between Eugene and Klamath Falls, the particular equipment will be selected in consultation with the provider that is selected by way of a competitive bidding process.

Price estimates are based on prices quoted on equipment offers, especially web based quotes. In some circumstances, where LCOG is aware of lower prices through pre-existing purchase contracts that LCOG is able to access, the lower price was used.

Equipment	Unit Cost	Count	Total
Cisco ME-3400EG-2CS-A & Metro Access IOS 4 port switch	2,174	113	\$ 245,662
Cisco ME-3400EG-12S-M with second power supply, Metro IP Access IOS 1000 Base LX 12 port switch	12,310	5	\$ 61,550



CWDM SFP and CWDM Passive Optics for above	3,800	7	\$ 26,600
			-
Juniper EX 4200, with EX-XFP-10GE-ER dual optics, mounting equipment	32,600	5	\$ 163,000
Cisco 15454, equipped as appropriate depending on location and optical requirements	193,947	5	\$ 969,735
Grand Total Equipment purchase			\$ 1,466,547
Installation supervision by LCOG personnel	72,108		\$ 72,108
Total Equipment Investment			\$ 1,538,655

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for Cash Matching Funds.**

No cash match is planned.

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation for In-Kind Matching Funds.**

No in-kind match is proposed.

**11. Miscellaneous**

**- Provide additional information as needed.**

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation of Cash Matching Funds.**

**- Provide description, calculation, and basis of evaluation of In-Kind Matching Funds.**

**Addendum**

**- If indirect costs (i.e., indirect, overhead, general and administrative, facilities and administration, etc.) and/or fringe benefits are included in the budget, please provide a copy of your existing Negotiated Indirect Cost Recovery Agreement (NICRA), if available. If the NICRA is applied accordingly in the budget, there is no need to justify the costs. If a NICRA is not available or is not consistent with the rates/calculations in the budget, please provide an explanation of how the amounts were calculated. Please clearly list the manner in which indirect costs are calculated in the budget.**



A copy of the negotiated agreement and the latest Indirect Plan is attached. Costs for LCOG personnel were calculated according to the negotiated agreement and the Indirect Plan for Engineering Supervision, Construction Management, and Equipment Installation supervision.



**BROADBAND TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM**  
**Federal Request and Match Verification**

Name of Applicant Organization Lane Council of Governments  
DUNS Number 107957268  
Easy Grants # of Submitted Application 942

As an Authorized Organizational Representative of the entity listed above, I verify that

(i.) The amounts in the "Grant Request" column from the budget table submitted by the entity I represent in response to Question 44 on page 17 of the Broadband Infrastructure Application completely and accurately reflect the amount of the organization's Federal grant request to NTIA; and

(ii.) The amounts in the "Cash \$" and "In-kind \$" fields submitted by the entity I represent in response to Question 52 on page 19 of the Broadband Infrastructure Application completely and accurately reflect, respectively, the organization's cash and in-kind matching contributions for the proposed project.

Signature of authorized person  Date 1-8-10  
Print name of authorized person George Kløppel  
Title or position Director

### DETAIL OF PROJECT COSTS Project 942

PLEASE COMPLETE THE TABLE BELOW FOR THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF EQUIPMENT THAT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR COMPLETING THE PROJECT. EACH CATEGORY SHOULD BE BROKEN DOWN TO THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL FOR IDENTIFYING UNIT COST

SERVICE AREA or COMMON NETWORK FACILITIES:		Eligibility (Yes/No)	Unit Cost	No. of Units	Total Cost	Support of Reasonableness
<b>NETWORK &amp; ACCESS EQUIPMENT</b>					<b>\$1,538,665</b>	
<b>Switching</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Routing</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Transport</b>	Eugene, Lowell, Oakridge, Chemult, Chiloquin, Klamath Falls, Myrtle Creek, Days Creek, Sutherlin, Wilbur, Oakland	Yes	\$104,885.00	11	\$1,153,735	Based on engineering study, with 2 Gigabit Ethernet backbone, local nodes. Path length 180 miles, requires long haul optics, Eugene to Klamath Falls. 10 Gig backbone for Douglas County sites
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Access</b>	Gig E Switches Cisco ME 3400, passive optics, CWDM where required	Yes	\$6,110.00	63	\$384,930	Based on price comparisons for typical access devices. Costs vary based upon configuration
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Other</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>OUTSIDE PLANT</b>					<b>\$7,170,600</b>	
<b>Cables</b>	Laterals and backbone, minimum 24 strands, including fiber and related materials, termination, testing and backbone splicing. Mostly aerial, includes underground duct in some cases.	Yes	\$49,230.00	107	\$5,051,260	Based upon Douglas Electric Co-op, Eugene Water and Electric Board, Springfield Utility Board and independent consultant calculations and estimates.
	Fiber donations @ \$22/mile/month	Yes	\$1,320.00	1198	\$1,581,360	
	Fiber donations @ \$40/mile/month	Yes	\$6,313.00	46	\$290,400	
<b>Conduits</b>	These are expected to be minimal, and are included in the cable cost above				\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Ducts</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	

<b>Poles</b>	These are expected to be				\$0
	minimal, and are included				\$0
	in the cable cost above				\$0
<b>Towers</b>					\$0
					\$0
					\$0
<b>Repeaters</b>					\$0
					\$0
					\$0
<b>Other</b>	Project oversight		\$247,580.00	1	\$247,580
					\$0
					\$0

SERVICE AREA or COMMON NETWORK FACILITIES:		Eligibility (Yes/No)	Unit Cost	No. of Units	Total Cost	Support of Reasonableness
<b>BUILDINGS</b>					<b>\$1,266,770</b>	
<b>New Construction</b>	For Interconnect Site		\$904.00	990	\$894,770	Based on \$1000 per square foot data center construction cost
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Pre-Fab Huts</b>	For Eugene to Klamath Falls		\$114,000.00	3	\$342,000	Includes racks, electrical, etc
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Improvements &amp; Renovation</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Other</b>	Land acquisition for huts		\$15,000.00	2	\$30,000	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>CUSTOMER PREMISE EQUIPMENT</b>					<b>\$0</b>	
<b>Modems</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Set Top Boxes</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Inside Writing</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Other</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>BILLING SUPPORT AND OPERATIONS SUPPORT SYSTEMS</b>					<b>\$0</b>	
<b>Billing Support Systems</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Customer Care Systems</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>Other Support</b>					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	

SERVICE AREA or COMMON NETWORK FACILITIES:	Eligibility (Yes/No)	Unit Cost	No. of Units	Total Cost	Support of Reasonableness	
<b>OPERATING EQUIPMENT</b>					<b>\$0</b>	
Vehicles				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
Office Equipment / Furniture				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
Other				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
<b>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</b>					<b>\$463,000</b>	
Engineering Design					Based upon costs to prepare bid specifications, evaluate responses, supervise construction and installation. Hourly rate varies.	
	Yes	\$106.00	4000	\$424,000		
				\$0		
Project Management					Based on estimated hours, principal LCOG staff and support costs	
		\$39,000.00	1	\$39,000		
				\$0		
Consulting				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
Other				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
<b>TESTING</b>					<b>\$0</b>	
Network Elements				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
IT System Elements				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
User Devices				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
Test Generators				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
Lab Furnishings				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		
Servers / Computers				\$0		
				\$0		
				\$0		

SERVICE AREA or COMMON NETWORK FACILITIES:		Eligibility (Yes/No)	Unit Cost	No. of Units	Total Cost	Support of Reasonableness
<b>OTHER UPFRONT COSTS</b>					\$0	
Site Preparation					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
Other					\$0	
					\$0	
					\$0	
<b>PROJECT TOTAL:</b>					<b>\$10,439,035</b>	

**Lane Council of Governments Project 942**

**BUDGET INFORMATION - Construction Programs**

*NOTE: Certain Federal assistance programs require additional computations to arrive at the Federal share of project costs eligible for participation. If such is the case, you will be notified.*

COST CLASSIFICATION	a. Total Cost	b. Matching Funds (Cash)	c. Matching Funds (In-Kind)	d. Federal Funding Request (Columns a-b-c)
1. Administrative and legal expenses	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$0	\$0
2. Land, structures, rights-of-way, appraisals, etc.	\$30,000		\$18,000	\$12,000
3. Relocation expenses and payments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Architectural and engineering fees	\$424,000	\$6,000	\$20,000	\$398,000
5. Other architectural and engineering fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Project inspection fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7. Site work	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Demolition and removal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Construction	\$8,407,380	\$158,745	\$1,871,760	\$6,376,875
10. Equipment	\$1,538,655	\$0	\$0	\$1,538,655
11. Miscellaneous	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. SUBTOTAL (add #1 through #11)	\$10,439,035	\$203,745	\$1,909,760	\$8,325,530
13. Contingencies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14. SUBTOTAL (add #12 and #13)	\$10,439,035	\$203,745	\$1,909,760	\$8,325,530
15. Project (program) income	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>16. TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (subtract #15 from #14)</b>	<b>\$10,439,035</b>	<b>\$203,745</b>	<b>\$1,909,760</b>	<b>\$8,325,530</b>
FEDERAL FUNDING				
17. Federal assistance requested, calculated as follows: (Consult Federal agency for Federal percentage share.) Enter the resulting Federal share.			Enter eligible costs from line 16a Multiply X 20%	\$2,087,807