System Management
Sub-Committee

Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: July 26, 2017 **Time:** 9:00-11:00 am

Meeting Location: Johnson County Transit Facility, 1701 W Old Hwy 56, Olathe, KS 66061

Attendees:

System Management Sub-Committee	JC SMP	Consultant Team
Neil Meredith – City of Olathe	Lee Kellenberger	Patti Banks – Vireo
Mike Gregory – City of Shawnee	Sarah Smith	Triveece Penelton – Vireo
Tom Jacobs – City of Lenexa	Heather Schmidt	Bryan Dickerson – B&V
Lorraine Basalo – City of Overland Park		Andrew Smith – B&V
Patrick Beane – JC Wastewater		Justina Gonzalez – B&V
Jason Hrabe – JC AIMS		
Brent Johnson – Olsson Associates		
Doug Carpenter – GBA		
Cliff Speegle - Affinis		
Mike Beezhold – HDR		
Stacy Gallick – TREKK		

Agenda Objectives

Discuss the conceptual preferred direction for watershed-based system management

Confirm key elements of asset management framework

Discuss county-wide strategic asset and system management plan

Discuss individualized watershed-based asset and system management plans

Handouts: Agenda

Notes

Introduction / Update of Implementation Status / 5th Meeting Goals

- Andrew of B&V welcomed attendees to the fourth meeting of the system management sub-committee. He provided a quick update of SMP strategic plan implementation to date.
  - **Strategic Plan Implementation Progress:** The system management sub-committee is in phase two of the overall implementation process. Once all sub-committees finalize future strategies, then a pilot watershed organization will be implemented at a later date.

- Consultants outlined the agenda and goals of the fifth system management meeting.
  - **System Management Sub-Committee 5th Meeting Goals:** During the fifth meeting, the group will conclude identifying the system management direction. The County and consultants will also ask for comments/suggestions on the next steps of the system management process.

- Consultants called for any questions or comments pertaining to the strategic plan implementation. Questions and answers are summarized below.
  - Q: *Will SMAC review the direction and strategy proposed by the sub-committee?*
    A: After the sub-committee confirms a clear consensus, then that strategy will be reviewed by SMAC. The County wanted to first give area stakeholders a chance to weigh in on the system management approach. Next steps will include a county-wide asset management initiative that will begin soon. (Lee, JC SMP)

- Andrew then reviewed accomplishments of the previous system management meeting.
  - **System Management Sub-Committee 4th Meeting Review:** At the previous meeting, the sub-committee identified the most important factors for capital project prioritization. Those factors were safety, service life, economy, and quality of life. The sub-committee also provided recommendations on common requirements to qualify for SMP funding and drafted a framework for emergency projects in the interim. Emergency funding will not be available for the budget year 2018, but there will be funds available in 2019.

JC SMP Strategic Asset & System Management Plan

- Bryan of B&V then outlined the key components of the JC SMP Strategic Asset & System Management Plan (SAMP) so as to gather consensus and suggestions from the group. Bryan explained that there will be one SAMP for the County and then individual watershed plans. Asset management plans for each watershed will allow for individualized solutions to address different priorities per watershed. The SAMP essentially lays out the framework and ground rules for system management. In order to do comparisons of projects, there has to be a structured, consistent approach in how information is developed and used.
  - **Asset Registry:** The asset registry will include the entirety of the system in the watershed which will include the natural and engineered systems as well as community and private assets. The inclusion of private assets, however, is for informational purposes and does not imply a requirement to maintain such assets. The SAMP can identify what assets are priorities to inventory first, for instance if the engineered components should be first considered.
  - **Prioritization Methodology:** The sub-committee defined four key prioritization criteria. Those criteria will be used to target assets and resources. Prioritization methodology will involve identifying funding required to operate, maintain, renew, & upgrade assets on a scheduled basis.
  - **Criteria for Risk/Capital Prioritization:** Prioritization criteria will consider safety, service life, economy, and quality of life. Safety implies that assets operate to prevent and protect residents from dangers of the system. Service life means that the life expectancy of the asset will be weighed when evaluating management solutions. Economy implies prioritization for assets in areas of high use or with critical infrastructure. Lastly, quality of life considers the role assets play in enhancing residents' overall well being. Service life assesses the likelihood of failure while the other three criteria assess the consequence of failure.
  - **Information Management:** The SAMP will lay out an approach for compiling a common data set of assets including their risk profile and condition. There will be a county-wide data structure where information will be shared amongst county and city entities.
  - **Funding & Maintenance Strategies:** Funding strategies mainly apply to internal funding. The SAMP will look at common minimum requirements to qualify for program funding, such as the use of established design standards. In regards to maintenance, there will need to be common tools/methodologies for evaluating an asset's condition and maintaining it.

- Sub-committee members had the following comments on the key components of the SAMP.
  - Drafting an asset registry will take a significant amount of time because of limited resources. Following criteria for condition assessment and inventory may be easier for cities that haven't collected this information. For cities that have, though, it may be difficult to make adjustments going forward.
  - It should be expected that preparing an asset registry is a long process. But the cities can do a little at a time and build from there. JC Wastewater, for example, is half-way through preparing their registry.
  - The four criteria for prioritization are still valid. The phrase "**economic impact**" should be used instead of economy so as to better define what that goal means.
  - In regards to information management, the County does not want to take over city asset management programs. The expectation is that cities will still maintain their information but that data will be shared such as with AIMS. Cities that don't have an asset inventory may need assistance bringing them up to speed so certain elements of the registry might rise to county-wide involvement.
  - The purpose of information management is not to provide the County with lots of data. The end goal is to inform decisions so that funds are spent in the most strategic way possible. Such efforts should demonstrate value to the cities and watershed organizations.
  - Information management is also a tool to help city councils and residents understand the need to fund system management appropriately. Having the registry with condition assessment keeps the conversation in the forefront that communities are not funding at the level needed. At the same time, communities that choose lower levels of service are informed in the process and understand the risk being taken.
  - Service levels will be different per watershed. Communities will have to come to an agreement on what levels they want and move forward from there. It will have to be a group effort to balance city and county hats.
  - Some cities that have already pursued system management may feel like they are being penalized if funding shifts to predominantly those that haven't maintained their systems. Funding strategies should look at equity, especially for cities that have best management practices in place. Perhaps there should be a mechanism that triggers funding for cities that take proactive measures and have projects sitting on the SMP list for a long time.
  - The County will have to find a balance between directing funds to the greatest need and promoting areas that have taken a more pro-active stance in system management.
  - Unless cities have a lot of resources, it will be hard to move beyond a reactive approach.
  - The overall intent of the SAMP is to make the County more proactive in asset management. Once entities have the data, then they can prioritize better and put money and labor where it needs to be in a more strategic way.
  - All of the cities have more demands than resources. The asset management approach just identifies where the smartest place to focus is.
  - If truly being proactive, then projects will likely include an entire neighborhood since cities typically only want to go through a neighborhood one time. There will be assets that are weak and others that are not. The SAMP and SMP strategies will need to take that into consideration.
  - From JC Wastewater's experience, the most difficult part is getting started and then the program gains momentum. Having a county asset management program will help form the common language for the cities that will work together under the watershed approach.

- In closing discussions on the SAMP, Bryan noted that many additional details will need to be developed from city and county input. He extended an invitation for sub-committee members and represented entities to be involved in that later process.

Watershed-based Individualized Asset Management Plans

- Before starting discussions on the watershed plans, Patti of Vireo requested confirmation from the sub-committee that a watershed-based approach is the right approach going forward for system management. Via vote, the sub-committee confirmed that it is.

- Bryan presented a brief outline of the watershed asset management plans. Each watershed has a different mix of asset types & conditions, maintenance priorities, projects, and management challenges. Individualized plans will have to be tailored to a common strategy framework per watershed. The plans will have to define expectations for level of service, future demand, asset registry, condition, risk profiles, investment strategies, and performance measures. Across watersheds, the risk profile for similar assets may be different because the watersheds will have different challenges.

- Sub-committee members had the following comments on the watershed-based asset management plans:
  - Prioritization for system replacement should be consistent across the county and not differ on a watershed basis. System management is the first step, but is different than system replacement which hasn't been discussed yet. The sub-committee should consider the criteria and priorities for system replacement or at least identify who will consider that. System replacement encompasses the annual maintenance that cities do because of imminent failure.
  - A concern with the watershed-based asset management plans is that criteria will end up being skewed towards projects that are not system maintenance. The asset management plans should not be weighted differently based on water quality or flooding objectives. If so, then flooding will always rise to the top of projects and system management won't receive proper attention.
  - Service life won't differ a lot amongst the watersheds which assesses the likelihood of failure. But it is possible for consequences of failure to differ since economic impact, safety, and quality of life differ across the watersheds. For instance, all of the watersheds would have an overall economic score for assets. How that is calculated, though, is different because economic drivers will differ such as with more rural, agricultural areas.
  - The consequence of failure criteria can be interfaced with different layers in GIS. Factors are then aggregated, weighted, and scores can be calculated. Such methods are standard practices in asset management.
  - Asset management will likely be an iterative process. After drafting criteria weights then you would check the prioritizations to see where certain assets rank that are known to be a problem.

- Andrew explained that the goal of the sub-committee is to guide the general direction for the system management approach. The sub-committee has provided valuable guidance going forward. There is a directive to compile a County SAMP document. That process will delve much further in the four prioritization criteria which would be an effort beyond the practical scope of the sub-committee. Andrew received confirmation from the sub-committee that the SAMP is the next step going forward.

- Lee noted that JC SMP will be working with cities on the development of the SAMP. He noted that the County recognizes the many stormwater needs and that the SAMP will have to be primarily geared towards system replacement.

Closing / Next Steps:

- The meeting concluded with JC SMP and participants confirming that the sub-committee had provided sufficient direction for the system management component of the SMP.
- The sub-committee confirmed to re-convene after the SAMP is compiled and the funding sub-committee has proposed strategies. A timeframe to meet again is tentatively set for the beginning of 2018. JC SMP will later contact members with further meeting details.
- JC SMP and consultants closed by thanking participants for their role in the strategic plan implementation and for the significant amount of progress they provided.