

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

MEMO

To:BCWMC CommissionersFrom:Laura Jester, AdministratorDate:October 7, 2015

RE: Financial Accounting of Watershed Management Plan Development

As you are well aware, the development of the 2015 BCMWC Watershed Management Plan was quite a process – a very successful and thorough process, but one that took more time, effort, and funding than originally planned. Starting in 2012, the Plan Steering Committee was established and started meeting, the gaps analysis was performed (<u>Appendix D</u> in the final Plan), and a new Commission mission statement was generated: *Stewardship of water resources to protect and enhance our communities.*

A thorough public input process (called the Watershed Assessment and Visioning Exercise or WAVE) began early in 2013 and culminated in the Watershed Summit in June. The process included an online survey with 174 respondents, a small group discussion and issues identification session in each city with city officials and/or city staff, the Watershed Summit event where the public prioritized issues, and a prioritization of issues by the Commission, TAC members, and technical partners. (Results of the WAVE process are found in <u>Appendix E</u> of the Plan.)

In the beginning of the Plan development process, the Commission had planned and budgeted for a simpler "update" to the 2004 Plan without a significant overhaul of its policies and strategies. However, as meetings with the Plan Steering Committee, Commission, TAC, member communities, and partnering agencies got underway - the Plan's goals, strategies, and policies were discussed at length. The desire (by some) for new policies emerged – including buffer requirements; and the possibility for significant changes to other policies became apparent (such as the adoption of MIDS to replace the 2004 development requirements, and a change to the Commission's waterbody classification system). Other tasks also took longer than expected including the compilation of existing data and the development of the Land and Water Resource Inventory and its twenty figures (Section 2, Appendix F).

Overall, the original Plan budget of \$95,485 was exceeded substantially. However, the Commission wisely budgeted each year for the ongoing work anticipated in the following year: 2012 = \$40,000; 2013 = \$40,000; 2014 = \$40,000; 2015 = \$30,000 for a total budget of \$150,000. In the end, a total of \$148,120 was spent on Plan development, plus my time of \$21,560 (which was not included in the Plan budget) for a final grand total of \$169,680. The in-depth public input process and the detailed and lengthy discussions among Commissioners, TAC members, partners, and agencies resulted in a robust Watershed Management Plan that will carry the Commission through the next 10 years! Furthermore, the Commission remains in good financial standing.

			Breakdown of Plan Budget and Costs by Task										
	Actual Cost								Actual Cost				
		Original								(% of original			
Task No.	Original Task Description	E	Budget		Labor	Ex	penses		Total	budget)			
6	Plan kickoff and stakeholder input process	\$	2,110	\$	921	\$	25	\$	945	45%			
7	Self-assessment and review of current practices	\$	1,970	\$	1,735			\$	1,735	88%			
8	Assess and prioritize issues	\$	2,600	\$	1,348			\$	1,348	52%			
9, 10	Establish and finalize goals, policies, strategies	\$	9,910	\$	34,908	\$	46	\$	34,953	353%	Includes review of 2004 goals, policie revisions to same for 2015 plan; discu Committee (at multiple meetings), A Plan Steering Committee meetings a		
11	Review monitoring and other data; prepare Land and Water Resource Inventory (Section 2) and associated figures; general plan formatting tasks	\$	10,150	\$	19,740			\$	19,740	194%	Includes compilation of data from m Quality Summary). Compilation of data combining the data from the various gathering and summarizing raw data also includes development of the pr format, and table of contents		
12	Develop monitoring plan	\$	2,820	\$	1,070			\$	1,070	38%			
13	Review and update rules and standards	\$	2,820		12,013	\$	85	\$	12,097	429%	Includes development of buffer poli MIDS		
14	Develop education and outreach plan	\$	900	\$	242			\$	242	27%			
15, 16	Draft implementation plan and evaluation process	\$	6,390	\$	12,999	\$	230	\$	13,229	207%	Includes development of Section 5 (recreation policy, and a Commission		
17, 18, 19	Complete draft Plan and submit for 60-day review	\$	8,830	\$	7,867	\$	510	\$	8,377	95%			
20, 21, 22, 23	Draft and distribute responses to 60-day comments	\$	9,690	\$	17,156	\$	14	\$	17,170	177%	Includes Plan revisions per 60-day co		
24, 25	Revise and submit Plan for 90-day review	\$	6,380	\$	1,174	\$	17	\$	1,191	19%			
26	Commission adoption & Plan production	\$	2,940	\$	8,495	\$	806	\$	9,301	316%	Includes responses to 90-day comme costs		
	Sub-Total (Commission Engineer)	\$	67,510	\$	119,664	\$	1,733	\$	121,397	180%			
	Next Generation Plan Costs through 2/01/2013 (Commission Engineer)	\$	23,960					\$	23,960	100%	Tasks 1- 5 were completed prior to a developed and approved		
	2013-2015 Administrator costs	\$	-	\$	21,560			\$	21,560	NA	No specific budget was assigned to t the Administrator did track time spe		
Non-Barr Expenses	Meeting materials and supplies	\$	450			\$	342	\$	342	76%	Includes supplies for small group me		
	Watershed Summit facilitator (June 2013)	\$	-	\$	2,023			\$	2,023	NA	The need for a neutral facilitator for budget was established. Facilitator c		
	Recording Secretary	\$	2,565		-			\$	-		Recording secretary's time on Plan-r		
	Writer for public involvement process	\$	1,000	\$	400			\$	400	40%			
	Total	\$	95,485	\$	143,646	\$	2,074	\$	169,680	178%			

Notes

cies, strategies and development/drafting of suggested scussions and correspondence with Plan Steering , Administrator, and TAC; attendance and follow up from s and Commission workshops multiple sources and development of Appendix F (Water

data took much more effort than anticipated due to 1) us sources and formats, 2) removing duplicate data, and 3) ta to a standardized "summer average" period. This task project schedule and scoping tasks, discussions about plan

olicy, triggers for BCWMC review, and standards based on

5 (Implementation) and Table 5-3 (and CIP, discussion of on workshop

comments (budgeted in Task 24)

ments and associated revisions, in addition to production

a detailed task schedule, scope, and budget were

o the Plan budget for the Administrator's time. However bent on Plan related tasks, reflected here.

neetings + refreshments at Commission workshops

or the Watershed Summit was determined after the Plan r contract was approved by Commission 4/18/13.

-related tasks was not specifically tracked.