



Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: July 24, 2017 **Time:** 1:30 – 3:30 pm
Meeting Location: Johnson County Transit Facility, 1701 W Old Hwy 56, Olathe, KS 66061

Attendees:

Water Quality Focus Sub-Committee	JC SMP	Consultant Team
Ian Fannin-Hughes – City of Overland Park	Heather Schmidt	Patti Banks – Vireo
Patty Ogle – City of Overland Park	Sarah Smith	Triveece Penelton – Vireo
Denver Hicks – City of Olathe	Lee Kellenberger	Andrew Smith – B&V
Bryan Dyer – City of Merriam		Justina Gonzalez – B&V
David Roberts – City of Leawood		
Teresa Rasmussen – U.S. Geological Survey		
Doug Carpenter – GBA		
Jamie Cole – HDR		

Agenda Objectives
Review feedback from June meeting and obtain agreement on water quality top issues, goals, and project types
Evaluate potential water quality measures of success and sample project scoring sheet

Handouts: Agenda
 On the Road to Measuring Success – DRAFT
 Sample Project Scoring Sheet – DRAFT

Notes

Introduction / Update of Implementation Status / 4th Meeting Goals

- Andrew of B&V welcomed attendees to the fourth meeting of the water quality sub-committee. He provided a quick update of SMP strategic plan implementation to date.
 - **SMP Strategic Plan Implementation Status:** The sub-committees for water quality, system management, and flooding have been meeting to further develop strategic directions going forward. When the watershed-based organization sub-committee reconvenes they will use the input from the other sub-committees to finalize a future framework. A pilot watershed will then enact the framework. Feedback and guidance from these sub-committees has been especially important in identifying County needs and potential solutions.

- Andrew outlined the agenda and goals of the fourth water quality sub-committee meeting.

- **Water Quality Sub-Committee 4th Meeting Goals:** The sub-committee has reviewed case studies and informed the water quality aspect of the watershed-based framework. During June’s meeting, the sub-committee looked at a sample prioritization matrix. A goal of the fourth meeting is to obtain agreement on water quality top issues, goals, and project types. The sub-committee will also look at potential water quality measures of success and a sample project scoring sheet.
- Consultants called for possible comments or questions on the strategic plan implementation.
 - Lee of JC SMP noted that defining water quality goals and projects is not an easy task since there are many different components that can be considered. The SMP will need additional tools such as the watershed plans and water quality modeling to better inform efforts. The sub-committee isn’t expected to thoroughly define key issues at this time, but their input will guide future efforts.

Review of Feedback from 3rd Water Quality Sub-Committee Meeting

- Consultants quickly highlighted the feedback received from the June meeting. Participants discussed the sample prioritization matrix and noted the importance of clearly identifying what the program wants to achieve, what the public wants, and the role of routine monitoring and measurement. The sub-committee also discussed general project type categories such as retrofit and preservation.

Confirmation of Water Quality Top Issues, Goals, and Project Types

- Consultants asked for voting consensus from the sub-committee as to what should constitute top issues, goals, and project types as drawn from previous comments. A majority vote confirmed the following:
 - **Top Issues**
 - Hydromodification
 - TMDLs / MS4 requirements
 - Reduction in pollutants at the source
 - Human health
 - Supporting aquatic life and habitat
 - Stream restoration
 - Riparian corridor health
 - Primary and secondary recreation
 - Fish consumption
 - Aesthetics
 - **Overarching Goals**
 - Improve health of impaired water bodies and protect those meeting water quality standards
 - Establish level of service standards
 - Establish criteria to quantify measures of incremental water quality improvement
 - Address TMDL / permit requirements
 - Prioritize projects based on cost-benefit ratio / “low-hanging fruit”
 - **Project Types**
 - Retrofit
 - Detention pond rehabilitation
 - Impervious surface disconnection
 - Streambank stabilization
 - Stream daylighting
 - Lake dredging

- BMPs particularly infiltration solutions
 - Septic system removal
 - Preservation
 - Regional wetlands
 - BMPs
 - Stream setbacks
 - Riparian corridor restoration
 - Purchase of development rights
 - Conservation / preservation easements and land purchases
 - Other
 - Street sweeping
 - Education / public involvement / awareness
 - Household hazardous waste collection
 - Fall leaf collection program
 - Model ordinances for land use and development
- Consultants then asked for confirmation on potential requirements or incentives that the watershed-based organizations and municipalities could adopt and implement to be eligible for additional funding. The following were confirmed:
 - **SMP Water Quality Incentives / Requirements**
 - Public education / involvement standards
 - Continued commitment and demonstrated pro-activeness
 - Maintenance requirements

Sample Measures of Success and Project Scoring Sheet

- Consultants provided handouts with examples of potential water quality objectives, projects, and factors to measure success along with a sample project scoring sheet. A copy of the handouts is provided below.

On the Road to Measuring Success – DRAFT

Objective of Water Quality Improvement	General types of projects	Examples	Potential Factors (not all factors would be included)
Reduce Non-Point Source pollution	Retrofit and/or preservation	Structural BMPs to settle and/or infiltrate particulates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lbs/day or % reduction of TP, TN, TSS • increase in days of attainment • removal from 303(d) list
Reduce sedimentation and erosion	Retrofit and/or preservation	Streambank Stabilization/Restoration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • amount of sediment, TP, TN prevented from entering streams • area restored • property, features, facilities protected
Habitat improvement	Retrofit and/or preservation	Improve water temperature <u>Hydromodification</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • movement toward more balanced biological community • movement toward more natural stream morphology
Preservation of high quality waters	Preservation	Regional wetlands Land Use policies/Model ordinance development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount/area protected

Sample Project Scoring Sheet - **DRAFT**

Scoring Categories	Rationale	Scoring Range
Alignment with Watershed Goals	All of the plans reviewed have alignment with watershed goals as a primary factor in selecting projects	Low to high
Effectiveness of Improvement (Factors vary by project type)	This is a measure of the effectiveness of the project. It is reasonable that different measures could be used for different types of projects	Numeric
Logistical Feasibility	This is a measure of the ease or difficulty of implementation	Low to high
Potential Negative Impacts	Project should produce improvements in water quality but evaluation should also consider potential negative impacts	Low to high
Additional Benefits	Credit could be given for additional (non-water quality) benefits	Low to high

- When reviewing the draft measures of success and project scoring sheet, consultants noted that water quality prioritization can become very broad and qualitative because of the multiple degrees of freedom with so many varying constituents and solutions. Consultants indicated that prioritization will need to consider the individuality of each project to some extent but at the same time not be too cumbersome to use. Also, general methodology will need to be consistent within and across watersheds. Examples provided are to guide further discussions on what to include and exclude in prioritization.

- In response to the draft measures of success and project scoring sheet, sub-committee members had the following summarized comments:
 - Potential factors for measuring success should include ease of maintenance and ownership.
 - Prioritization should also consider where does the proposed project sit in the watershed and what is the amount of area impacted.
 - It would be important to consider if a proposed solution is part of an existing project, such as if a contractor is already pursuing development.
 - Quantifying water quality “success” of a project is difficult to do before it is even done. Post monitoring will provide better glimpses of effective strategies.
 - When measuring post improvement, a significant amount of data will be needed for some of these criteria in order to truly see impacts. Each objective will also require different tools to measure.
 - Walking through examples of projects may be helpful. For instance, the sub-committee could evaluate how impervious pavement in a parking lot for commercial development would compare to a regional wetland facility.

Closing / Next Steps

- Meeting closed with consultants noting the need to identify a preferred direction in the next meeting.
- The sub-committee will meet again on August 28th at the same place, same time.
- JC SMP and consultants thanked the participants for their time and valuable discussion.