

**JOHNSON COUNTY
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
ADVISORY COUNCIL**

STRATEGIC PLAN MEETING

JUNE 30, 2016

SMAC OVERARCHING COMMENTS:

- Report looks good
- Looks really good
- Report looks good
- Plan looks mostly good to us
- Strategy to delist 303(d) water bodies and/or avoid development of TMDs is a great idea.
- We appreciated the Phase 1 and 2 tasks and action items in the study.
- We are pleased to see that the updated strategic plan continues those objectives, while also considering stormwater related challenges and opportunities.
- ...supports the new strategic vision...believe this new approach will favor all cities and force collaboration/cooperation in the County.

PROJECT TEAM OVERARCHING RESPONSE:

- We appreciate your thoughtful review and comments on the draft Strategic Plan for the Johnson County Stormwater Management Program. While the Plan outlines the overall direction for achieving the vision and mission of the program, implementation of the Plan will require much more work. We will be creating several subcommittees to develop policies and procedures around each new program area, and how projects will be funded and prioritized in the future.

DETAILED COMMENTS/RESPONSE

CATEGORY	SMAC COMMENTS	RESPONSE (PROJECT TEAM)
Timing of Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Move faster (gradual phase-in) versus waiting until Phase 1 is complete ■ What will next year’s budget look like? ■ Need to use existing surpluses. ■ Don’t wait to begin distributing some funding to provide for the emergency pipe failures. Recommend moving some of available 2017 funding to be distributed Q1 2017 for maintenance. Reserve specific amount for future projects once details about administrative rules developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The County is anxious to get started as soon as the SMP Strategic Plan is approved. While completion of Phase 1 is currently estimated to be completed within 3 years, many action items will be completed significantly sooner, and as early as one quarter after approval. In addition, the plan is a living document and we will be reviewing and updating tactics and schedule as appropriate throughout implementation.
Revision of Funding Methods (source and prioritization)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More points for projects that alleviate street flooding than property in floodplain. ■ Allow flexibility in funding by category. ■ Consider more points for projects that bring alternative funding. In program to use available budget / reduce surpluses ■ Need flexibility – project types and funding criteria ■ Tiered priority system - higher priority and/or cost share for projects that address both home and street flooding. Lower for individual home buyouts, system upgrades, etc. ■ Be careful as prioritization criteria are revised – avoid what has happened at MARC where brick-and-mortar projects cannot score as high as non-traditional projects. ■ Strike appropriate balance, and method to select projects, between projects that are significantly different. ■ Provide temporary funding immediately to address backlog of system replacement needs before failure occurs ■ Recommend developing a method to distribute funds for maintenance in 2017, especially to use up the large fund balances that are accruing. These distributions could be given a set of requirements, etc. to follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Any changes to the current funding method and the prioritization of projects will be developed in Phase 1 Implementation based on the work of a specific subcommittee that will include County staff and SMAC members. This is a good starting point for issues to consider as part of that evaluation process.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Need stand-alone home buyout program 	
System Replacement/ Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Should be an eligible expense. ■ Important to include funds for maintenance projects. ■ Include acceptable criteria – use of different lining methods, when to consider full replacement, materials, life-cycle analysis, etc. ■ Technology is improving reliability and ease of gathering asset information - smaller cities can more reasonably begin to catch up. A JCSMP Guidelines/SOP would be very helpful. ■ Some cities have spent significant time and money identifying, prioritizing and programming aging system replacement. New funding from County will benefit only a subset of cities within the County. Request recognizing/crediting cities that already have successful asset inventory and condition assessment programs in place <p>Lakes, ponds and streams significant part of system – funds need to be allocated to keep them functioning properly. Also lake and dam restoration, spillway retrofits, dredging, wetland enhancements, stream stabilization projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The County and the Steering Committee recognizes the need for on-going “maintenance” or “System Replacement” as described in the Plan, and there has been a significant amount of stakeholder feedback regarding the need for funding assistance for this type of project. Details regarding funding of such projects, including decisions regarding how such projects would be prioritized with other projects, are details that a subcommittee will need to work through during implementation.
Asset Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Should be a priority. County should provide funding to cities to move through process – but do not need to hire a county asset manager or manage the process on behalf of cities. ■ Many cities already initiated AM activities – standardizing condition rating criteria will be a challenge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ To best facilitate and fairly prioritize how the SMP would support system replacement projects, it will be necessary to develop a comprehensive understanding of the system. Therefore, the “System Replacement” gap that was identified and discussed by the Steering Committee is slightly broadened in the report, and called “System Management,” and is intended to include the inventory and condition assessment activities necessary for an Asset Management program, as well as prioritization of system replacement projects.

Water Quality Improvement Projects

- Politics: Flood control/system maintenance prioritized over water quality in region. Org and Priorities need to meet needs/priorities of councils and residents.
- Streams/rivers degraded. Delisting streams lofty goal. Focus on local needs not receiving bodies of water. Focus on restoring hydrology in urban areas.
- Developing strategies to delist 303(d) water bodies and/or avoid development of TMDL is a great idea.

- While water quality may not currently rank as high in the mid-west as in other parts of the country, it is inevitable that water quality protection requirements will increase, and it is important for SMP to be organized such that it can help facilitate the achievement of future requirements. In the meantime, it is the desire of County and the steering committee to encourage watershed based improvements projects that both reduce flooding and improve water quality. Details regarding funding of such projects, including decisions regarding how such projects would be prioritized with other projects, are details that a subcommittee will need to work through during implementation.

Watershed Based Organization

- Need to have consistency between watersheds regarding policies and approval procedures that follow the new scoring guidelines and funding policies.
- 1st hurdle for watershed based program – ensure watershed wide agreement on technical concepts and goals, problem areas with both cause and effect identified, required agreement on potential projects.
- Some obstacles will be source of matching funds from local governing bodies for each project so authority of a watershed based organization would be limited.
- Exact role of watershed committee needs to be identified.
- Not in favor of establishing separate watershed boards that allocate project funding. Revise project scoring to give priority to projects that have larger scale watershed benefits instead.

- The purpose of the watershed-based approach is to be able to look at needs on a watershed basis rather than a jurisdictional basis, in order to gain maximum value regarding flood control and water quality. The County and the steering committee agree that there will need to be consistency regarding policies and procedures for all watersheds. The details regarding the roles and responsibilities of these watershed boards/committees will be developed by a subcommittee comprised of County staff and SMAC members.