



**Meeting Notes**

---

**Meeting Date:** May 31, 2017                      **Time:** 9:00-11:00 am  
**Meeting Location:**                                      Johnson County Transit Facility, 1701 W Old Hwy 56, Olathe, KS 66061

---

**Attendees:**

<b>System Management Sub-Committee</b>	<b>JC SMP</b>	<b>Consultant Team</b>
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	Andrew Smith – B&V
John Sullivan – City of Westwood		Justina Gonzalez – B&V
Lorraine Basalo – City of Overland Park		
Jose M. Leon, Jr. – City of Roeland Park		
Patrick Beane – JC Wastewater		
Jason Hrabe – JC AIMS		
Brent Johnson – Olsson Associates		
Doug Carpenter – GBA		
Cliff Speegle - Affinis		
Mike Beezhold – HDR		
Stacy Gallick – TREKK		

---

**Agenda Objectives**

Discuss the baseline level of service for the watershed-based system management program  
Discuss the factors most important for deciding capital project prioritization  
Consider common minimum requirements to qualify for SMP system management funding  
Discuss the potential framework for emergency projects (interim program)

---

**Handouts:**              Agenda

---

**Notes**

**Introduction / Update of Implementation Status / 4<sup>th</sup> 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 watershed-based organization sub-committee has drafted a structural framework for the County watershed-based organizations. The system management sub-committee is one of three sub-committees (system management, water quality, and flood damage reduction) that are meeting to help fill in further details for that framework. Currently, the watershed-based organization sub-committee is on hiatus and will likely reconvene

- in October to finalize paths forward. Later in the process, a pilot watershed organization will begin implementing the structure, goals, and prioritizations prepared by the sub-committees.
- **System Management Sub-Committee 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting Review:** At the previous meeting, the sub-committee finalized the parameters to include as assets in system management. Patrick Beane of JC Wastewater provided a brief presentation of their asset management program and the benefits it has provided. Also, the sub-committee had a chance to review the System Management White Paper and discuss key elements of the highlighted case studies.
  - Consultants outlined the agenda and goals of the fourth system management meeting.
    - **System Management Sub-Committee 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting Goals:** During the fourth meeting, the sub-committee will discuss the baseline level of service for the watershed-based system management program along with the factors most important for deciding capital project prioritization. Consideration will also be given to the common minimum requirements to qualify for SMP system management funding. Lastly, the sub-committee will break-up into two groups to discuss the framework for emergency projects in the interim until the watershed-based process is fully implemented.
  - Consultants then called for any questions or comments pertaining to the strategic plan implementation thus far. Sub-committee member comments are summarized as such:
    - In regards to the meeting summaries, it would be beneficial to include the context details and data provided by the cities that have helped guide sub-committee decisions.
    - As for further case studies that can be reviewed, the stormwater initiatives undertaken by King County, such as their voluntary buyout program, are examples of good practices when considering elements of a successful program.

### **System Management Baseline Level of Service**

- Consultants led the sub-committee through a discussion of what should be the baseline level of service for the watershed-based system management program. As an example, Andrew noted the System Management White Paper case study of the City of Grand Rapids Stormwater Asset Management Program.
  - **City of Grand Rapids Case Study:** Grand Rapids level of service goals include 1) healthy natural resources (e.g., river, streams, lakes), 2) improved recreational opportunities, 3) a stronger economy, and 4) making Grand Rapids a more desirable place to live. The City drafted four levels of service options with varying system renewal rates (i.e. 100 yrs, 125 yrs, 150 yrs, and existing).
- Consultants asked if the goals seen in the Grand Rapids example would apply for JC or if other goals should be considered. The goals are broadly categorized as promoting the environment, recreation, economy, and quality of life. Sub-committee member responses are noted as such:
  - Safety should be a significant goal when considering level of service. Safety was a key consideration in previous sub-committee discussions on the potential risks for the natural and engineered systems.
  - Mitigating risk should be a goal. As part of asset management, the program will look at consequence of failure and probability of failure.
  - The program should denote expected response time for failures and the extent to which the program can nimbly address emergencies.
  - Environmental concerns can be considered as part of the level of service but they would not rank as high as safety. An environmental component will be more specifically addressed in the water quality prioritization.
  - Emergency provisions should be included not just in the interim but in the long term system management program. The system is too unpredictable in that there will always be components that fail unexpectedly.

- Auxiliary goals such as recreational concerns are good to add for project prioritization but the reality is that it will be a long time to address fundamental maintenance issues within the system.
  - Everyone acknowledges that there is much greater need than there is supply. However, the sub-committee needs to clearly agree upon why to prioritize projects coming out of the watersheds so as to develop a fair playing field and equitable distribution of funds. In regards to recreation, should the fact that a failed CMP goes through a public space, such as a park, have any prioritization bearing?
  - Quality of life would be a better category than recreation. It is difficult to identify the recreational component when talking about an engineered system.
  - Economy would likely already be considered under risk and consequence of failure. Generally it is understood that more priority is given to highly used areas vs. a gravel road for instance.
  - The service life of the asset should be considered under level of service. The program will need to weigh options when given varying solutions to a problem with different life expectancies. For instance, there could be two failures going on side by side with one solution as total replacement and the other as a rehab. The program should include the positive impact of longer life asset solutions.
  - The program should also be mindful of level of service goals that constituents are willing to support.
- The sub-committee then asked JC SMP about their expectations for County involvement in terms of system operations to do surveys and keep data accurate. The sub-committee asked how involved the County will be with management or does the County expect to focus solely on capital projects.
    - Lee of JC SMP explained that the County is not intending to take on the operation and maintenance of assets which is done by the cities. The County is committed, however, to establishing an asset management program for system management. That will require an investment to assemble and then there is the issue of maintaining data over time. Overall, the County would be looking at maintenance of information instead of maintenance of completed projects.
    - City members of the sub-committee noted that they do not expect the County to address all of the system management gaps. Also, every city has a different degree of need. But any assistance the SMP can provide to promote consistency across the County would be beneficial.

### **System Management Factors for Capital Project Prioritization**

- Consultants confirmed from the sub-committee that the following list would be the most important factors for capital project prioritization, with the list being ranked from highest to least.
  - **System Management Prioritization:**
    - Safety
    - Service Life
    - Economy
    - Quality of Life

### **Common Minimum Requirements to Qualify for SMP System Management Funding**

- Consultants noted that the County would like to be a partner for assisting with aging infrastructure based on common understandings. Consultants asked what should be the common minimum requirements to qualify for SMP funding. Sub-committee member responses are summarized as such:
  - Minimum design standards could be adopted such as APWA 5600. Adoption of such standards is already required for the flood damage reduction component of the program.
  - Some level of analysis for proposed projects could be required, such as evaluating if there are instances of overtopping or if further problems are being created downstream.
  - There could be material requirements for projects that are funded, meaning that RCP is required in place of CMP.

- The program should not interfere in city business too much but there would not be an objection to common minimum requirements that make sense, such as established design criteria.
- Lee of JC SMP asked the sub-committee if the program should have a requirement that cities enact a stormwater utility. There has been consideration in the past of a county wide stormwater utility but cities chose to have their own instead. Some cities have still not adopted a stormwater utility. In regards to equity, Lee asked if there are thoughts as to whether a city that has set aside little to no funding for O&M should have the same level of funding as cities that have exercised political authority to ask for a stormwater utility. The following member responses were noted:
  - It would be good for the program to setup a standard of best practices and if an entity is following those practices then they would be eligible for a different level of funding. Some cities have made significant investments in their systems. There could be higher incentives for cities that are taking the right steps and following the philosophy of the program.
  - One of the main reasons that some cities have not done a stormwater utility is they have not yet defined the need. The system management program will show that cities are only going to get so far with County funds and that the remaining gap will need to be taken over and proactively assumed.
  - A utility helps in that it can be raised and lowered based on projects being undertaken, bonds being paid, etc. But even if all of the cities don't have a stormwater utility, everyone is paying into the sales tax. In regards to maintenance, the program could have a flat amount that is being divided up based on population.

#### **Potential Framework for Emergency Projects (Interim Program)**

- Consultants then divided the sub-committee into two groups to discuss the potential framework for emergency projects in the interim until the watershed-based process is fully implemented. The two groups discussed what threats would trigger an emergency project, ownership requirements, and other factors for consideration. Activity results are provided on the next page. The following additional sub-committee member comments were noted:
  - The program will need to clearly define failure, including what constitutes imminent failure. For instance, the program may not want projects being submitted for existing assets that have 3-4 years left.
  - Imminent failure can be considered as action needed by the city now to keep an asset going.
  - Any failure could essentially be argued as a public threat. There could be the qualifier that a failure prohibits emergency passage, such as fire trucks, etc.
  - Cities likely have a list of emergency places in mind. The emergency funding should be for when something has happened that requires action.
  - It would be beneficial to have a retroactive element of the program. If there is a real emergency then the city can't wait to fix the failure.
  - The program should consider the use of the County's on-call contracts to reduce city wait time to pursue an action.
  - A funding cap per city should be established along with a limit on the number of projects per city. A first come, first serve funding strategy would give an unfair advantage and would reduce the program's ability to respond to true emergencies.
  - In regards to a cost/share match, a 50% match by the cities would be equitable given the intention of the funding and the limited amount available.

**Feedback from Group 1**

**Framework for Emergency Projects (interim program)**

**Threats**  
What threats would trigger an emergency project?

① ~~road~~ failure ⇒ road closure, threaten infrastructure  
flooding, safety

② imminent failure

**Ownership**  
Could projects occur on private lands? If so, under what circumstances might they occur?

public infrastructure Only

**Other Factors**  
What other factors should be considered?

- Reimbursement option
- Design Criteria
- cost share/match → 50/50
- known problem?

**Feedback from Group 2**

**Framework for Emergency Projects (interim program)**

**Threats**  
What threats would trigger an emergency project?

Safety - <sup>(level of road)</sup> traveling public - loss of home and flooding  
failure imminent action being taken now

\* use County's on-call contracts

**Ownership**  
Could projects occur on private lands? If so, under what circumstances might they occur?

Public gets priority  
Private would be considered if failure impacts public inf.

**Other Factors**  
What other factors should be considered?

- # of people impacted
- major arterials & thoroughfares
- permanent vs. temporary repair
- 50% match

**Closing / Next Steps:**

- Consultants finished the meeting by requesting that sub-committee participants notify Sarah of JC SMP if they are unable to attend the next meeting. Due to the summer schedule, members may not be able to attend and the County would like to have as much member input as possible when proposing paths forward. The meeting will be postponed till July if not enough members can attend.
- At present, the sub-committee is scheduled to meet again on June 28<sup>th</sup> at the same time, same place.
  - The discussion will involve confirmation on an emergency funding structure as well as project prioritization.
- JC SMP and the consultants thanked participants for their valuable time and comments.