

# **Bassett Creek Water Management Commission**

## **2012 Budget and Levy**

**June 2011**

The Joint and Cooperative Agreement establishing the Bassett Creek Water Management Commission (BCWMC) sets forth the procedure required to adopt the annual budget. Article VIII, Subdivision 3, provides that each member agrees to contribute each year to a general fund to be used for administrative purposes and certain operating expenses. Half of the annual contribution of each member is based on assessed valuation of property within the watershed and the other half on the ratio of area of each member within the watershed to the total area of the Bassett Creek watershed. Subdivision 5 of Article VIII further provides: "On or before July 1 of each year, the Board shall adopt a detailed budget for the ensuing year and decide upon the total amount necessary for the general fund." Budget approval requires a two-thirds vote (six Commissioners). Further, the Secretary "shall certify the budget on or before July 1 to the clerk of each member governmental unit, together with a statement of the proportion of the budget to be provided by each member." Each of the nine members then has until August 1 to file an objection to the budget.

The 2012 budget was prepared by a Budget Committee consisting of Commissioner Linda Loomis (BCWMC Chair), Commissioner Ginny Black (BCWMC Vice Chair), Commissioner Michael Welch (Commission Treasurer), Commissioner Jim deLambert (Commission Secretary), and Commissioner Pauline Langsdorf (Education Committee representative), with assistance from Amy Herbert (Recorder), Geoff Nash (Administrator) and Sue Virnig (Deputy Treasurer).

The BCWMC's "Second Generation" Watershed Management Plan was approved by the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources on August 25, 2004, and adopted by the BCWMC on September 16, 2004. That plan includes a capital projects budget, which is funded by ad valorem taxes and has been amended to include channel restoration projects. Commission activities have focused on implementation of the Watershed Management Plan.

The proposed 2012 budget of \$724,045 was adopted by eight commissioners voting in favor of the budget at the BCWMC meeting on June 16, 2011. The proposed 2012 budget is enclosed. Specific items in the budget are discussed below.

1. **Engineering** services are budgeted at \$253,250 in 2012. Many of the individual items have remained the same from the 2011 budget. The following paragraphs summarize each of the Engineering budget items.
  - **Technical Services**—this item covers the day-to-day technical services performed on behalf of the Commission, such as preparing for the Commission and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings, performing preliminary site reviews and correspondence, and communications with the Commissioners, watershed communities, developers, agencies, and other entities. The proposed 2012 budget is \$120,000.
  - **Plat Reviews**—at its December 15, 2005, meeting, the BCWMC instated a permit fee effective January 1, 2006, and revised as of January 1, 2009, to cover the expense of reviewing development plans and improvement projects. Assuming permit fees are raised to cover the costs of assessing the water quality impacts of proposed projects, the projected revenues will be higher. The proposed 2012 budget for plat reviews is \$60,000, which will largely be offset by permit fees. These expected permit fees are shown in the 2012 budget under "2012 Assessments and Fees;" it is estimated that the BCWMC will receive \$40,000 in permit fees in 2012.

- Commission and TAC Meetings— this item covers the cost for the engineer to attend 12 monthly Commission meetings and 7 monthly TAC meetings. The proposed budget for 2012 is \$14,250.
- Surveys and Studies—the proposed budget for 2012 is \$10,000. The 2011 budget was \$20,000. The intent of this budget item is to cover the costs of conducting special studies, and addressing unanticipated issues, questions, etc. that arise during the year.
- Water Quality/Monitoring—the proposed budget for 2012 is \$20,000, which includes performing biotic index monitoring on Bassett Creek, as part of the BCWMC's three-year monitoring cycle for this type of monitoring. During 1980, 1983, 1991, 1995, 2000, 2003, 2006 and 2009, benthic invertebrates were collected from Plymouth Creek, the Sweeney Lake Branch, the North Branch and the Main Stem of Bassett Creek to evaluate its water quality and to detect changes in water quality over time. The same sites will be monitored in 2012. Hilsenhoff's Biotic Index (HBI) and the MPCA's IBI will be used to evaluate existing water quality and to assess changes. Water quality monitoring on Twin Lake and/or Sweeney Lake is also included. A final report will be prepared summarizing the results.

This task also includes finalizing the 2011 water quality report, and other general water quality tasks, such as reviewing water quality information and previous studies as requested by the BCWMC, member cities, or regulatory agencies.

*Note: According to the BCWMC's four-year lake monitoring cycle, detailed lake monitoring of Sweeney and Twin Lakes should take place in 2012. However, detailed monitoring was performed on Sweeney and Twin Lakes in 2008 and 2009. This means the monitoring could be delayed to 2013 to keep with the four-year monitoring cycle. The TAC recommended delaying the monitoring even later, to 2014, so that the data is available for the TMDL evaluation report, which will be due in 2016. The 2012 budget includes only \$4,000 for monitoring Sweeney and/or Twin Lakes, not include the full \$30,000 estimated for that monitoring.*

- Water Quantity—this item covers the work associated with the BCWMC's lake and stream gauging program. The proposed budget for 2012 is \$11,000, the same as the 2011 budget. The readings have proved valuable to the communities for planning future development and as documentation of the response of surface water bodies to above normal and below normal precipitation.
  - The 2012 lake gauging program will consist of measuring water levels on Medicine Lake, Sweeney Lake, Parkers Lake, Westwood Lake, Crane Lake (Ridgedale Pond), and Northwood Lake. The Bassett Creek Park Pond and Wirth Park storage areas will also be included for monitoring. Two readings per month will be taken during the period April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012. One reading per month will be taken during the period October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013.
  - The 2012 stream gauging program will consist of periodically reading stages, or gauging the stream, at the new tunnel entrance, at the Theodore Wirth Park/T.H. 55 outlet structure, at Highway 100 (main stem), at Wisconsin Avenue, at Sweeney Lake, at Medicine Lake outlet, at Winnetka Avenue (north branch), at 26th Avenue (Plymouth Creek fish barrier), and at other selected locations during periods of high flow.
  - The program also includes periodic surveys of benchmarks to ensure consistency with past readings.
- Inspections—there are two separate budget items under this task:

- Watershed Inspections—this item covers the BCWMC’s construction site erosion control inspection program. The proposed budget for 2012 is \$7,000; permit fees offset a portion of the watershed inspection cost. The inspections are valuable for identifying and correcting erosion and sediment control practices that do not conform to BCWMC policies. The inspections also verify that sites are developed in accordance with approved plans. The watershed inspection program consists of inspecting active construction sites in the watershed once every month. Erosion control inspections will begin April 2012 and extend through October 2012. Selected sites may be inspected on two-week intervals to verify that requested erosion control modifications have been completed. Critical work such as wetland or creek crossings and work adjacent to lakes and sensitive wetlands will be inspected as necessary. The new conduit inlet in Minneapolis will also be inspected for accumulation of debris. BCWMC staff will coordinate the inspection with respective contacts from each city. Following each inspection, and where site improvements are required, a letter listing the construction projects and the improvements needed for effective erosion control will be sent to each city.
- Project Inspections—this item covers the BCWMC’s annual inspection of the flood control project system. The proposed budget for 2012 is \$9,000 (\$10,000 in 2011). The inspection program covers the flood control project features completed by the Commission between 1974 and 1996. The objective of the inspection program is to find and address erosion, settlement, sedimentation, and structural issues. In accordance with the Bassett Creek Flood Control Project Operation and Maintenance Manual (except as noted), the following project features require annual inspection:

**Minneapolis:**

- Conduit (Double Box Culvert) – inspect double box culvert every five years (2004, 2009, 2014, 2019 ...)
- Deep Tunnel – dewater and inspect tunnel every 20 years. This inspection was performed during 2008; the next inspection will be 2028
- Old Tunnel (not included in BCWMC inspection program)
- Open Channel

**Golden Valley**

- Highway 55 Control Structure & Ponding Area
- Golden Valley Country Club Embankment (Box Culvert, Overflow Weir, and downstream channel)
- Noble Avenue Crossing
- Regent Avenue Crossing
- Westbrook Road Crossing
- Wisconsin Avenue Crossing
- Minnaqua Drive Bridge Removal

**Crystal**

- Box Culvert and Channel Improvements (Markwood Area)
- Edgewood Embankment with Ponding
- Highway 100/Bassett Creek Park Pond

- 32nd Avenue Crossing
- Brunswick Avenue Crossing
- 34th Avenue Crossing
- Douglas Drive Crossing
- Georgia Avenue Crossing
- 36th-Hampshire Avenue Crossing
- Channel Improvements

### Plymouth

- Medicine Lake Outlet Structure
  - Plymouth Fish Barrier
- Municipal Plan Review—this item covers the cost to review the member cities local water management plans for conformance with the BCWMC Watershed Management Plan. All of the member cities have BCWMC-approved plans in place. It also covers the cost to review adjoining WMO plans/plan amendments. The proposed budget for 2012 is \$2,000. These funds are budgeted to cover expenses that may be incurred reviewing member cities’ local plan amendments and adjoining WMO plan amendments.

## 2. Planning

- Watershed-wide XP-SWMM Model—this item covers the cost to update the current Bassett Creek hydrologic and hydraulic (H & H) models to XP-SWMM. Currently, the majority of the watershed hydrology is modeled by the HEC-1 program, and the creek hydraulics are modeled with the HEC-2 program. Small sections of the watershed have been updated to the XP-SWMM model where more detailed modeling has been needed. XP-SWMM is a more powerful and user-friendly model that incorporates both hydrology and hydraulics and deals effectively with issues like backwater and more complex outlet structures.

An updated H & H XPSWMM model will allow the Commission to evaluate the impact of structure modifications and other projects on the creek and other major waterbodies in the watershed. For example, it could be used to evaluate the impact of modifications similar to the Sweeney Lake outlet modification, the Wisconsin Avenue control structure modification, and the Wirth Lake outlet modification. In the future, newer and/or more detailed XPSWMM models performed by others (e.g., the cities) could be integrated into the Commission’s updated H & H model, further increasing the usefulness of the model to the Commission and the member cities. The updated H & H model could also be used to help the Commission evaluate/understand potential flooding risks (e.g., spring snowmelt).

The work includes creating an XP-SWMM model for the areas currently modeled in HEC-1 and HEC-2, and then merging the new model with the areas already modeled in XP-SWMM. This will create one comprehensive XP-SWMM model for the entire Bassett Creek Watershed. This task includes updating the watersheds and hydrology inputs for inclusion into XP-SWMM. Because of how the model simulates outlets at ponds and lakes, each pond or lake outlet will need to be checked and recalculated as part of this task. This task does not include checking if bridge or culvert geometry along the creek has changed since previous modeling efforts. The XP-SWMM model will also be calibrated to known storm events.

The proposed 2012 budget for this project is \$70,000. Source of funds: Flood Control Long-term Maintenance Fund. This would mean that this amount would not appear on the 2012 assessment for operating expenses.

- Watershed-wide P8 Water Quality Model—this item covers the cost to update the current Bassett Creek water quality modeling. The water quality modeling of a significant portion of the watershed was completed with an older version of the P8 Model, with best management practice (BMP) information that is representative of the treatment conditions fifteen to twenty years ago. Some major subwatersheds have been updated to current land use and runoff drainage/BMP conditions when more detailed modeling was needed for Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) studies.

An updated P-8 water quality model will provide a key tool for the Commission to use in tracking the progress of the BCWMC and the MS4s towards TMDL implementation for impaired water bodies, not only within BCWMC, but also downstream of Bassett Creek. When projects are proposed and/or completed, the updated P8 model could be used to estimate the loading reduction that will be achieved by the projects. An updated P8 model could also be used to evaluate the effect of proposed projects, such as projects that come under Commission review and Commission CIP projects. The member cities could also use the model to evaluate individual BMPs in their cities.

The work includes two major tasks: 1) updating the P8 model and 2) calibrating and further refining the modeling. This work includes updating the P8 model for the Main Stem, North Branch (Lost Lake, Northwood Lake, and Bassett Creek Park Pond), Parkers Lake, Westwood Lake, and Grimes, North Rice and South Rice Ponds major subwatersheds.

The proposed 2012 budget for this project is \$135,000; a significant portion of this budget is for field surveys. Source of funds: Flood Control Long-term Maintenance Fund.

- Next Generation Plan—For the 2012 fiscal year, it is recommended that the Commission begin the planning process for the “next generation” of the Watershed Management Plan. Starting the process in 2012 will help ensure that the Plan obtains Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) approval before the current plan expires (September 2014 – 10 years from the date of BWSR approval). The plan update planning process, including planning steps recommended for 2012, is shown on the attached planning process flowchart. The proposed planning process takes into consideration the proposed changes to BWSR’s 8410 Rules, which dictate the watershed plan content and the process to be followed for developing the watershed plan.

Steps C through H and part of Step I are proposed to be completed in 2012. The steps are described below:

Step C. Notify plan stakeholders of plan initiation and request information. This step is a result of the anticipated 8410 rule changes. Plan stakeholders include all plan review agencies (BWSR, Met Council, DNR, MPCA, MN Department of Health, and MN Dept of Agriculture), as well as other jurisdictions, including member cities, Hennepin County, Hennepin Conservation District, and MnDOT. During this step, these stakeholders are to provide information on water resources, issues and key regulations that should inform the planning process. Stakeholders have 60 days to provide this information. (February-March)

Step D. Review and summarize responses from plan stakeholders (March - April).

Step E. Visioning process – review BCWMC’s achievements, perform gaps analysis, review WMO/member roles and responsibilities, survey members to identify activities

and needs, and create/refine organizational vision. This step includes two to three meetings of the Commission. (May - July)

Step F. Form Planning Advisory Group (PAG). The PAG will include Commissioners and Alternates, the TAC (and other city staff as appropriate), Commission staff, the plan review agencies (BWSR, Met Council, DNR, MPCA, MN Department of Health, and MN Dept of Agriculture), Hennepin County, Hennepin Conservation District, and citizens. Task includes coordinating recruitment and preparing recruitment materials to attract participants. (July - August)

Step G. Initial planning meeting to identify and prioritize issues. Meeting participants will include the PAG and other plan stakeholders. Issues identified by the TAC and Commission in 2011 will be presented and discussed at this meeting. This step is required per the anticipated 8410 rule changes; however, it is a normal (although currently not required) step in the plan update process. The draft 8410 rules also dictate that the plan stakeholders be invited to the meeting. (September)

Step H. PAG meeting to establish goals/policies that address priority issues. This step will also include a review of existing goals and policies that are relevant to the priority issues. (November)

Step I. Revise Plan sections and hold four (4) PAG meetings. To stay on schedule, the plan revision task needs to begin in January 2013, the last month of the BCWMC's 2012 fiscal year. In January, the land and water resource inventory and other background/introductory information sections will be revised/drafted. (January 2013 – July 2013 (entire step))

The proposed 2012 budget for this project is \$40,000; work on the plan will continue through 2013 and into 2014.

3. **Administrator**—this was a new budget item in 2008. In 2010 the commission entered a contract with an administrator to coordinate all commission activities, with a focus on working with member cities, the Minnesota Department of Transportation, Hennepin County and other stakeholders to implement total maximum daily load plans; development and organization of commission policies; communications; and strategic planning. The administrator budget item was \$15,000 in 2010, as the commission completed an analysis of its systems and functions, and worked on carefully defining a role for an administrator. The actual amount spent in 2010 was \$30,297. The budget in 2012 is \$50,000, an increase from \$36,000 in 2011. As of the end of April 2011, \$14,412 had been invoiced. The Commission, at the time of adoption of the 2011 budget, had begun honing the scope of duties for the administrator and appropriately shifting tasks among its contracted service providers. The commission anticipates that administrator tasks will be well defined at the outset of the 2011 budget year, and that operational efficiencies will balance costs of expanding the administrator's scope of duties.
4. **Legal**—this item covers basic legal services, which are budgeted at \$18,500 for 2012, remaining at the same level as 2011.
5. **Financial Management**—this item covers services provided by the Deputy Treasurer at the City of Golden Valley, which are budgeted for \$3,045 in 2012, an increase of 1.5% over last year.
6. **Liability Insurance, Auditing and Bonding**—this item is budgeted at \$15,225 for 2012, an increase of 1.5% over last year.
7. **Meeting Catering**—this item is budgeted for \$2,750 in 2012, a decrease from \$4,750 in 2011.
8. **Administrative Services**—this item covers administrative, secretarial, and recorder services. The Administrative Services budget is \$40,000 for 2011, a decrease from \$45,000 in 2011.

9. **Public Relations & Outreach**—there are two separate budget items under this task:
  - Publications/Annual Report—\$2,000 is budgeted in 2012 for preparing the BCWMC’s 2011 annual report, the same as last year.
  - Website—\$2,500 is budgeted in 2012 for maintaining, updating, and making improvements to the BCWMC website, a decrease from \$4,500 in 2011.
10. **WOMP**—\$10,000 is budgeted for 2012, which covers the BCWMC’s costs related to the Watershed Outlet Monitoring Program (WOMP) station on Bassett Creek. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has been running the WOMP station for the last several years in a cooperative effort with Metropolitan Council Environmental Services. The MPRB handles the sample and data collection tasks, MCES performs maintenance, and Barr provides assistance with the rating curve and flow monitoring. The 2012 budget includes \$5,000 for MPRB to operate the WOMP station.
11. **Demonstration/Education Grants**— this item is the BCWMC grant program, which is managed by the Education Committee; funding for this item has been eliminated in 2012. The 2011 budget for this item was \$5,000.
12. **Watershed Education Partnerships**— the 2012 budget for this item is \$13,000, which includes participation in the Metropolitan Council’s Citizen Assisted Monitoring Program (CAMP; \$5,000), the Hennepin Conservation District River Watch Program (\$2,000), Metro WaterShed Partners (\$3,000), the Blue Thumb program (\$1,000), and the Metro Blooms Rain Garden program (\$2,000). The 2011 budget for this item was \$14,500.
13. **Education and Public Outreach**—the 2012 budget for this item is \$5,775, which includes event space costs (\$200), display maintenance and posters (\$400), water quality survey & quiz (\$75), seed packets and handouts (\$700), develop and distribute watershed coloring book (\$500), watershed coloring contest in 3 age groups (\$300), educational articles (\$600), and WMWA administration and projects (\$3,000). The 2011 budget for this item was \$4,900.
14. **Public Communications**—the 2012 budget for this item is \$3,000 and covers costs related to the publication of hearing and special meeting notices in newspapers and journals and the publication and distribution of other required communications that are separate from the Web site or education and public outreach communications. The 2011 budget for this item was \$3,000.
15. **Erosion/Sediment (Channel Maintenance)**—these funds are for creek and streambank erosion repair and sediment removal projects that are not funded as a channel restoration project through the BCWMC’s Capital Improvement Program. The amount budgeted for collection in 2012 is \$25,000, the same amount as in 2011. The money collected goes into the BCWMC’s Creek and Streambank Trunk System Maintenance, Repair and Sediment Removal Fund (the Channel Maintenance Fund). There is currently \$158,000 in the Channel Maintenance Fund; to-date about \$42,000 of the fund has been used on channel maintenance projects.

The BCWMC Watershed Management Plan (Section 7.2.2) calls for the BCWMC to use the Creek and Streambank Trunk System Maintenance, Repair and Sediment Removal Fund to finance the:

- Maintenance and repairs needed to restore a creek or streambank area to the designed flow rate.
- Work needed to restore a creek or streambank area that has either resulted in damage to a structure, or where structural damage is imminent, based on an assessment of benefits.

- Portion of a project that provides BCWMC benefits, including reduced potential for flooding, mitigation of water quality impairment, or minimizing the potential for water quality impairment.
- BCWMC's share of maintenance projects to be applied for by the cities that have a regional benefit, or to partially fund smaller, localized projects that cities wish to undertake.

16. **Long-Term Maintenance (Flood Control Project)**—these funds are for projects to repair and maintain structures associated with the BCWMC Flood Control Project. The BCWMC Plan calls for annual assessments of \$25,000 to the fund, and for the fund balance to be maintained at (but not exceed) \$1 million. The current fund balance is about \$510,000, which takes into account the funding of the \$250,000 Sweeney Lake outlet project. The proposed 2012 budget/assessment is \$25,000, the same as 2011.

#### 17. TMDLs

- **TMDL Studies**—the TMDL budget was set up to fund the BCWMC's costs for participating in the Medicine Lake, Sweeney Lake and Wirth Lake TMDL studies. The TMDL Studies fund is currently at \$22,000. No TMDL studies are scheduled for the next several years. It is recommended that the remaining funds in the TMDL studies account be used to pay the costs of TMDL implementation reporting (see next item).

There is no proposed 2012 budget for TMDL studies.

- **TMDL Implementation Reporting**—For the 2012 fiscal year, it is recommended that the Commission set aside funding to cover the costs associated with the BCWMC's role in tracking the implementation of the Medicine Lake, Sweeney Lake and Wirth Lake TMDLs. These TMDLs assigned categorical waste load allocations, which means a watershed approach is to be taken in implementing water quality improvement measures in these watersheds. The EPA approved the Wirth Lake TMDL on October 25, 2010 and the Medicine Lake TMDL on February 8, 2011. The Sweeney Lake TMDL is expected to be approved later in 2011.

In general, the Commission's role would be to monitor implementation of the TMDLs. This role would likely include the following tasks:

- Report on TMDL implementation activities to the MPCA. Formal reports will be due every five years, and annual reports will be needed by the MS4s to meet their reporting requirements. The MPCA has indicated that this type of reporting would include tracking installation/construction of BMPs, and implementation of activities. The report must also provide a short description of an adaptive management strategy for meeting the wasteload allocations.

For the first year of reporting, the report format will need to be developed. The data from the cities will need to be collected and entered into the report form. Five years after TMDL approval, a report must be prepared regarding the effectiveness of the implementation efforts on lake water quality. In addition to the information included in the annual reports, the five year assessment report (assume to be 2016 for all three lakes) should include trend analyses of the lake data, inflow monitoring data, an estimate of the reductions in phosphorus loading (from P8 modeling and/or monitoring data), and implementation strategy recommendations for the next five years. Possible recommendations could include changes to the water quality monitoring program for the lakes and/or inflows and changes to the potential management measures to reduce watershed and/or internal phosphorous loads.



Lake water quality monitoring data should be collected for one or two years prior to the preparation of the five year assessment reports. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) conducts annual monitoring of Wirth Lake, and Three Rivers Park District (TRPD) conducts annual monitoring of Medicine Lake. The MPRB and TRPD monitoring programs are similar to the monitoring performed by the Commission. Assuming that the MPRB and TRPD continue their monitoring of Wirth and Medicine Lakes, the Commission will need to take responsibility for monitoring Sweeney Lake. For Sweeney Lake, the completed and to-be-updated P8 modeling should be adequate for the five year assessment report. This means monitoring of inflows to the lake should not be necessary until the ten year assessment. In anticipation of the ten year assessment, the Commission should consider monitoring the inflows to Sweeney Lake in years eight and nine. The TRPD also conducts monitoring of inflows to Medicine Lake on a regular basis. Assuming that the TRPD continues their inflow monitoring for Medicine Lake (and it occurs at the right time), the Commission will be able to use this information in the five year assessment report. With implementation of the Wirth Lake outlet modification project in 2012, lake water quality monitoring data may show that the lake is meeting water quality criteria within the first five years of TMDL implementation. Therefore, the Commission should not need to monitor inflows to Wirth Lake.

Estimated cost: less than \$10,000

- Estimate and report progress towards achieving the assigned wasteload allocations. The watershed P8 model, slated for completion in 2012, will be an essential tool for estimating reductions in phosphorus loading. The additional fee proposed for Commission review of projects will cover the costs for updating the P8 model to include BMPs constructed/installed as part of Commission-reviewed projects. However, there will be additional BMPs constructed/installed that are not part of a Commission-reviewed project. The reduction in phosphorus loading for these BMPs should also be estimated, but this will require additional funding from the Commission. Beginning in 2013, the P8 model should be updated every year that new BMPs are constructed/installed, and the model results should be analyzed to understand the impacts of the BMPs on phosphorus loading. When available, this analysis should include a comparison of flow and runoff monitoring data to the P8 model results.

Estimated cost: \$0 – included in 2012 cost of proposed P8 modeling

- Lake water quality monitoring. Annual monitoring (at least CAMP monitoring) of lake water quality for Medicine, Sweeney and Wirth Lakes should occur. As noted above, the MPRB conducts annual monitoring of Wirth Lake, and the TRPD conducts annual monitoring of Medicine Lake, along with regular monitoring of inflows to Medicine Lake. It will be important for the Commission to coordinate with the MPRB and the TRPD to ensure that Wirth and Medicine Lakes continue to be monitored, either by MPRB/ TRPD, or by the Commission, should MPRB and/or TRPD decide not to perform the monitoring.

Estimated cost: \$0 – included in Commission’s water quality monitoring program (except Wirth Lake is assumed to continue to be monitored by MPRB).

The proposed 2012 budget for TMDL Implementation Reporting is less than \$10,000.

18. **Proposed 2012 Capital Projects**—For 2012, the capital projects to be paid through a Hennepin County tax levy include the 1) Main Stem restoration project (2012CR; Irving Avenue to Golden Valley Road, in Golden Valley and Minneapolis); estimated cost is \$856,000; 2) Wirth Lake outlet modification project; estimated cost is \$180,000, and 3) Schaper Park feasibility study

Wirth Lake outlet modification project from the Clean Water Legacy Fund, through the Board of Water and Soil Resources.

The Sweeney Lake outlet replacement is another capital project that will be constructed in 2011 or 2012. This \$250,000 project is to be paid using existing funds in the Flood Control Long Term Maintenance fund.

At its June 16, 2011 meeting, the BCWMC Commissioners also considered the assessment on the cities. The 2012 assessment was adopted by eight commissioners voting in favor to levy \$461,045 for the 2012 fiscal year, as compared with the \$434,150 for 2011 adopted in 2010, based on the following:

**Funding Needs:**

2012 Administrative Budget.....\$724,045

**Funding Source:**

2012 Assessment.....\$461,045


Transfer from BCWMC Flood Control Long-term Maintenance Fund .....\$205,000

Transfer from TMDL Fund.....\$10,000

2012 Estimated Permit Review Fees .....\$48,000

2012 Capital Projects Assessment (Hennepin County) .....\$998,000

The Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission's 2012 Operating Budget and 2012 Assessment per community are enclosed.



Linda Looms, Chair, Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Enclosures: 2012 Operating Budget  
2012 Assessment  
Watershed Management Plan Timeline

	A	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	<b>2012 Operating Budget</b>								
2	<b>Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission - June 2011</b>								
3	<b>DRAFT</b>								
4	Item	Audited 2010 Actual	2011 Budget	2011 Estimated - numbers shown are 2011 budget for now	Proposed 2012 Budget				
5	<b>ENGINEERING</b>								
6	Technical Services	119,832	110,000	110,000	120,000				
7	Plat Reviews (funded by permit fees)	53,128	50,000	50,000	60,000				
8	Commission and TAC Meetings	12,316	13,000	13,000	14,250				
9	Surveys and Studies	17,899	20,000	20,000	10,000				
10	Water Quality / Monitoring	24,489	34,000	34,000	20,000				
11	Water Quantity	8,264	11,000	11,000	11,000				
12	Inspections								
13	Watershed Inspections	10,842	8,000	8,000	7,000				
14	Project Inspections	5,714	10,000	10,000	9,000				
15	Municipal Plan Review	7,927	2,000	2,000	2,000 (1)				
16	<b>Subtotal Engineering</b>	<b>\$260,411</b>	<b>\$258,000</b>	<b>\$258,000</b>	<b>\$253,250</b>				
17	<b>PLANNING</b>								
18	Watershed-wide XP-SWMM Model				\$70,000				
19	Watershed-wide P8 Water Quality Model				\$135,000				
20	Next Generation Plan				\$40,000				
21	<b>Subtotal Planning</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$245,000</b>				
22	Administrator	30,297	36,000	36,000	50,000				
23	Legal	17,331	18,500	18,500	18,500				
24	Financial Management	3,054	3,000	3,000	3,045				
25	Audit, Insurance & Bond	13,328	15,000	15,000	15,225				
26	Meeting Catering Expenses	4,610	4,750	4,750	2,750				
27	Administrative Services	42,578	45,000	45,000	40,000				
28	Public Outreach								
29	Publications / Annual Report	5,169	2,000	2,000	2,000				
30	Website	1,031	4,500	4,500	2,500				
31	Watershed Outlet Monitoring Program (WOMP)	6,818	10,000	10,000	10,000 (2)				
32	Demonstration/Education Grants	3,140	5,000	5,000	0 (3)				
33	Watershed Education Partnerships	16,150	14,500	14,500	13,000 (4)				
34	Education and Public Outreach	2,911	4,900	4,900	5,775 (5)				
35	Public Communications	692	3,000	3,000	3,000				
36	Erosion/Sediment (Channel Maintenance)	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000 (6)				
37	Long-Term Maint. (Flood Control Project)	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000 (7)				
38									
39	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$197,108</b>	<b>\$216,150</b>	<b>\$216,150</b>	<b>\$215,795</b>				
40	<b>TMDLS</b>								
41	TMDL Studies	\$10,000	0	0	0				
42	TMDL Implementation				10,000				
43	<b>Subtotal TMDL Studies</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>				
44	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$467,519</b>	<b>\$474,150</b>	<b>\$474,150</b>	<b>\$724,045</b>				
45	<b>For Information (Administrative Account)</b>								
46	<b>Financial Information</b>								
47	Audited fiscal year 2010 fund balance at January 31, 2011				\$337,951				
48	Expected income from assessments in 2011				\$434,150				
49	Expected interest income in 2011				\$900				
50	Expected income from project review fees				\$40,000				
51	Estimated funds available for fiscal year 2011				\$812,401				
52	Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 2011				\$474,150				
53	Estimated fund balance as of January 31, 2012				\$338,251				
54									
55	<b>2012 Budget</b>								
56	Proposed 2012 Capital Projects				\$998,000				
57	Proposed 2012 Operating Budget				\$724,045				
58	Proposed total 2012 Budget				\$1,722,045				
59	<b>2012 Assessments and Fees</b>								
60	2012 Operating Budget				\$724,045				
61	Estimated 2012 permit fees (80% of permit expenditures)				\$48,000				
62	Transfer from Long-term Maintenance Fund for XP-SWMM Model				\$70,000				
63	Transfer from Long-term Maintenance Fund for P8 Model				\$135,000				
64	Use of TMDL Studies Fund				\$10,000				
65	Assessment proposed for 2012 Operating Budget				\$461,045				
66	Proposed Budget Reserve on January 31, 2012				\$338,251				
67									
68									
69	(1) Review municipal local plan amendments and adjoining WMO plan amendments.								
70	(2) Review municipal comprehensive plan amendments.								
71	(3) Grant program for demonstrations and education								
72	(4) 2012 budget – CAMP (\$5,000); River Watch (\$2,000); WaterShed Partners (\$3,000); Metro Blooms (\$2,000); Blue Thumb (\$1,000). In 2011 WMWA projects and administration were combined into line item 34 -Education and Public Outreach.								
73	(5) 2012 budget includes brochures, factsheets, display materials, educational articles and WMWA administration and projects.								
74	(6) Will be transferred to Channel Maintenance Fund								
75	(7) Will be transferred to Long-Term Maintenance Fund								

**Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission  
2012 Assessment  
June 2011**

Community	For Taxes Payable in 2011 Net Tax Capacity *	2010 Percent of Valuation	Current Area Watershed in Acres	Percent of Area	Average Percent	2009 Assessment	2010 Assessment	2011 Assessment	Proposed 2012 Assessment	Percent Increase 2011 to 2012
Crystal	\$7,417,300	5.73	1,264	5.09	5.41	\$449,874	\$414,150	\$434,151	\$461,045	6%
Golden Valley	\$30,145,030	23.29	6,615	26.63	24.96	\$24,067	\$22,131	\$23,433	\$24,941	6%
Medicine Lake	\$918,976	0.71	199	0.80	0.76	\$112,052	\$103,256	\$109,230	\$115,080	5%
Minneapolis	\$9,531,547	7.37	1,690	6.80	7.08	\$3,298	\$3,090	\$3,301	\$3,464	6%
Minnepinka	\$8,217,982	6.35	1,690	6.80	7.08	\$33,246	\$30,216	\$31,375	\$32,661	4%
New Hope	\$7,811,766	6.04	1,252	4.46	5.41	\$23,031	\$21,510	\$22,558	\$24,920	10%
Plymouth	\$56,865,614	43.94	11,618	46.77	45.35	\$24,445	\$22,605	\$23,840	\$25,533	7%
Robbinsdale	\$2,706,469	2.09	345	1.39	1.74	\$205,093	\$188,453	\$196,201	\$209,101	7%
St. Louis Park	\$5,796,381	4.48	752	3.03	3.75	\$8,077	\$7,417	\$7,672	\$8,022	5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$129,411,066</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>24,843</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>\$449,875</b>	<b>\$414,150</b>	<b>\$434,150</b>	<b>\$461,045</b>	<b>6%</b>

\* Information is certified amounts from the County.