



**Meeting Notes**

---

**Meeting Date:** December 20, 2017      **Time:** 9:00-11:00 am  
**Meeting Location:** Johnson County Transit Facility, 1701 W Old Hwy 56, Olathe, KS 66061

---

**Attendees:**

<b>Funding Approach Sub-Committee</b>	<b>JC SMP</b>	<b>Consultant Team</b>
Courtney Christensen – City of Mission Hills	Lee Kellenberger	Patti Banks – Vireo
Burt Morey – City of Overland Park	Sarah Smith	Triveece Penelton – Vireo
Melissa Prenger – City of Prairie Village	Heather Schmidt	Andrew Smith – B&V
Rob Beilfuss – City of Olathe		Justina Gonzalez – B&V
Joe Johnson – City of Leawood		
Doug Whitacre – City of Shawnee		
Matt Scott - CDM		
Brad Schleeter – Affinis		
Tony Stanton – Olsson Associates		
Ginny Moore – The Conservation Fund		

---

**Agenda Objectives**  
Confirm future SMP funding strategies

---

**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 funding approach sub-committee. He provided a quick update of SMP strategic plan implementation to date.
  - **Strategic Plan Implementation Progress:** The watershed-based organization sub-committee has reconvened. They are working through a lot of the guidance developed by the system management, water quality, and flood damage reduction sub-committees. That sub-committee along with this funding group will be setting the policy path for moving forward.
  - **Funding Approach Sub-Committee 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting Review:** During the previous meeting, the sub-committee discussed opportunities to pursue alternative funding sources. Participants discussed potential SMP changes that could incentivize and assist the watershed organizations in securing outside funding.

- Consultants outlined the agenda and goals of the fifth funding approach meeting.
  - **Funding Approach Sub-Committee 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting Goals:** The goal of the fifth meeting is to gain consensus on a future funding strategy. The objective is to turn tentative suggestions into firm guidance.

### Future Funding Strategy

- Consultants explained that over the course of multiple meetings the sub-committee has consistently emphasized key elements of a funding strategy. Consultants stated that they would like to get additional input and then voting consensus on three main issues; that being funding categories, allotment method, and tiers.
- **Funding Categories**
  - Consultants explained that funding categories are essentially the grouping the SMP would be assigning to particular projects and activities. The sub-committee has stated that since system management is a different initiative from that of flooding and water quality improvements then funding should be separate.
  - Participants had the following comments:
    - Having categories for funding would be appropriate so long as there is flexibility. A range of minimum and maximum funding for categories would allow the program to be responsive to changing needs.
    - System management should have a balanced approach in that the goal is to improve the system without also draining all available funding.
    - In order to receive system management funds there should be some minimum level of standards that the applicant has to follow.
    - There should be an additional category for allocating planning funds. Planning should be accounted for separately regardless of the type of initiative.
    - The weighting of funding categories should be re-evaluated when the asset management plans and watershed plans are completed.
  - **Via vote, participants confirmed that the SMP should have separate categories of funding. Participants confirmed initial targets for system/asset management at 30%, for flooding and water quality at 50%, and the remainder 20% for planning and administrative expenses.**
- **Funding Allotment Method**
  - Consultants stated that the sub-committee has indicated that funding allotment for watershed improvement projects (flooding and water quality) should be based on merit prioritization. That prioritization will be done via the watershed plans. Consultants asked if funding for system management should be merit based as well or if there should be a set allocation to each watershed.
  - Participants had the following comments:
    - System management funding should not be simply divided up amongst watersheds because the funds will be spread too thin. The program then would not be able to fund projects of substance.
    - System management initiatives will be more localized, city based projects. There should be a merit system so as to avoid potential conflict amongst cities.

- Allocating set funding to watersheds means that the watersheds would define their key interests. But that means they may also spend funds on issues that are not as pressing amongst the overall County setting.
    - There should be no minimum allocations to watersheds and merit based competition should be at the County level rather than within a watershed.
  - **Via vote, participants confirmed that the allotment method for both watershed improvement projects and system/asset management should be merit based. Participants confirmed that initial competition for funding should be County-wide. After the development of watershed plans, stakeholders could then evaluate if competition for funding should be determined by the watershed organizations.**
- **Funding Tiers**
  - Consultants explained that the sub-committee has discussed having separate tiers of funding for higher priority projects. The highest tier would be for significant watershed projects with potential funding at 100% from the SMP. Remaining projects, such as local drainage issues, would be at a lower tier of match funding. The flood damage reduction sub-committee also identified a key solution of having a voluntary home buyout program which may be a separate tier.
  - Participants had the following comments:
    - Having full funding of watershed level projects will greatly help in overcoming logistical issues of multi-jurisdictional projects.
    - Offering a lower match for non-watershed level projects puts the onus on cities for their local issues. It would also help incentivize alternative funding.
    - The change in match funding for local projects should be moderate. A drop in match funding from 75% to then 25% would likely be considered too large of a change.
    - The match for local projects should change to 50%. That way watershed level projects gain a 25% match and local projects lose that 25%.
    - For voluntary home buyout, the SMP should offer a 50% match. Cities will likely need to administer the buyout because they will need to tear down the house. Cities will also most likely own and maintain the property.
  - **Via vote, participants confirmed that watershed level improvement projects should receive 100% funding from the SMP. Projects that are at the local level should receive 50% funding from the SMP. For the home buyout program, the SMP should offer a 50% match.**
- The sub-committee reiterated that the confirmed funding strategies are a starting point. Strategies are to be re-evaluated and modified as needed after a determined time period.

### Closing / Next Steps

- Consultants explained that the next meeting will be a joint meeting with the watershed-based organization sub-committee.
- The next **joint meeting** is scheduled for January 31<sup>st</sup> at the same time, same place.
- JC SMP and Consultants thanked the sub-committee for their time and guidance.