



**Meeting Notes**

---

**Meeting Date:** October 11, 2017      **Time:** 9:00 - 11:00 am  
**Meeting Location:** Johnson County Transit Facility, 1701 W Old Hwy 56, Olathe, KS 66061

---

**Attendees:**

**Flood Damage Reduction Sub-Committee**

- Paula Swatch – City of Westwood Hills
- Chet Belcher – City of Olathe
- Lauren Garwood – City of Overland Park
- Cynthia Moeller-Krass – City of Shawnee
- Kevin Bruemmer – City of Merriam
- Tom Jacobs – City of Lenexa
- Charles McAclister – JC Wastewater
- John Denlinger – HDR
- Katie Handley – GBA
- John Parker – Burns and McDonnell
- Jessica Veach – CDM
- Dan Miller – Lamp Rynearson

**JC SMP**

- Lee Kellenberger
- Heather Schmidt
- Sarah Smith

**Consultant Team**

- Patti Banks – Vireo
- Triveece Penelton – Vireo
- Andrew Smith – B&V
- Pablo Gonzalez – Quesada – B&V
- Justina Gonzalez – B&V

---

**Agenda Objectives**

- Gather consensus on the final direction for flood damage reduction
- Identify top solutions the County should do to reduce flooding

**Handouts:**      Agenda

---

**Notes**

**Introduction / Update of Implementation Status / 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting Goals**

- Andrew of B&V welcomed attendees to the fifth meeting of the flood damage reduction sub-committee. He provided a quick update of SMP strategic plan implementation to date.
  - **Strategic Plan Implementation Progress:** The flood damage reduction sub-committee is continuing to add details to the future framework. System management and water quality sub-committees have wrapped up their work and have identified final directions. The funding approach sub-committee has begun meeting. In a few weeks, the watershed-based organization sub-committee will re-convene.
  - **Flood Damage Reduction Sub-Committee 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting Review:** During the previous meeting, the sub-committee spent a good deal of time looking at updated priorities and the new direction to approach flooding on a watershed scale. The sub-committee discussed regional solutions, limits for

flooding analysis, impactful solutions, and partnership opportunities. Also, the sub-committee approached the topic of NOAA Atlas 14 revisions with some great points gathered from that discussion.

- Consultants outlined the agenda and goals of the fifth flood damage reduction meeting.
  - **Flood Damage Reduction Sub-Committee 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting Goals:** The main goal for the fifth meeting is to identify the top solutions the County should pursue to reduce flooding. By the end of the meeting, the program would like to gather consensus on the final direction for flood damage reduction.

### Flood Damage Reduction Top Solutions

- Lee of JC SMP explained that past prioritization included a rating table that established a scoring level a project must meet in order to be considered for county funding. The rating table is a valuable tool for addressing local drainage issues. In going forward, the SMP is looking to **prioritize multi-jurisdictional projects** in that multiple cities contribute and benefit. The program would still address local drainage, but the goal of this sub-committee is to generate a list of what should be the top solutions to address flooding. So far, the sub-committee has suggested a **three prong approach** in looking at **watershed scale solutions, local drainage, and a stand-alone home buyout program.**
  - Participants had the following comments:
    - The FEMA floodplain is an arbitrary cut-off when addressing flooding. Having the different scales of solutions will give the program flexibility to be more responsive in the future.
    - Watershed scale solutions allow the program to become more pro-active, particularly in not relying on municipalities alone to initiate work. Watershed solutions will promote longer range plans beyond just the annual cycle.
    - The watershed plans should be an incubator for presenting future projects. There should be coordination in the scope of the plans so as to ensure that cohesive strategies are proposed rather than piecemeal solutions.
    - Under the three prong approach, there should also be tiers of funding. A regional, watershed-based improvement project could receive 100% funding because of the difficulty in coordinating funding. Local drainage projects could then receive a lower match from the program.
    - Funding matches could be set, but funding amounts per solution type or even per watershed should not be set. The program should have flexibility to move funding so that needs are met.
    - Needs really won't be defined until the watershed plans are completed. Plans should encourage flow attenuation. The program could give greater prioritization weight towards attenuation versus capacity projects.
- Lee explained that the **watershed plans** will look at existing hydrology and hydraulics as an input. Updates could be done if necessary, but the output will be a list of projects that can enable the program to go forward and be strategic in efforts. Watersheds will likely have different priorities. But by going beyond the limitation of municipal boundaries, the plans will develop solutions that haven't been considered yet. The program is looking at long term planning of 5, 10, and potentially even 25 year horizons. Watershed plans should also help in communicating to the public the amount of stormwater needs in the area.

- Lee then asked the sub-committee if future solutions should include **partnerships** with additional entities, such as private developers, etc.
  - Participants had the following comments:
    - Having the watershed organizations partner with development projects would be a benefit for all parties. Developers are only expected to follow APWA, which may not be adequate in certain situations.
    - The watershed organizations need to have more initiative on partnerships and outside involvement. Partnerships have greatly benefited JC Wastewater by leveraging resources and in getting multiple stakeholders committed to results.
    - Funding strategies should not only consider how to divide funds, but also how to increase the amount of available funds. Partnerships will be integral in driving more funds into the program.
  
- Consultants asked the sub-committee to provide confirmation on the **top solutions** for SMP flood damage reduction. The sub-committee confirmed that the following are top priorities:
  - **SMP Flood Damage Reduction Top Solutions**
    - **FEMA floodplain and Johnson County regulated areas (includes Zone X)**
    - **Regional solutions (includes land preservation)**
    - **Local drainage projects (includes roadway flooding)**
    - **Home buy-out program**
    - **Home-owner's technical assistance program**
  
- Sub-committee members had the following additional comments:
  - Zone X should be included as a priority. Zone X is beyond the FEMA floodplain but is regulated by the County. It is the ultimate build out conditions with more impervious area and higher runoff under the 100 year event.
  - The home-owner's technical assistance program would offer flood proofing assistance. The SMP could use a list of consultants that can do a home inspection.
  - On flood proofing construction, the SMP could do a cost share for construction but not for technical assistance. To qualify for cost share the house would have to be out of Zone AE. Otherwise, the program would basically be paying home-owner's to stay in the floodplain.
  - A revised ranking sheet should be prepared that places the top solutions on the same scoring plane. The ranking sheet should be re-assessed once the watershed plans are done to ensure that scoring aligns with key needs.

### **Closing / Next Steps**

- The meeting closed with JC SMP and participants confirming that the sub-committee had provided sufficient direction for the flood damage reduction component of the SMP. Guiding principles will be communicated back to the watershed-based organization sub-committee and SMAC.
- The flood damage reduction sub-committee has concluded their meetings, but members are more than welcome to participate in later initiatives. JC SMP and consultants thanked participants for their valuable role in the strategic plan implementation.