

City of Champaign, Illinois
Minutes of Meeting

Stormwater Utility Fee Advisory & Technical Committees Meeting

October 11, 2010

Advisory Committee Members Present: Anna Maria Watkin, Jim Bustard, Jim Spencer, Jim Jesso, Karen Foster, Vic McIntosh, Steve Cochran, Jim Creighton, Eliana Brown, Dave Tomlinson, Donald Agin

Advisory Committee Members Absent: Clif Carey, Chris Hamelburg, Chuck Allen

Technical Committee Members Present: Lorrie Pearson, Mark Toalson

Technical Committee Members Absent: Leslie Lundy, Andrew Proctor, Shawn Luesse

City Staff Present: Dennis Schmidt, Roland White, Jamie Vermillion

Consultants Present: Greg Kacvinsky – Foth Infrastructure & Environmental

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.

Minutes

Watkin informed staff that her surname was misspelled in the September 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes.

Introductions

McIntosh, Committee Chair, led introductions of City Staff and the Stormwater Utility Fee Advisory Committee.

Member Inquiries

None

Surveys

McIntosh explained the purpose of the “Existing (Budgeted) Expenditures Stormwater Fund” and “How Are We Doing” surveys found in the meeting packet materials.

Champaign’s Existing Stormwater Management Program

Schmidt gave a presentation describing existing stormwater program activities provided by the City and how much is spent on each of these activities. Expenditures discussed were Debt Retirement, Capital Improvement, Operation, Maintenance & Rehabilitation

(City Crews), Storm Sewer Cleaning & TV, Storm Sewer Pipe & Manhole Repair and Channel & Detention Basin Maintenance.

Tomlinson asked for an explanation of the \$600,000 increase in Debt Retirement expenditures between FY12 & FY13. Schmidt explained that the increase was due to the way the debt was structured.

Foster asked if Urbana was considering continuing the Boneyard project beyond Wright Street. Schmidt speculated that Urbana's project will start at Goodwin. Foster followed up by asking how far east that project is expected to go. Schmidt guessed that it would go to either University or Cunningham in Urbana.

Foster asked when Cross Construction will begin work on the Washington Street East Project. Schmidt estimated the project would begin by October. Foster then asked if the pipes that are going to be installed are large enough to alleviate the flooding in that area. Schmidt responded that the existing pipe can only handle a one or two year storm event and new pipes will be able to handle a ten year storm. Foster then asked if there would be similar disruption in the Washington Street East Project as there has been in the John Street Improvement Project. Schmidt indicated that there would be disruption in the neighborhood including restricted driveway access for some residents.

Cochran asked for the estimated completion date of the John Street Improvement Project. White explained that the John Street Project will be bid in early 2011 with the majority of work being completed by the end of the 2011 construction season.

Tomlinson asked if the money being used right now to pay for debt retirement will be available in twenty years. Schmidt said there will be no capital improvements for the next twenty years until the bond indebtedness is over.

Creighton asked if the City retires the debt accrued through the Lamar Project and the Healey Street Detention Basin Project in 2016 (\$25 million), would that \$25 million be available to bond? Schmidt indicated that is not the way the debt is structured.

Spencer asked for the projected cost for Washington Street West to handle a 40 year storm. Schmidt indicated that cost estimate is between \$10-\$12 million.

Foster asked how many City crews are dedicated to stormwater activities in the City. Schmidt explained that in a storm event all operations crews respond. Outside of storm events, crews are dedicated to certain activities including forestry, concrete, sewers, asphalt and streets. The sewer section is dedicated to stormwater and sanitary sewer operation, maintenance and rehabilitation activities.

Foster asked if all inlets get checked after a storm event. Schmidt responded by explaining that staff does not visit all inlets, but is aware of trouble spots within the City and these are visited after each event for blockages.

Brown asked if the purchase of the jetter and televising equipment are paid for or are they part of the \$2.2 million operation, maintenance and rehabilitation expenditure. Schmidt explained that through work orders staff is able to calculate equipment hours. Each piece of equipment is charged an hourly rate and annually the vehicle maintenance fund and vehicle replacement fund are compensated according to the work order records.

Watkin asked how much time staff spends responding to calls of basement flooding. Schmidt explained this question would be answered later in Private Property Expenditures portion of the presentation.

Cochran asked if the 40% of the storm sewer system that has been cleaned and televised is the same 40% of the storm sewer whose conditions are known. Schmidt confirmed.

McIntosh asked if a ten year cleaning and televising cycle is good according to industry standards. Schmidt indicated that it was. McIntosh then asked if the cleaning and televising would go faster in newer parts of the City. Schmidt said that was staff's logical conclusion.

Jesso asked if staff attributes the decrease in time it will take to clean and televise the newer areas of town to advancements in procedures over the years. Schmidt indicated that new procedures as well as the fact that the pipes have not been in the ground long enough to accumulate root penetration, or the amount of soil and silt as reasons the City believes it will not require as much to clean and televise newer areas as it did the older areas of the City.

Agin asked how cleaning and televising contracts are negotiated. Schmidt indicated that when the City first started contracting for these activities contracts were negotiated on a time and material basis, but the current contract is on a per lineal foot basis with a time and material factor for unforeseen problems.

Creighton asked if completing the ten year cleaning and televising activities is part of the criteria for obtaining the NPDES permit. Schmidt confirmed. Creighton then asked if the City will continue televising after the ten years is up. Schmidt responded that the City would continue televising.

Creighton asked if there are 100-125 storm sewer pipe and manhole repairs completed annually because of cost. Schmidt indicated that number is based upon cost. Creighton then asked if there was more funding for this activity, could more repairs be made. Schmidt indicated that more repairs could be made with more money dedicated to this activity.

Jesso asked if the backlog repair number for storm sewer pipe and manhole repairs was determined from the televising done in the last four years. Schmidt confirmed.

McIntosh asked if City crews complete any of the cleaning and televising of storm sewer. Schmidt explained the City's television van is mostly dedicated to our 10 year program

for our sanitary sewer system. City crews will do some limited televising work on storm sewers to address a specific problem. The vast majority of storm sewer cleaning and televising of the City's storm sewer system is done by contractual forces.

McIntosh asked if channel flood control maintenance of the Phinney Branch is a responsibility of the Drainage District. Schmidt indicated the Phinney Branch is the City's responsibility.

McIntosh asked if there are problems with private owners completing channel vegetative maintenance. Schmidt indicated there are certainly problems with private owners performing that maintenance.

Foster asked how many feet from a channel a private property owner is responsible for. Schmidt indicated that it varies depending upon the channel, but in most cases the owner is responsible for mowing down to the stream level.

Public Participation

There were no questions or comments made by the public.

Next Meeting

McIntosh announced the next meeting will be held on November 8 at 4 p.m.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:33 p.m.