

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

MEMO

TO: BCWMC Commissioners

FROM: Laura Jester, Administrator

DATE: June 8, 2015

RE: Items for Consideration in 2016 Operating Budget

At the May 21st BCWMC meeting, I presented a list of possible items to include in the 2016 operating budget that were not discussed by the BCWMC Budget Committee. The Commission asked that I bring more information and estimated costs of these items to this Commission meeting for discussion.

<u>Install creek signs at major road crossings</u> - \$4,000 – This amount could be added to the Education and Public Outreach budget line and would allow for the installation of several creek identification signs at major road crossings. It's likely many commuters and drivers don't realize they cross over a creek every day. The public's knowledge of creeks in their communities is likely to elevate their concern and stewardship of these waterbodies.

<u>Develop a CIP inspection and/or maintenance program</u> - \$0 – After speaking more with the Commission Engineer, we believe this is an important activity for the Commission to consider. However, the development of such a program would take time and discussions with the Commission and the TAC. Therefore, the Commission Engineer and I believe time should be spent in 2016 discussing and/or developing such a program with possible implementation in 2017.

<u>Begin a shoreland habitat monitoring program</u> - \$6,000 – With input from the TAC and Commission later in 2015 and early 2016 to develop this program, it could begin during the field season in 2016. It makes sense to dovetail this monitoring with our other lake monitoring in 2016, but to start with just one lake (Northwood Lake is recommended) to keep costs down. Possible elements of the program include:

- Evaluate habitat quality within the submergent, emergent, and upland buffer vegetation
- Evaluate the lake for sedimentation and shoreline erosion problems
- Evaluate wildlife habitat characteristics based on diversity of native plant communities present within each vegetation zone and an assessment of wetland functions and values
- Perform floristic quality assessment and a four-tiered rating system (poor, moderate, high, and excellent)
- Identify private versus public ownership of shoreline parcels (a nice map!)
- Identify possible locations for restoration and preservation

Host one or two informational evening sessions for Commissioners - \$0 — I would like to begin this practice in 2016, however, I do not believe additional funding is needed. I would like to provide more in-depth information to Commissioners on a variety of topics that do not fit into a regular Commission meeting. This would be an evening session to which our partners (such as lake groups and others) could be invited as well. Topics could include a presentation on the "State of the River Report," a presentation on innovative practices happening in other watersheds or cities, a more indepth presentation on the Envision process, and others. Twice a year, the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District holds events like this which are always popular and informative. The event also allows for a more informal place to network and talk with fellow Commissioners. At this point, I believe that no additional budget is necessary to hold one or two sessions in 2016 as they would be covered under my existing Administrator budget line. If engineering assistance was needed, it could be covered under surveys and studies.

TOTAL ADDITIONAL BUDGET REQUESTED: \$10,000

- Increases total 2016 operating budget to \$685,700.
- Funds could come 2015 fund balance rather than city assessments (see revised 2016 draft budget attached.
- Projected fund balance at end of FY2016 would be \$324,850 which is still in the optimal range of approximately 50% of the annual operating budget.

REVISED 2016 Working Draf Bassett Creek Watershed Man							
ltem	2013 2013 Budget Actual		2014 Budget	2014 Actual	2015 Budget	2016 Draft Budget	
ENGINEERING & MONITORING							
Technical Services	120,000	133,347	120,000	109,391	120,000	120,000	
Development/Project Reviews (funded by fees	60,000	62,902	65,000	52,643	65,000	65,000	(A)
Non-fee and Preliminary Reviews					15,000	15,000	(B)
Commission and TAC Meetings	14,250	17,390	16,000	15,984	14,500	13,000	(C)
Surveys and Studies	10,000	11,380	20,000	7,446	20,000	20,000	(D)
Water Quality / Monitoring	40,000	39,913	45,000	74,090	63,000	77,500	(E)
Shoreland Habitat Monitoring						6,000	
Water Quantity	11,000	10,250	11,000	12,100	11,500	11,500	_
Assistance on Erosion Control Inspections	7,000	4,790	1,000	225	1,000	1,000	(F)
Annual Flood Control Project Inspections	15,000	3,024	20,000	17,031	10,000	10,000	(G)
Municipal Plan Review	2,000	0	2,000	764	2,000	2,000	(H)
Watershed Outlet Monitoring Program (WOMP)	17,000	12,757	17,000	13,917	17,000	17,000	(l)
Subtotal Engineering & Monitoring	\$296,250	\$295,754	\$317,000	\$303,591	\$339,000	\$358,000]
PLANNING							
Watershed-wide XP-SWMM Model	0	488	0	0	-	-	1
Watershed-wide XP-SWMM Phase II	Ü	100	Ü	Ŭ		79,000	(J)
Watershed-wide P8 Water Quality Model	0	9,967	0	0	_	-	(0)
Next Generation Plan Development	40,000	43,394	40,000	55,198	30,000		1
Subtotal Planning	\$40,000	\$53,849	\$40,000	\$55,198	\$30,000	\$79,000	1
oubtotai i laining	Ψ+0,000	ψ55,043	Ψ-10,000	ψ55,150	Ψ30,000	Ψ13,000	
ADMINISTRATION							
Administrator	50,000	48,310	60,000	53,917	62,000	62,000	
Legal	18,500	17,570	18,500	22,269	18,500	18,500	<u> </u>
Financial Management	3,045	3,119	3,045	3,045	3,200	3,200	<u> </u>
Audit, Insurance & Bond	15,225	13,000	15,500	12,476	15,500	15,500	
Digitize Historic Paper Files/Data Management					2,500	5,000	(K)
Meeting Catering Expenses	2,750	1,821	3,000	1,836	2,500	2,200	ļ.,,
Admin Services (Rec Sec+Printing+Postage)	40,000	31,157	35,800	22,763	32,000	27,300	(L)
Subtotal Administration	\$129,520	\$114,977	\$135,845	\$116,306	\$136,200	\$133,700	_
OUTREACH & EDUCATION							
Publications / Annual Report	2,000	1,948	2,000	2,272	4,000	2,500	(M)
Website	2,500	201	2,000	0	12,000	2,000	(N)
Demonstration/Education Grants	0	0	0	0	-	-	
Watershed Education Partnerships	15,000	11,200	15,500	11,100	15,500	15,500	(O)
Education and Public Outreach	14,775	12,788	15,000	20,292	17,000	22,500	(P)
Public Communications Subtotal Outreach & Education	3,000 \$37,275	1,867 \$28,004	3,000 \$37,500	1,198 \$34,862	3,000 \$51,500	2,500 \$45,000	-
Subtotal Outreach & Education	\$31,213	\$20,004	\$37,500	\$34,002	ФО1,500	\$45,000	
M AINTENANCE FUNDS							
Erosion/Sediment (Channel Maintenance)	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	(Q)
Long-Term Maint. (Flood Control Project)	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	(R)
Subtotal Maintenance Funds	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	L
TMDL WORK							
TMDL Implementation Reporting	10,000	-	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	(S)
Subtotal TMDL Work	\$10,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	
GRAND TOTAL	\$563,045	\$542,584	\$600,345	\$579,957	\$626,700	\$685,700	_
	2013	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016 Draft	
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Budget	

NOTES (A) Majority of costs are covered by review fees

- (B) New line item in 2015 used to cover reviews for which either we do not receive an application fee or it's too early in the process for us to have received an application fee (such as the Blue Line LRT, SWLRT, MnDOT projects, etc.). This allows the Commission to better track how well the fees they receive for reviews match up with the costs of those reviews. We believe that development reviews will continue to pick up, based on what we saw last year and are seeing this year.
- (C) Engineer attendance at BCWMC meetings and TAC meetings. 2010- 2013 estimates based on 18 meetings. 2014 estimate based on 30 meetings. 2015 estimate based on 24 meetings. 2016 estimated based on 18 meetings (12 BCWMC and 5 TAC)
- (D) For Commission-directed surveys and studies. Past work has included watershed tours, Medicine Lake outlet work, etc. (\$10,000); lake monitoring includes monitoring two locations on Medicine Lake, and one location each at Crane Lake and Northwood Lake on 12 occasions (Medicine Lake) or six occasions (Crane Lake and Northwood Lake) for selected parameters (total phosphorus, soluble reactive phosphorus, total nitrogen, pH and chlorophyll a), sample analysis, phytoplankton and zooplankton collection and analysis, an aquatic plant survey (two occasions), and preparation of a final report. Estimate includes lowered costs due to cooperation with TRPD and City of MTKA. TRPD will on Medicine Lake: 1) perform all of the sampling at both monitoring sites (main and SW Basin), including collection of chemical samples, phytoplankton (algae), and zooplankton samples; 2) charge the BCWMC for the sample collection at the SW Basin site (as they don't usually sample that site); 3) perform the chemical analyses for the samples collected at both sites; and 4) charge the BCWMC for the chemical analysis of the samples collected from the SW Basin. The TRPD's analytical (lab) costs are very reasonable. BCWMC will on Medicine Lake: 1) perform the phytoplankton and zooplankton analysis/identification; 2) perform, via a subcontract with Endangered Resource Services, LLC, the aquatic plant survey; 3) compile and analyze the data (e.g., graphs, tables); and 4) prepare report. City of Minnetonka will on Crane Lake: 1) perform all of the sampling at the monitoring site, including collection of chemical samples, phytoplankton (algae), and zooplankton samples; and 2) pay for the chemical analysis of the samples. BCWMC will on Crane Lake: 1) perform the phytoplankton and zooplankton analysis/identification; 2) perform, via a subcontract with Endangered Resource Services, LLC, the aquatic plant survey; 3) compile and analyze the data (e.g., graphs, tables); and 4) prepare report. BCWMC will on Northwood Lake: 1) collect and analyze samples, 2) perform the phytoplankton and zooplankton analysis/identification; 3) perform, via a subcontract with Endangered Resource Services, LLC, the aquatic plant survey; 4) compile and analyze the data (e.g., graphs, tables); and 5) prepare report. General water quality requests may include responding to or addressing the following issues:
- o proposed impairments listings
- o chloride TMDL: may be follow-up on final TMDL, such as reviewing, or involvement in developing, implementation plan
- o bacteria TMDL: may be follow-up with implementation plan
- o coordination with MPCA regarding potential future stressor identification analysis for biota (fisheries) impairment
- o concerns over algae blooms
- o invasive species identification/concerns
- o aeration concerns
- o Commission and/or TAC curiosity regarding new water quality treatment practices; practices could be identified by Commission, TAC, Commission staff
- (F) After recommendations from the TAC and Budget Committee, the Commission's ended the erosion and sediment control inspection program (Watershed Inspection) in 2014 due to duplication with activities required by the member cities. Some budget remains here to provide, as requested by the Commission, some oversight of city inspection activities (reports of inspections are available from each city), and for inspecting projects such as County highway and MnDOT projects.
- (G) 2016 budget includes usual inspection (as it did in 2015). 2014 budget Included inspection of double box culvert (performed once every 5 years), and assumed City of Minneapolis will assist with access. (2013 budget included sediment survey of Bassett Creek Park Pond.)
- (H) 2016 assumed budget to address municipal and adjacent WMO plan amendments; reviews of updated/revised local controls and updated/revised municipal plans not likely in 2016, most likely in 2017.
- (I) Reimbursed \$5,000 from Met Council. \$17,000 includes \$11,000 for Wenck or similar contractor + \$6,000 for Barr's data management and analyses
- (J) Based on Administrator recommendation to begin project in 2015 with \$103,000 of Long Term Maintenance Funds and continue project in 2016 with half of \$158,000 project estimate coming from operating budget (\$79,000) and the other half coming from Long Term Maintenance Funds
- (K) Place holder for records and data management project to begin in 2015.
- (L) Recording Secretary \$60/hr rate x 12 hrs/mo for taking and drafting meeting minutes (\$7,200) + \$65/hr (requested increase) x 25 hrs/mo for other assigned tasks (\$19,500). [Average number of hours in last year for recording secretary = 32 hrs/mo.] Also includes \$50/mo printing and postage (\$600)
- (M) Lowered from 2015 because press release writing is being charged within recording secretary or administrator time.
- (N) Place holder for website maintenance and hosting fees.
- (O) Includes CAMP (\$5,000), River Watch (\$2,000), Metro Watershed Partners (\$3,500), Metro Blooms (\$3,000), Freshwater Society (\$2,000) [Freshwater Society is a new addition and replaces Blue Thumb which is merging with Metro Blooms.]
- (P) Includes funding for West Metro Water Alliance at \$13,000 plus funding for other educational supplies and materials and up to \$4,000 for road signs at creek crossings.
- (Q) Will be transferred to Channel Maintenance Fund
- (R) Will be transferred to Long-Term Maintenance Fund
- (S) Task includes reporting on TMDL implementation and updating P8 model to include new BMPs.

2015 Financial Information					
Audited Fund Balance as of January 31, 2015		\$	388,206		
Expected income from assessments in 2015	+	\$	490,345		
Expected interest income in 2015	+	\$	-		
Expected income from project review fees	+	\$	60,000		
Expected income from CIP Administrative Funds	+	\$	25,000		
Expected transfer from Long-term Maint Fund for Flood Control Project	+	\$	10,000		
Expected income from WOMP reimbursement	+	\$	5,000		
Estimated funds available for fiscal year 2015		\$	978,551		
Estimated expenitures for fiscal year 2015	-	\$	626,700		
Estimated fund balance as of January 31, 2016		\$	351,851		
2040 Darkert Datalla					
2016 Budget Details					
Expected Income					
Proposed Assessments to cities	+	\$	553,150		
Use of fund balance	+	\$	27,000		
CIP Administrative Funds (2.5% of requested levy of \$1.222M)	+	\$	30,550		
Project review fees	+	\$	60,000		
Transfer from Long-term Maint Fund for Flood Control Proj Inspections	+	\$	10,000		
WOMP reimbursement	+	\$	5,000		
Interest income in 2016	+	\$	-		
		\$	685,700		
Expected Expenses					
		\$	COE 700		
Total operating budget		Ф	685,700		
Fund Balance Details					
Beginning Fund Balance (Jan 31, 2016)		\$	351,851		
Use of Fund Balance (see income above)	-	\$	27,000		
Remaining Fund Balance (Jan 31, 2017)		\$	324,851		

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission 2016 Proposed Assessments

Community	For Taxes Payable in 2014	2014 Percent	Current Area Watershed	Percent	Average	2012 Assessment	2013 Assessment	2015 Assessment	2015 Assessment	2016 Proposed Assessment
	Net Tax Capacity	of Valuation	in Acres	of Area	Percent	\$461,045	\$515,016	\$490,345	\$490,345	\$490,345
Crystal	\$7,008,868	5.42	1,264	5.09	5.26	\$24,941	\$27,424	\$25,504	\$25,868	\$25,771
Golden Valley	\$32,888,059	25.45	6,615	26.63	26.04	\$115,080	\$129,126	\$123,033	\$121,964	\$127,675
Medicine Lake	\$862,204	0.67	199	0.80	0.73	\$3,484	\$3,909	\$3,479	\$3,543	\$3,600
Minneapolis	\$8,543,009	6.61	1,690	6.80	6.71	\$32,661	\$35,236	\$32,953	\$33,235	\$32,885
Minnetonka	\$8,750,862	6.77	1,108	4.46	5.62	\$24,920	\$28,464	\$27,402	\$28,121	\$27,536
New Hope	\$6,995,669	5.41	1,252	5.04	5.23	\$25,533	\$27,648	\$26,479	\$25,681	\$25,627
Plymouth	\$56,041,783	43.36	11,618	46.77	45.07	\$209,101	\$235,310	\$224,959	\$225,159	\$220,974
Robbinsdale	\$2,339,439	1.81	345	1.39	1.60	\$8,022	\$8,479	\$7,743	\$7,587	\$7,843
St. Louis Park	\$5,804,289	4.49	752	3.03	3.76	\$17,303	\$19,420	\$18,792	\$19,184	\$18,433
TOTAL	\$129,234,182	100.00	24,843	100.00	100.00	\$461,045	\$515,045	\$490,345	\$490,345	\$490,345