

**City of Champaign, Illinois**  
**Minutes of Meeting**

---

**Stormwater Utility Fee Advisory & Technical Committees Meeting**

**November 8, 2010**

**Advisory Committee Members Present:** Donald Agin, Charles Allen, Eliana Brown, Clif Carey, James Creighton, Karen Foster, Jim Jesso, Vic McIntosh, Jim Spencer , David Tomlinson

**Advisory Committee Members Absent:** Jim Bustard, Steve Cochran, Chris Hamelburg, Anna Maria Watkin

**Technical Committee Members Present:** Shawn Luesse, Lorrie Pearson

**Technical Committee Members Absent:** Leslie Lundy, Andrew Proctor, Mark Toalson

**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 p.m.

**Minutes**

The minutes from October 11, 2010 were approved.

**Member Inquiries**

Following the October 11, 2010 meeting, Brown made an email inquiry to staff asking why the potential Stormwater Utility Fee would be considered a fee and not a tax. The response is included in the November 8, 2010 Advisory Committee Meeting packet.

**Champaign's Existing Stormwater Management Program (Part 2)**

Schmidt continued his presentation from the October meeting describing existing stormwater program activities provided by the City and how much is spent on each of these activities. A review of expenditures discussed last month was given, including the activities of Debt Retirement and Capital Improvements in the Capital Improvement Expenditures category. Reviewed topics also included the activities of Operation, Maintenance & Rehabilitation (City Crews), Storm Sewer Cleaning & Televising, Storm Sewer Pipe & Manhole Repair and Channel and Detention Basin Maintenance in the Operation Maintenance and Rehabilitation (OM&R) Category. New material included the last activity in the OM&R Category, which are expenditures related to Intergovernmental Maintenance Agreements (JULIE, Encephalitis Program, USGS

Stream and Rain Gauges, Saline & Urbana Maintenance Agreements). The Stormwater Quality (Erosion Control, Grading & Drainage Permits, NPDES Permits) and Private Property (Stormwater Management, Hazardous Sump Pump – Cost Share, Overhead Sewer Program – Cost Share and Rain Gardens- Cost Share) categories of expenditures were also presented.

Foster asked how the water from the Copper Slough, Boneyard and Phinney watersheds travels to the channels. Schmidt explained that water enters an inlet and is transported through a series of pipes which become larger and larger as they get closer to the channel. Foster then asked how the water knows which channel to go to. Schmidt explained how water flows downhill, so it goes to lower areas. White noted if a large storm occurs and a pipe gets overwhelmed, the water comes out on the surface and flows over the ground to get to the channel. This is a source of flooding that is seen in the community.

Foster asked who is responsible for fixing pipes that are damaged by fiber optic cables penetrating and damaging pipes. Schmidt indicated that usually the encroaching utility will pay for the repairs.

Creighton asked why the Fountainhead Drainage District does not pay for the USGS Stream and Rain Gauges, since they are responsible for the Copper Slough. Schmidt explained that the Fountainhead Drainage District does not recognize the data gathered as valuable information and they do not have a computer model for the data. The City of Champaign finds the data to be useful and also has a computer model for the information.

McIntosh asked if the City knows how much water the Copper Slough will hold and if the information obtained from the stream and rain gauges help staff to predict if there is a need for more detention ponds. Schmidt indicated that we do have capacity information which allows City staff to make predictions. McIntosh asked if the City is making any progress in taking over the Copper Slough. Schmidt indicated that negotiations with the Fountain Head Drainage District have been ongoing for 15 years, with rejuvenated discussions occurring recently because of the flooding in 2008-09. However, Schmidt could not predict if they will be successful or not. McIntosh asked if jurisdictional transfer could be done with a referendum. Schmidt indicated that question would be best answered by the City's Legal Department. Schmidt then explained that in the past the City negotiated jurisdictional transfer of the Boneyard and Phinney Branch with the agreement being taken to local courts for approval. In those two cases, there was not a vote.

Brown asked how committee members can return the "Existing Expenditures Stormwater Fund" and "How Are We Doing" survey forms. Schmidt indicated that they could be given to staff following the meeting, e-mailed or mailed.

Creighton asked where pipe televising is budgeted. Schmidt explained televising is an activity in the Operations, Maintenance and Rehabilitation category.

Tomlinson asked if the City is currently budgeting \$70,000 for the Overhead Storm Sewer Program. Schmidt stated staff is budgeting that amount, however, the program is not in place due to staffing limitations.

Carey asked who could require a Rain Garden Program? White indicated that the United States EPA could impose a requirement by regulating Cities through State EPAs.

Spencer asked what the impact of a rain garden is. White explained that on an incremental basis there is not much of an effect. But, if these technologies and infrastructures were spread throughout the City on a widespread scale, there would be a measurable impact on water quality.

McIntosh asked if there are any rain garden programs available that could bring federal money. Schmidt said there are state and federal programs available to encourage communities to incorporate this type of program, however, the funding will only be available temporarily.

Brown asked if there would be a possibility of combining the rain garden program with the hazardous sump pump program. White said a combination program is a good suggestion for how Public Works could modify what is currently being done.

Creighton asked if staff knew how much the City spent on street maintenance. Schmidt indicated that prior to the economic downturn, the City spent approximately \$5 million yearly on street maintenance.

Agin asked what the bond schedule is. Schmidt stated that in general the current bonds are a 20 year issuance.

Tomlinson asked if expenditures occur in the TIF District, could TIF infrastructure money be utilized to pay for the expenses. Schmidt said infrastructure expenses are probably eligible expenditures, however utilizing the money for infrastructure is not typical practice. The City usually uses that money for enhancements to projects (bike lanes, streetscape, etc.).

### **Public Participation**

There were no questions or comments made by the public.

### **Next Meeting**

McIntosh announced the next meeting will be held December 13 at 4 p.m.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.