



Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: August 30, 2017 **Time:** 9:00-11:00 am
Meeting Location: Johnson County Transit Facility, 1701 W Old Hwy 56, Olathe, KS 66061

Attendees:

Funding Approach Sub-Committee Doug Whitacre – City of Shawnee Burt Morey – City of Overland Park Melisa Prenger – City of Prairie Village Tim McEldowney – City of Gardner Chet Belcher – City of Olathe Courtney Christensen – Mission Hills Matt Scott – CDM Brad Schleeter – Affinis Chad Johnson – Olsson Associates Steve Roth – Benesch James Keith – Walter P. Moore Ginny Moore – The Conservation Fund	JC SMP Lee Kellenberger Sarah Smith Heather Schmidt	Consultant Team Patti Banks – Vireo Triveece Penelton – Vireo Jeff Henson – B&V Andrew Smith – B&V Justina Gonzalez – B&V
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda Objectives
Inform sub-committee of the JC SMP Strategic Plan Implementation Status
Highlight preliminary outcomes achieved by other sub-committees to date

Handouts: Agenda
 JC SMP What’s Happening Booklet

Notes

Introduction / Meeting Ice Breaker

- Andrew of B&V welcomed attendees to the first meeting of the funding approach sub-committee. He stated that JC SMP and consultants appreciate attendees dedicating their time to this effort and being part of engaged, open discussions.
- Triveece of Vireo led the sub-committee through a meeting ice breaker. Each attendee was given a circular cut-out with a word written on it that describes a community characteristic, such as safety, affordability, jobs, or schools. Triveece asked the sub-committee to think about the characteristics that are most important for the community that their family lives in. She asked attendees to group up based on what they believe a strong community offers. Attendees formed three groups with all groups having similar

characteristics. Attendees noted that a strong community has services that people desire along with jobs and infrastructure that can connect people to such services in a safe and affordable atmosphere.

- Triveece explained that the meeting ice breaker relates to the funding sub-committee in that the SMP used to fund just one characteristic of a strong community which was flood damage reduction. Now the SMP and area stakeholders are tasked with looking beyond that. The funding sub-committee will be providing important guidance on how to direct and balance funding for also water quality and system management. Going forward, attendees will need to think within the framework of a watershed versus a municipality.

1st Meeting Goals / Review of JC SMP 2016 Strategic Plan

- Consultants outlined the agenda and goals of the first funding approach meeting.
 - **Funding Approach Sub-Committee 1st Meeting Goals:** Andrew stated that the sub-committee will spend time during the first meeting going over the JC SMP Strategic Plan and the direction the County will be taking. During the first meeting, attendees will be informed on the other sub-committees and what they have accomplished. A good deal of time will be spent on the background and context of the program and preliminary outcomes. Andrew explained that attendees will be given a significant amount of information and that later meetings will involve far more interactive discussions. In the meantime, JC SMP and consultants want attendees to feel engaged and should feel free to ask any questions.
- Andrew also provided a review of the JC SMP 2016 Strategic Plan.
 - **SMP Strategic Plan Review:** The adopted plan represents a lot of change for the program. The plan seeks to establish a state-of-practice for a watershed based approach. Such an approach will look at needs on a watershed basis rather than a jurisdictional basis so as to gain maximum value regarding flood control, system management, and water quality. Sub-committees for each area have been formed along with a watershed-based organization sub-committee. Each sub-committee has specific goals and is adding technical details to an overall framework. There has been an effort to define needs and methodology for project prioritization. This funding approach sub-committee will look at how money should move in the program and opportunities to pursue outside funding. Currently, the watershed-based organization sub-committee is on hiatus but they will re-convene in the fall. Once forward paths are finalized then a pilot watershed will be implemented.
- Lee of JC SMP stated that the program really wants to hear from area stakeholders. Attendees should feel welcome to present their ideas and comments. The other sub-committees have done just that and have given valuable feedback in forming a framework and developing future strategies.

Update of Sub-committee Preliminary Outcomes

- Consultants provided attendees with a JC SMP What's Happening Booklet that explains the Strategic Plan focus areas and the preliminary outcomes of the sub-committees. They then provided additional detail on each sub-committee.
 - **Watershed-based Organization:** As mentioned previously, the most significant change to the SMP is that the program will be moving from a municipally based system to a watershed basis. The watershed-based organization sub-committee divided the County amongst 6 watershed groupings. Those groupings were based on common characteristics of the watersheds and communities as well as the goal of ensuring board efficiency. The sub-committee wanted the groupings to be meaningful and have size to them but at the same they did not want to over-burden city staff with too many meetings. The watershed sub-committee also drafted a sample organizational concept that looked at who should be in the organizations along with voting rights and responsibilities. A good deal of time was spent on discussing who should be members of the organizations. There was

a strong sentiment that cities still need to have control over what happens in their jurisdiction. The watershed approach will allow the SMP to make investments towards the highest need in the watershed. The first objective of the organizations will be to put together watershed plans as facilitated by the SMP.

- Consultants showed the following slide with the cities in the 6 watershed groupings. The watershed sub-committee determined that if a city is less than 2% of the watershed then they do not need representation in the organization.

Cities in the 6 Watershed Groupings

NE Johnson County		Indian Creek		Upper Blue River		Marais Des Cygnes River		Captain/Kill Creek		Cedar/Mill Creek	
Fairway	4%	Johnson County Uninc.	0.0%	Leawood	7%	Edgerton	8%	Gardner	7%	Bonner Springs	0.3%
Lenexa	4%	Leawood	14%	Johnson County Uninc.	50%	Gardner	5%	De Soto	7%	De Soto	4%
Merriam	15%	Lenexa	4%	Olathe	6%	Johnson County Uninc.	79%	Johnson County Uninc.	86%	Gardner	0.1%
Mission	9%	Olathe	21%	Overland Park	36%	Olathe	0.3%			Johnson County Uninc.	15%
Mission Hills	7%	Overland Park	57%	Spring Hill	0.8%	Spring Hill	8%			Lake Quivira	0.9%
Mission Woods	0.3%	Prairie Village	4%							Lenexa	22%
Overland Park	26%									Olathe	31%
Prairie Village	11%									Shawnee	27%
Roeland Park	6%										
Shawnee	17%										
Westwood	1.4%										
Westwood Hills	0.2%										

- Triveece then led the funding sub-committee through a second group activity. Each attendee was provided with a set amount of fake money. They were then asked to distribute funds amongst three jars labeled system management, water quality, and flooding. Triveece explained that the purpose of the exercise was to have attendees think on the watershed scale as to what weighting of investment they wanted to give to each focus area.
 - **System Management:** In the group activity, attendees allocated a total of \$590 to system management. Attendees explained that not investing in system management is comparable to buying a house with termites in that why should cities put a new road over a system that is going to fail. Attendees noted that failed systems directly affect the people and industries that are right next to it. Consultants explained that the preliminary outcomes of the system management sub-committee consisted of defining the stormwater asset registry, establishing key goals and strategies, and drafting a framework for emergency projects as an interim program. The sub-committee also looked at putting together asset management plans on the County and per watershed basis. Such plans will compile information from stakeholders to assess asset risk and prioritization. The County asset management plan will likely be completed in 2018 and will provide a framework for the watersheds.

- **Water Quality:** Attendees allocated a total of \$310 to water quality. Attendees explained that communities with riparian corridors, especially near housing, do consider water quality to be a top priority. But at the same time communities have to assess the effectiveness of putting funds towards some natural systems with quality that is too degraded. Consultants highlighted the outcomes of the water quality sub-committee which involved identifying water quality top issues, goals, and project types. The sub-committee considered potential incentives and participation requirements as well as looked at draft project prioritization and methods for estimating project effectiveness. Consultants noted that water quality involves varying constituents and means by which such constituents get in the water. Prioritization as a result can become quite complicated. The sub-committee did indicate the importance of using a sliding scale to measure success and demonstrate improvements. In addition, the sub-committee particularly focused on preservation of high quality waters as a top priority.
- **Flood Damage Reduction:** Attendees gave a total of \$600 to flood damage reduction. They explained that flooding is a main, vocal concern from constituents. Consultants stated that the flood damage reduction sub-committee is continuing to meet. So far the sub-committee has looked at updating project prioritization, revising the SMP Flood Problem Rating Table, and considered varying levels of service beyond the 100-year event. Consultants noted that it's important to remember that the SMP has been a very successful program around flood damage reduction. The goal of the sub-committee is to consider ways to increase benefits and broaden its reach to entities that may not have been able to participate. The sub-committee is also discussing how to proceed with NOAA Atlas 14 updates.

Closing / Next Steps

- The meeting concluded with consultants acknowledging that they covered a lot of background context on implementation so far. Attendees are encouraged to review the booklet and meeting materials so as to further inform the process going forward. Subsequent meetings will involve collaborative discussions with attendees with the goal of getting as much input as possible.
- The next meeting is scheduled for September 27th at the same time, same place.
- Consultants called for any questions or comments.
 - **Q: *Has the County considered offering services, such as stormwater crews, in lieu of funding? Would it be possible for the watersheds to have a service crew?***
A: County crews were tasked to work on Blue River projects, for instance. The County would likely have to hire additional staff in order to offer services on that scale. But it is a good option to consider when evaluating future strategies. (Lee, JC SMP)
A: The watershed organizations are going to be asked to be as proactive as possible. The SMP will establish minimum recommendations and each organization will have a representative to the SMP. Right now it has been suggested that the representative be city staff. But an organization could also decide to go further and have dedicated staff. (Andrew, B&V)
 - **Q: *Can you tell us more about the watershed-based organization sub-committee and how they decided member representation?***
A: After a series of meetings, the sub-committee came to the consensus that each city would have a voting representative on the organization. The cities are not required to participate should they so choose. The sub-committee decided that the organizations will have a technical committee that can consist of ex-officio members per their choosing, such as MARC or NGOs. Voting rights will stay with the cities, though, because they have to come up with funding and manage the projects along with assume liabilities. (Andrew, B&V)

- Attendees had the following final comments:
 - The watershed-based organization should be commended for considering ex-officio membership. Including important voices of those involved in water quantity and quality will help broaden the scope and capabilities of the program. Ex-officio involvement could particularly facilitate alternative funding opportunities.
 - Each watershed organization will decide how to move forward once the watershed plans are complete. The organizations will also decide how often to meet and the extent of their involvement. Even though the organizations may mean more meetings for city staff, it will also mean more coordinated resources and funding which would be worth the effort.
- Lee closed by saying that the SMP has been a good program, but that the purpose of implementing the Strategic Plan is to make it even better. He thanked the sub-committee for their time and for their future involvement in key discussions.