



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Budget Committee

Meeting Notes

Monday June 10, 2013

3:30 – 5:15 p.m.

Golden Valley City Hall

Attendees: Commission Chair Ginny Black, Commissioner Jim de Lambert, Commissioner Ted Hoshal, TAC member Derek Asche, Administrator Laura Jester

The Committee discussed the following items and/or made the following recommendations for the Commission's consideration in the 2014 budget:

Transfers:

Jester reported that she talked with Deputy Treasurer Virnig about showing transfers from long term maintenance funds back into the operating funds (shown as revenue) to pay for certain activities such as flood control project inspections (as previously directed by the Commission). Virnig told Jester that was an acceptable practice. The group discussed the merits of showing transfers in and out of the operating budget and long term funds. The Committee recommends showing transfers back into the operating budget as "revenue" to offset expenses for certain activities, as directed by the Commission.

Watershed and Flood Control Project Inspections:

Jester reported that some figures of actual amounts spent in 2010 and 2012 for watershed inspections and flood control inspections were incorrect. Engineer Chandler reviewed past expenditures and corrected the budget sheet – shown at the meeting. Jester indicated the base amount needed for annual flood control inspections was \$9,000 - \$10,000. The increase to \$15,000 in 2013 was for the sediment survey of Bassett Creek. The \$10,000 additional requested in 2014 is for the inspection of the Bassett Creek tunnel box culverts. There was a question about whether or not the Commission is obligated (through an agreement) to inspect the box culverts. Jester will look into this issue. It was noted that all information on the tunnel and box culverts should be kept in one place, perhaps even on the website.

The Commission should discuss how much of the flood control inspections should be funded with long term maintenance funds.

Asche reported the TAC recommended ending the practice of watershed inspections due to the duplicity with city practices. There was some discussion about where and when oversight and/or additional inspections may be necessary. The Budget Committee agreed with TAC recommendations after discussion to leave \$1,000 in that line item.

Fees for Development Reviews:

Jester reported that Engineers Chandler and Herbert were available by phone to discuss this item, if needed. Jester reported a few items Chandler had asked to relay to the group regarding review fees including: review fees cannot produce revenue for the organization; flat fees do not cover the costs of larger projects; a \$300 review fee for an individual homeowner is already high; some reviews (like highway projects) do not pay fees at all.

Asche reported on the recommendation from the TAC that fees for reviewing developments come closer to paying for the actual costs of the review program. There was considerable discussion about the structure of the Commission's fee schedule. Asche indicated he hoped the Commission could move toward fees that were based on the project size rather than parcel size. The Committee decided that restructuring the review fee schedule was a good task that should dovetail with the Watershed Plan Amendment and perhaps be modified for the 2015 budget. At this time, the Committee recommends raising the review fees by 25% in hopes of generating revenue that better covers the actual cost of reviews.

Updates to Watershed Models

There was discussion about adding funding to the 2014 budget to further refine the XP-SWMM model and whether or not updates to the model should be paid by review fees (since development and redevelopment is what spurs the need to update the model). The group decided to leave the model line items at zero for now, but asked that Engineer Chandler come to the June Commission meeting with an estimate of the cost to refine the XP-SWMM model.

Other Items and Next Steps:

There was some discussion about including funding to produce and install stream identification signs at road crossings. This should be further investigated and could perhaps use fund balance in the 2014, if funding is needed and it's a viable project.

It was agreed that the proposed lower member contributions will be greatly appreciated by the cities.

A fund balance policy is needed as well as policies on what, where and how various funds can be used.

Jester is to bring the draft budget, as discussed here and with TAC recommendations, to the Commission's June meeting along with an updated memo with specifics on the budget line items.

Jester asked about the purpose of the odd fiscal year. This will be a discussion item at the June meeting as it may be a good fit with amending the JPA.

Jester is to ask Virnig about interest income on large funds.