



RIVERDALE NATURE PRESERVANCY
2015-2016 ANNUAL REPORT

Table of Contents

Activities	1
Guides to development – Planning, zoning and historic preservation.....	1
Local experience illustrates limits to protections.....	1
Limits spur city-wide changes to Special Natural Area District zoning regulations	3
Development pushes against 197-a land use plan	4
New zoning puts low-density residential zoning at risk city-wide	6
Long-term planning and preservation	
Hudson River Valley Greenway.....	9
Pesticides and herbicides	9
Henry Hudson Parkway listing in the National Register of Historic Places	10
Provide Information and Strengthen Communication	10
Annual Financial Statement 2015	13
Annual Financial Statement 2016	14
Board of Directors 2015	15
Board of Directors 2016	16
Tables	
Table A - ZQA and MIH Public Hearing Process and Preservancy Participation	7
Table B - Summary of email blasts in 2015 and 2016	12

Riverdale Nature Preservancy
c/o Riverdale Neighborhood House
5521 Mosholu Avenue
Bronx, NY 10471

www.RiverdaleNature.org
info@RiverdaleNature.org

The Riverdale Nature Preservancy is a non-profit 501(c)3 membership organization working in Community District 8 in the northwest Bronx, New York City. We are organized for the purpose of protecting the natural and historic features and the neighborhood character of this unique part of New York City. Our neighborhood has retained much of its hilly topography and treed landscape, and the rustic features of the area's first roads and settlements, because of visionary protections of earlier generations of residents, because of our low-density and Special Natural Area District (SNAD) zoning and because of the landmarking of historic districts and individual buildings in the area.

Activities

The Preservancy **monitors local development** projects to ensure full compliance with zoning and historic preservation regulations. We **initiate and participate in long-term planning and preservation** projects to ensure that community needs are heard and met, and to protect and enhance Riverdale's superb natural environment and community character. We also **provide information** through community meetings, written materials and our website, to enable local residents to be active and engaged in environmental and planning issues.

Guides to development – planning, zoning and historic preservation

Changes to the built environment in Riverdale are guided by our

- local 197-a land use plan, *River to Reservoir*
- base zoning
- Special Natural Area District (SNAD) overlay zoning, and
- regulations for the Riverdale and Fieldston historic districts

Local experience illustrates limits to protections

Historically, the core of the Preservancy's work has been to monitor local development and to advocate for protection of natural and historic features in Riverdale under zoning and historic preservation regulations.

Several development projects proposed or continuing in early 2015 raised the community's awareness of gaps in these regulations. Members of the Preservancy Board met with property representatives when feasible and presented comments to Bronx Community Board 8's Land Use Committee meetings on January 12, 2015 and February 5, 2015

- **Salanter Akiba Riverdale Academy (SAR)** submitted a land use application in December 2014 to the NYC Planning Commission for

authorizations to change steep slopes, trees and other vegetation on its property in order to enlarge its main school building and extend a playground. SAR responded to community comments—including a meeting between representatives of the Preservancy board and SAR on January 8 and the Preservancy's comments to the Community Board—by altering its plans. In February 2015 SAR proposed moving one of its proposed buildings 15 feet away from the property line to accommodate both a neighbor and proposed trees plantings.

The Preservancy took the opportunity to encourage SAR to incorporate “green” architectural elements into its project, including

- White, blue or green roofs
 - On-site storm water management
 - Rain gardens
 - Comprehensive ecosystem plantings
 - Permeable paving materials
-
- An application to subdivide and build three new houses on a property in Fieldston adjacent to **Delafield Pond, also known as Indian Pond**, was submitted to the NYC Planning Commission in 2010. In 2014 the NYC Department of City Planning issued a negative declaration under its environmental review and determined that the project met the requirements of SNAD zoning regulations. The Community Board 8 Land Use Committee considered the application in January 2015.

The Indian Pond development was found to meet SNAD requirements, but the site is also within the Fieldston Historic District. The Preservancy's comments to the Community Board emphasized that the proposal “both distracts and detracts from the Fieldston Historic District's sense of place and the historic setting of the existing home. It is not appropriate to the historic district.” The full Community Board voted on February 10, 2015 to disapprove the application.

A week later, on February 17, the community turned out to speak at the hearing of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The Preservancy again objected to elements of the design and site plan, and expressed concern for future water quality in Delafield Pond. The Commission decided to delay action until commissioners had a chance to visit the site. By the close of 2016, the proposal had not been rescheduled for consideration.

- **The Cardinal O'Connor Clergy Residence** was one of several properties to lose a number of large, valuable trees while complying with SNAD regulations.

Limits spur city-wide changes to Special Natural Area District zoning regulations

The bigger picture – Preservancy challenges the effectiveness of Special Natural Area District (SNAD) regulations

SAR, Indian Pond, and the clergy residence were the latest projects to demonstrate to the community that a development could comply with SNAD regulations and still result in the loss of treasured, mature trees and ecosystems.

The Preservancy championed a review of SNAD regulations in a letter to the Community Board 8 Land Use Committee dated January 12, 2015. The Preservancy's letter cites loss of "a large number of old growth trees" as a result of the expansion of the Cardinal O'Connor Clergy Residence on Arlington Avenue and asks

"... what is the value of a SNAD if a property can be stripped of its glorious trees in such a manner? ...what is the role of the regulatory bodies if this occurred in the SNAD without proper oversight and with minimal opportunity for community review and input? The Preservancy believes it is time to review the SNAD regulations and modify and strengthen them where appropriate. To this end, the Preservancy asks that the Committee undertake a thorough review of these regulations, and offers to assist the Committee with this review."

Initiation of a study by the Community Board and a text amendment by City Planning

Community dissatisfaction with outcomes of the SNAD regulations prompted both Bronx Community Board 8 and the NYC Department of City Planning to begin in 2015 to examine the effectiveness of SNAD zoning. The Community Board focused on improving the existing regulations, while City Planning considered ways to change the entire approach. Both bodies were concerned with enforcement.

The SNAD is mapped in both the Bronx and Staten Island. City Planning organized separate working groups in each borough, and invited the Preservancy to join the Bronx group. Planners are relying, in this multi-year effort, on input from the community with regard to practical aspects of implementation as well as definition of goals for the new regulations.

Over the course of 2015 – 2016:

- Four meetings of the Bronx working group were held over the summer and fall of 2015
- The Preservancy board provided to City Planning extensive comments on the first working group meeting
- In May of 2016, city planners attended the Preservancy board's regular monthly meeting, where they presented their draft approach and engaged in frank and detailed discussion with board members
- In July 2016, City Planning presented their proposed changes to the Community Board 8 Land Use Committee

At this stage in the review, discussion has centered on City Planning's initial goals:

- Increase predictability of SNAD reviews
- Increase as-of-right provisions
- Add protections of land and ecosystems to the regulations

The Preservancy's extensive experience with the outcomes of efforts to protect resources under current SNAD regulations and with the costs incurred by homeowners proceeding through the SNAD review process enables the Preservancy to provide DCP with detailed insights.

City Planning recognizes that the field of resource protection has changed since the SNAD regulations were first conceptualized and written in 1974. Planners are attempting to move away from a menu approach of individual types of protections for individual types of resources to an overall ecosystem approach.

Moreover, the agency's experience with discretionary SNAD review has suggested to planners the possibility of defining strict criteria which could allow a project in the SNAD to proceed as-of-right.

While understanding this viewpoint, the Preservancy cautioned that the new guidelines must prioritize identification and protection of natural features over increased short-term efficiency and predictability. The Preservancy is encouraged that City Planning is basing its approach on current thinking in ecology and best practices in landscape design and maintenance. In this initial phase, it is unclear how or whether the goal of increasing as-of-right development is compatible with the goal of protecting natural features, land and ecosystems.

Other important issues emphasized to City Planning by the Preservancy include

- The vital need for education of property owners as to their responsibilities under SNAD,
- Requirements that new plantings installed under SNAD requirements be replaced if they do not live for a still-to-be-determined length of time, and
- Potential conflicts of interest for arborists who currently are asked both to certify that a tree is diseased or a hazard and to remove the tree.

The Preservancy offered to assist DCP in the future with distribution of educational materials about the SNAD.

Development pushes against 197-a land use plan

Riverdale is one of only 13 communities in NYC (as of July 2013, according to City Planning's website) to have created a Community Plan to guide local development. Community Plans are referred to as 197-a Plans because they are authorized by Section 197-a of the City Charter.

CD 8 2000: A River to Reservoir Preservation Strategy was adopted by the NY City Council on November 19, 2003. The plan was sponsored by Bronx Community Board 8 and involved discussion and study over several years by city agencies, residents, and business owners. The Preservancy led discussion of recommendations for the Special Natural Area District.

Many of the recommendations in *River to Reservoir* were implemented through zoning changes, including rezoning large portions of Community District 8 to R1-1, the lowest-density residential zoning district in NYC, and strengthening the SNAD regulations.

Development proposal upends 197-a Plan and puts Riverdale's large lots and low-density zoning at risk

In 2012, **Hebrew Home at Riverdale** proposed a massive development of over 300 apartments for 14 acres along the Hudson River, on land that was zoned R1-1 as part of the implementation of the 197-a Plan. Specifically, the proposed apartment buildings would be built on land zoned for single-family, detached homes with a minimum lot size of 9,600 square feet. The property was adjacent to an existing Hebrew Home geriatric care facility on land zoned R4 for mid-density residential buildings.

City officials and residents agree that NYC needs more affordable housing in general and more affordable housing for the expanding proportion of aging residents. However, the Preservancy expressed to the Borough President in a 2013 letter that "changes on the Hebrew Home property that are vastly outside of the vision of *River to Reservoir* and the expectations of our zoning regulations will not only call into question the value of the protections but will prime conditions for additional, incremental changes on nearby properties that when taken together over time will cumulatively and irretrievably alter Riverdale's character."

By the end of 2013 the community and Hebrew Home had developed separate concept plans expressing different visions of the appropriate level of density and massing on the site. Continuing opposition by the Riverdale Nature Preservancy and the Riverdale Community Coalition (RCC), formed in January 2013, plus lack of support from Bronx Community Board 8, brought the Hebrew Home to the table in February 2015.

By May 2015, two meetings of architects representing each party resulted in a new plan which included a shift of building massing to the R4 site and reorientation of buildings on the R1-1 site to re-establish views of the Hudson River from the road. Preservation of open space on the R1-1 site, with public access, was also under discussion.

However, in August 2015 the community made it clear to Hebrew Home and elected officials that the plan remained too large and too out-of-scale with its surroundings to support.

New zoning puts low-density residential zoning at risk city-wide

During the protracted struggle in 2015 over the shape of new development on the Hebrew Home site, the NYC Department of City Planning proposed two new, city-wide zoning changes aimed at increasing the overall supply of affordable housing in the city and at improving the quality of housing in general.

The two new zoning proposals, known as zoning for Moderate Income Housing (MIH) and Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA), went through a very contentious public review process and were adopted with modifications by the NY City Council on March 22, 2016.

Critical to the Hebrew Home project was a provision in ZQA that made it possible to build long-term care facilities in New York City's lowest-density residential districts, R1 and R2, with approval of a special permit.

Hebrew Home had applied to New York State to be licensed as a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC). CCRCs are included in the city's zoning definition of long-term care facility, and with their approval of ZQA the City Council thus allowed CCRCs in R1 and R2 districts via special permit.

Recognizing the intrusion these developments will likely make into low-density neighborhoods, the City Council required developers to demonstrate in their application for special permit that a facility will

- Be compatible with the character of the surrounding area,
- Be sited and landscaped in a way to adequately buffer themselves from nearby residences, and
- Make provisions to handle traffic on access streets.

The Preservancy, Riverdale Community Coalition and other local groups recognized the historic nature of Hebrew Home's application. Final approval by NY State of Hebrew Home's CCRC application would not only impact the character of Riverdale. It would create an incentive for development in low-density neighborhoods across New York City.

Members of the Preservancy board met with planners at City Planning and with their City Council member in July, to make their case.

When Hebrew Home came back before the Community Board Land Use Committee in September 2016, community groups argued that the presentation did not address the special permit findings required by ZQA.

Timeline of public review of ZQA and MIH

As noted above, the City Council adopted with modifications ZQA and MIH on March 22, 2016. Public review of the two proposed zoning text amendments, put forth by the NYC Department of City Planning (DCP), began in September 2015.

According to DCP, the purpose of MIH was to "encourage housing production, affordability, and quality". The purpose of ZQA was to "address several ways in which [NYC's zoning] regulations, drafted a generation ago, have in practice discouraged the affordability and quality of recent buildings".

The Preservancy supports the Mayor's goals: preserving and developing affordable housing in all boroughs, and improving the quality of housing for all. However, the original proposals were decried throughout the city as one-size-fits-all in a city of individual neighborhoods.

The Preservancy participated vigorously in the public review process as a founding member of the Riverdale Community Coalition (RCC). RCC members engaged with our elected officials, gave hours of time to offer thoughtful testimony at public hearings and reached out to the community with emails and phone calls to insist that MIH and ZQA not reverse years of community preservation efforts especially as expressed in the community board's 197-a plan and the subsequent rezonings approved by the City Planning Commission to implement the plan. Table A details the public hearing process and highlights Preservancy participation.

Table A ZQA and MIH Public Hearing Process and Preservancy Participation	
April 2015	A draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to MIH and ZQA is available for public comment.
June 25, 2015	The NYC Department of City Planning presents its proposed zoning text amendments, referred to as MIH and ZQA, at a meeting of the Bronx Community Board 8 Land Use Committee. The Chair of the Preservancy is in attendance. Formal review by the Community Boards is to begin in the fall, after the summer break.
September 2015	Community organizations of the NW Bronx meet to organize opposition to the MIH and ZQA zoning text amendments as proposed. The Riverdale Nature Preservancy is a founding member of the new coalition.
September 8, 2015	The newly-formed Community District 8 Neighborhood Coalition reads a statement of concerns about the proposed MIH and ZQA text amendments at the Bronx Community Board 8 first full board meeting after the summer break.
September 10, 2015	Preservancy co-president attends a meeting between community members and City Council member.
September 18, 2015	DCP issued a Negative Declaration for the Environmental Assessment Study for MIH
September 2015	Preservancy posts informational materials on its website
September 19, 2015	Director of the Bronx office of NYC Department of City Planning, NYS Assemblyman representing Riverdale, and the Housing Policy Analyst for the Community Service Society host a community discussion entitled Solving the Puzzle: How Do We Build Enough Affordable Housing? The Preservancy is represented by several members of the board.
September 21, 2015	DCP refers out the citywide text amendment known as MIH

October 14, 2015	Bronx Community Board 8 Land Use Committee meet to discuss MIH zoning text amendment. Preservancy board members are present.
October 28, 2015	Bronx Community Board 8 Land Use Committee meet to discuss ZQA zoning text amendment. Preservancy board members are present.
October 29, 2015	The Preservancy's Annual Meeting is an information session about ZQA and MIH. It features a presentation by the Preservancy Chairman on the technical aspects of the zoning proposal and a comprehensive discussion with Riverdale's City Council Member and NYS Senator. Community members are urged to speak at upcoming public hearings.
November 6, 2015	Preservancy sends email blast urging members to attend and comment at Bronx Community Board Land Use Committee meeting on November 9.
November 9, 2015	Community Board 8 Land Use Committee Public Hearing on ZQA/MIH. Preservancy Chairman presents the Preservancy's statement. The Chair reminds the community board that the proposed zoning changes would undermine the community board's 197-a plan and the zoning that was approved by the NYC Planning Commission to implement the plan. The Committee unanimously passed two resolutions opposing ZQA and MIH.
November 10, 2015	The full community board votes unanimously, with two abstentions, for the Committee's resolutions opposing ZQA and MIH. Preservancy Chairman presents the Preservancy's views during the Board's gallery session.
November 12, 2015	The Borough Board hears public comments on ZQA and MIH. Preservancy Co-President presents the Preservancy's views to the Borough Board.
November 19, 2015	The Bronx Borough Board votes unanimously 0-19-1 to oppose the proposed text amendments. The City Council Speaker, who sits on the Borough Board, votes to abstain. Borough President issues a press release with his remarks on the zoning.
December 8, 2015	The Preservancy's annual fundraising appeal includes an announcement of the December 16 City Planning Commission public hearing and urges all to "attend, speak or send comments".
December 16, 2015	NY City Planning Commission public hearing. The packed hearing begins at 9:00 AM and lasts well into the evening. Preservancy Chairman delivers the Preservancy's remarks.
February 3, 2016	City Planning Commission votes to approve ZQA and MIH
February 4, 2016	Community Board 8 Land Use Committee approves resolution reiterating rejection of MIH and ZQA
February 9, 2016	City Council public hearing on MIH
February 10, 2016	City Council public hearing on ZQA. Preservancy co-president reads Preservancy testimony
March 17, 2016	City Council Zoning Subcommittee and Land Use Committee vote to approve modified versions of MIH and ZQA
March 22, 2016	Full City Council votes to approve both MIH and ZQA with modifications

Long-term planning and preservation

Hudson River Valley Greenway

Final recommendations for a route for the Hudson River Valley Greenway in the Bronx were released by the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) at the end of 2013.

The plan was presented to the community at a joint meeting, on February 26, 2014, of Bronx Community Board 8 Committees of Parks & Recreation and Traffic & Transportation. The Riverdale Nature Preservancy was one of four invited presenters on the plan. The Preservancy's statement reiterated support for preserving Riverdale Park and described a number of concerns regarding implementation of the Greenway.

Hurricane Sandy devastated parts of NYC in October of 2012 and motivated Metro-North to consider ways to safeguard and stabilize its tracks along the Hudson River. The community seized the opportunity to combine the Greenway with Metro-North's work, and by the spring of 2015 Metro-North had agreed to consider installing a greenway path on top of a stabilized embankment. Funding was secured by a NY State Senator for Metro-North to complete a Scope of Work for a study of future engineering work needed to stabilize the tracks in light of rising sea levels and more intense storms, based on global climate models.

The Preservancy will remain engaged in this important project as each step progresses.

Pesticides and herbicides

In 2014 the Preservancy raised awareness among community residents, members of Bronx Community Board 8, the NYC Council and representatives of the NYC Departments of Sanitation and Parks & Recreation, about health hazards potentially related to the use of herbicides and pesticides, particularly the use of the herbicide glyphosate, commonly sold under the trade name Round-up. The Preservancy partnered with the Mount Sinai Pediatric Environmental Health Specialty Unit (PEHSU) to prepare arguments against the continued use of lawn chemicals in city parks and on private properties.

This work continued in 2015 and 2016. The Preservancy met with:

- City Council Chair of the Council Committee on Parks and Recreation
- Pediatricians from Mt Sinai Children's Environmental Health Center (CEHC)
- A staff member at the NYS Department of Health, who was able to provide the Preservancy with information on where and what kind of pesticides and herbicides have been applied in the Riverdale area
- NYC Department of Parks and Recreation Forestry Division, which considers Round-up essential to controlling invasive species
- Researchers from Mt. Sinai's Pediatric Environmental Health Specialty Unit (PEHSU)
- An environmental activist with WEACTION

- NYC Department of Parks and Recreation Administrator of Van Cortlandt Park
- Bronx Community Board 8's Committees on Environment, Sanitation and Parks

Going forward into 2017, the Preservancy board agreed to undertake an education campaign to introduce residents in the SNAD to the Preservancy and to outline best practices for lawn care and landscaping practices.

Henry Hudson Parkway listing in the National Register of Historic Places

The Parkway north of 129th Street in Manhattan to the Westchester County line was determined eligible for listing in the National Register by the NY State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in 2009. The decision was the result of nearly a decade of work by the Preservancy's Henry Hudson Parkway Task Force to research the history and document the historic and engineering features of the Parkway. The Preservancy prepared in 2013 a nomination package to the National Park Service for formal listing of the Parkway in the National Register. As part of this work, the Task Force conducted substantial additional research which it believed supported arguments for broadening both the time frame and the geographic boundaries of the area of significance. As required, the application was submitted first to SHPO. It remains with SHPO due to the broadened scope, for which SHPO requires additional documentation.

In 2016, SHPO and the Preservancy discussed next steps to resolving the discrepancies between the application for eligibility and the application for listing, and both parties remain interested in pursuing formal listing in the Register.

Provide Information and Strengthen Communication

Annual Meeting – October 29, 2015

The topic of the Preservancy's annual meeting on October 29, 2015 was two zoning initiatives undergoing public review under the Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP). Public review of both Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA) and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) began in September 2015.

Approximately 30 community members attended, including nine board members. The Preservancy Chair and Riverdale's City Council Member highlighted the primary focus for the community - **How will the proposed changes protect the natural environment, natural features and community character** - and led a Question and Answer session that delved into the details of the zoning and its potential implementation in Community District 8.

The meeting provided a forum for residents to learn details of the two proposed zoning changes and to prepare for meetings and votes by the Community Board Land Use Committee on Nov. 9 and the full Community Board on Nov. 10.

A business meeting was held after the public meeting. Class I directors were elected for a term of 3 years, and officers and at-large executive committee members were elected for a term of 1 year. A robust fundraising effort was discussed for the upcoming month.

Riverfest

June 14, 2015. As in past years, the Preservancy manned a table at Riverfest, the community's celebration of the Hudson River and information venue for all things environmental. A member of the Preservancy board volunteered time at the table and garnered several names for the Preservancy's mailing list.

In recognition of a reduced bank balance, the Preservancy supported Riverfest with a \$500 donation in 2015, down from \$2,000 the previous year.

June 5, 2016. The board agreed to support Riverfest 2016 with a \$500 contribution, but decided not to table at the event.

"Made in the Bronx: Green Buildings, Green Jobs!" – November 14, 2015

This event was presented by Bronx Climate Justice North and Manhattan College, and co-sponsored by 11 mainly local organizations, including the Preservancy.

Community Energy Fair – May 22, 2016

The Earth Ministry of Christ Church Riverdale in the NW Bronx sponsored this event, which included tables by a variety of groups including the Preservancy and a panel on how individuals can reduce their personal carbon footprint.

Email blasts

The Preservancy currently follows a strictly opt-in policy of email list growth. In 2015 and 2016, 66 email addresses were added to the list. After the removal of bounced addresses 230 names remained, representing a net growth of 20% over the previous total of 191 addresses.

In 2015 and 2016, nine email alerts were sent. The open and click rates are shown in Table B. In general, an open rate between 20% and 40% is considered average. The Preservancy's open rate is generally at the high end of average. The email marketing industry does not cite an average click-through rate.

Table B
Summary of email blasts in 2015 and 2016

Date	Topic	#Sent	% Open Rate (count)	% Click-through Rate (count and description)	Number of Social Media Shares		
					Fb	Tw	LI
Oct. 22, 2015	Annual Meeting ZQA info session and community dialogue Oct. 29	180	39.4 (71)	3.3 (6 went to RNP home page)			
Nov. 6, 2015	CB8 LU Committee Pub Hearing on ZQA Nov 9	185	37.8 (70)	7.0 (13 went to RNP home page)	8	14	5
Nov. 10, 2015	BCJN Event: Made in the Bronx Nov 14	181	39.8 (72)	5.0 (6 went to RNP home page; 3 went to map of location)			
Dec. 18, 2015	Dec 2015 fundraising	181	27.1 (49)	8.3 (3 went to donate page; 4 to Indian Pond Page; 2 each to RNP home page, Hebrew Home page, pesticide ban page and ZQA zoning page)			
Dec. 28, 2015	Dec 2015 fundraising, second ask	181	28.7 (52)	6.6 (6 went to donate page; 3 to Hebrew Home page, 2 to RNP home page, 1 to ZQA zoning page)			
Dec. 30, 2015	Dec 2015 fundraising to additional list	55	21.8 (12)	5.4 (3 went to Indian Pond page)			
Apr. 26, 2016	Thank you to community for MIH/ZQA achievements	232	38.8 (90)	1.7 (3 went to ZQA zoning page, 1 to opt-in to email list page)			
May 5, 2016	Community Energy Fair May 22	227	32.2 (73)	0.9 (2 went to RNP home page)			
Dec. 16, 2016	Dec 2016 fundraising	225	26.7 (60)	2.2 (2 each went to Hebrew Home page and ZQA zoning page; 1 went to RNP home page)			

Annual Financial Statement 2015

REVENUE (\$)

Contributions/Membership dues/grants	\$ 21,174
Interest/Other	0
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 21,174

EXPENSES (\$)

Accounting Fees	\$ 975
Consulting Fees	8,288
Administrative Expenses	1,738
Project Expenses	2,675
Printing, postage, shipping	347
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 14,023

Surplus/Deficit **\$ 7,151**

Starting Fund Balance **\$ 7,898**

Ending Fund Balance **\$ 15,049**

Annual Financial Statement 2016

REVENUE (\$)

Contributions/Membership dues/grants	\$ 9,373
Interest/Other	0
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 9,373

EXPENSES (\$)

Accounting Fees	\$ 1,000
Consulting Fees	5,088
Administrative Expenses	271
Project Expenses	2,500
Printing, postage, shipping	941
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 9,800

Surplus/Deficit **\$ - 427**

Starting Fund Balance **\$ 15,049**

Ending Fund Balance **\$ 14,622**

Board of Directors 2015

Sherida E. Paulsen	Chairman
Peter S. Kohlmann	Co-President
Rob Lynch	Co-President
Sandy Shalleck	Treasurer
Mary Bandziukas (non-voting)	Secretary

At large exec committee members

Jodie Colon
Jessica Haller

Marcia Allina
Nada Marie Assaf-Anid
Elizabeth Haase
Stephanie R. Hill
Peter Joseph
Barbara R. Michaels
Aaron Mittman
Susan Morgenthau
Meryl Nadel
Franz Paasche
Joyce M. Pilsner
Ann S. Rauch
Elizabeth Schulz
Dart Westphal
Barry Willner

Gilbert Kerlin	Founding Chairman
Paul J. Elston	Honorary Chairman

Board of Directors 2016

Sherida E. Paulsen	Chairman
Peter S. Kohlmann	Co-President
Rob Lynch	Co-President
Sandy Shalleck	Treasurer
Mary Bandziukas (non-voting)	Secretary

At large exec committee members

Jodie Colon
vacant

Nada Marie Assaf-Anid
Jessica Haller
Stephanie R. Hill
Peter Joseph
Barbara R. Michaels
Aaron Mittman
Susan Morgenthau
Meryl Nadel
Franz Paasche
Ann S. Rauch
Elizabeth Schulz
Dart Westphal
Barry Willner

Gilbert Kerlin	Founding Chairman
Paul J. Elston	Honorary Chairman