



Champaign County Hazard Mitigation Plan Planning Team

Draft

1 **Date:** February 5, 2008
2 **Time:** 10:30 a.m.
3 **Place:** Regional Planning Commission
4 J. Dimit Meeting Room
5 1776 East Washington Street
6 Urbana, IL 61802
7

8 **Members Present:** Bill Keller, Steve Clarkson, John Dwyer, James Haake, Jeremy Leevey, Sherry
9 Wooten, Bonita Burgess, Bob Mahrt, Tony Foster, Robert Myers
10

11 **Members Absent:** Rob Kowalski, Dan Culkin, Todd Short

12 **Others:**

13 **CCRPC Staff:** Susan Monte, Zach Kennedy

MINUTES

14
15
16 **1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

17 Mr. Keller called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. Roll was taken by written record and a quorum
18 was declared present.
19

20 **2. Approval of Minutes –**
21 **A. December 4, 2008**

22 **There being no changes or additions, Mr. Foster made the motion to approve the minutes as**
23 **distributed. Mr. Haake seconded the motion. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.**
24

25 **3. Project Status**

26 Ms. Monte referred to a handout provided to the planning team members. She explained that the
27 handout was an overview of stage three, “Developing Mitigation Plan.” She explained that the
28 handout noted both steps within the stage that had been completed, and the steps that still need to be
29 completed. She explained that obtaining lists of current mitigation actions from each jurisdiction was
30 an ongoing process that is scheduled to be completed by February 20th.
31

32 Ms. Monte called attention to an error in the previously approved plan objectives and asked the
33 planning team to consider a proposed correction. She noted that the objective originally contained
34 language to the effect of “...coordinating the efforts of different agencies.” She explained that this
35 objective is beyond the control of the planning team. Ms. Monte explained the proposed change in
36 language to the plan objective, which qualified and clarified what was meant by “coordinating
37 efforts.” She asked the group if the adjustment in language would be acceptable. The planning team
38 members agreed to the change, and there was no conversation. Mr. Meyers subsequently asked for
39 clarification about which jurisdictions would be adopting the plan upon its completion. Ms. Monte
40 replied that hopefully all of the County’s jurisdictions would adopt the plan. She further clarified that
41 the purpose of modifying the language to the plan objective was to focus the objective to reflect the
42 capabilities of the planning team and the plan. Mr. Keller suggested that the intent of the objective in

1 question was to make sure that a mitigation action undertaken by one jurisdiction did not adversely
2 affect a neighboring jurisdiction.
3
4

5 **4. New Business**

6 ***A. HMP Mitigation Measures Survey Results***

7 Ms. Monte referred the planning team members to a section of the handout that listed the categories
8 of mitigation actions identified by FEMA. She stated that the plan objectives do allow for the
9 consideration of mitigation actions which fall into the FEMA mitigation action categories. She
10 mentioned that the next section of the handout consists of an overview of the mitigation actions which
11 were included in the public survey. She reminded the planning team that each jurisdiction was in the
12 process of creating a spreadsheet of potential mitigation actions which apply both to new and existing
13 structures and infrastructure. She explained that the next step would be to being thinking about
14 prioritizing the potential mitigation actions.
15

16 Mr. Keller inquired about the status of the public input for the project. Ms. Monte referred the
17 planning team members to a handout which contained preliminary results from the Hazard Mitigation
18 Actions Preference Survey. Mr. Kennedy stated that there were fifty-seven survey respondents. Ms.
19 Monte explained that the survey was publicized to the County Board members, the Environment Land
20 Use Committee, and at nearly all the Village Trustee meetings, and at all the Village and City
21 Councils. She mentioned that she had noticed the poster advertising the survey was posted in the
22 library. She explained that since the survey had ended, the poster would be switched out and replaced
23 with a poster containing more generalized information about the project. She noted that she had
24 observed a trend in the survey responses that revealed when a proposed mitigation action did not
25 involve a government subsidy it tended to have more support. Mr. Clarkson asked for clarification
26 that if there were government funds available for a particular mitigation action that survey
27 respondents were generally opposed to it. Ms. Monte explained that the survey questions which
28 included mitigation actions involving subsidies generally had as many people disagree as agree. She
29 pointed out that most survey participants responded favorably to the mitigation actions which involve
30 public outreach and awareness. She explained that respondents were generally more favorable to
31 mitigation actions that did not result in more regulations on individuals. She stated that project staff
32 will be preparing a report that summarizes the survey results. Mr. Dwyer asked about the possibility
33 of resending the survey again at a later stage of the project. Ms. Monte responded that she had not
34 planned on resending the survey, but that doing so would require little cost. Mr. Meyers mentioned
35 that the smaller villages and towns were well represented among survey respondents. He explained
36 that nearly half of survey respondents were from the smaller jurisdictions.
37

38 ***B. Proposed Mitigation Action Prioritization Method***

39 Ms. Monte stated that the next item of business was to discuss a prioritization method for the
40 proposed mitigation actions, as required by FEMA. She referred to a handout which included
41 FEMA's suggested prioritization method. She explained that FEMA's method was called STAPLEE.
42 She contended that STAPLEE had useful components but that it was also a bit cumbersome. She
43 stated that the handout contained the relevant and useful components of STAPLEE. She noted that
44 STAPLEE was an acronym for Social, Technical, Administrative, Political, Legal, Economic and
45 Environmental. Mr. Meyers asked if this method was done by each jurisdiction or by the overall
46 group. Ms. Monte responded that it is done by each jurisdiction. She suggested that the planning
47 team adopt a hybrid prioritization method. She explained that Sangamon County had a prioritization
48 strategy that was based on whether the mitigation action reduced property damages or deaths in a
49 wide area. She explained that these mitigation actions would be give level one or two priority. The
50 mitigation actions that affected a smaller geographic area or a less probable hazard would be given a
51 priority of three. She also reiterated that the plan goal and objectives talk about being cost effective
52 and feasible. She explained that the mitigation actions will require a cost effectiveness rating, and she

1 suggested that the mitigation actions could be assigned a cost effectiveness rating of high, medium or
2 low designation. She noted that the City of Urbana conducted a subjective cost-benefit analysis in
3 preparing their mitigation plan. She asked the group for input about the creation of a cost
4 effectiveness rating. She explained the importance of considering cost effectiveness by relating an
5 example about riverine flooding. She suggested that flood control projects such as building relocation
6 can have very high costs, but less than one percent of the structures in the County are within the one
7 hundred year floodplain. She contended that the benefits in this situation might not justify the costs.
8 She stated that in the case of floods it may be better to follow the example of the City of Urbana
9 Hazard Mitigation Plan and focus prevention. She again asked the planning team members for their
10 input regarding the creation of cost effectiveness ratings. Mr. Clarkson responded that it would be a
11 good idea to research possible grants that are available for specific types of mitigation actions. He
12 noted that grant availability may be the determining factor for whether a mitigation action is feasible.
13

14 Mr. Keller asked Mr. Foster and Mr. Meyers for clarification about a mitigation action contained in
15 the City of Urbana Hazard Mitigation Plan. He asked if a mitigation action related to the “buying
16 out” of mobile homes was actually implemented. Ms. Monte interjected that this mitigation action
17 may have just been considered but given a low priority. Mr. Meyers stated that this mitigation action
18 may have been suggested with a specific project in mind. He suggested that it may have been related
19 to removing mobile homes where the Capstone Quarters development is now.
20

21 Mr. Meyers mentioned that when considering these mitigation actions it is important to remember
22 that they can be accomplished through government spending and regulation. He added that regulation
23 is pushing the cost off on someone else. He explained that if the mitigation actions such as
24 regulations which have low or no costs to government are given a higher priority, the cost will be
25 borne by those who must meet the regulations. He asked if when costs are being considered would
26 only government cost be considered or would it also include private costs. Mr. Keller responded that
27 both government and private costs will be considered. Ms. Monte mentioned that the feasibility of
28 the mitigation actions will be evaluated using components of the STAPLEE method. She explained
29 that this will reveal if the mitigation action is feasible in a number of ways beyond just monetarily.
30 Ms. Monte suggested that rating the mitigation actions priority level, cost effectiveness and feasibility
31 would be a good method for evaluating each mitigation action. Mr. Clarkson mentioned that there is
32 already a mechanism in place which the different cities review and adopt building codes. Mr. Meyers
33 and Mr. Clarkson mentioned that the individual jurisdictions can make modifications to the building
34 codes as they see appropriate. Mr. Keller suggested that the three basic proposals for the way the
35 mitigation actions are rated (priority, cost effectiveness and feasibility) will work well. Mr. Clarkson
36 asked for clarification about how the mitigation actions would be prioritized. Mr. Keller explained
37 that they would be prioritized based on the three aforementioned dimensions. Ms. Monte stated that
38 the mitigation actions would be given a general priority rating in the main plan, but each jurisdiction
39 will have an appendix in which they can assign a different priority to a specific action if they wish.
40 She referred the planning team to the handout. She pointed out that a model output format for each
41 mitigation action would include information about the approach, cost, benefit, feasibility and the
42 priority of the mitigation action. Mr. Meyers stated that the end result of the prioritization would be
43 an expert opinion that would be offered to each jurisdiction. He asked for clarification about the
44 consequences of a jurisdiction not adopting the plan. Ms. Monte explained that to be eligible for
45 FEMA mitigation funding, each participating jurisdiction must adopt the plan and attempt to
46 implement at least one mitigation action.
47

48 Ms. Monte mentioned that she recently reviewed an update from FEMA about the hazard mitigation
49 program. She explained that FEMA would now like to see the hazard mitigation plans reviewed
50 every five years to consider changing political conditions. She stated that as part of the
51 implementation section of the plan, there will be a means for annual plan review.
52

1 Ms. Monte reiterated that proposed approach to prioritization includes assigning a priority rating, cost
2 effectiveness rating, and a feasibility rating based on a portion of the STAPLEE approach. **She asked**
3 **the planning team if they were in agreement with this approach. There was no further**
4 **discussion and the planning team agreed to the prioritization approach.**

5 Ms. Monte referred the planning team member to the project time table. She suggested that the
6 project staff would further review the mitigation actions spreadsheets for each jurisdiction and make
7 individual contact with planning team members as necessary regarding possible additional mitigation
8 actions over the next few weeks. She stated that she would like to review relevant aspects of the
9 HMP project with the RPC Technical Committee. She explained that the RPC Technical Committee
10 is comprised of municipal planners from within the County, some of which are also HMP planning
11 team members. She asked the planning team if they would agree to share the draft Stage 3 mitigation
12 action project information with the RPC Technical Committee. The planning team agreed. Ms.
13 Monte asked if the planning team would agree to allow the HMP advisory group to review the draft
14 Stage 3 mitigation action document draft. The planning team agreed. She stated that the earliest that
15 feedback could be available from these groups would be early April. Mr. Dwyer asked if the next
16 meeting would be April 2nd. Ms. Monte confirmed this date.
17

18 Mr. Keller told the planning team to contact Ms. Monte or Mr. Kennedy if they had any questions
19 about the material covered at the meeting. Ms. Monte suggested that if it is helpful that the
20 University of Illinois planning team members should meet with the City of Urbana and City of
21 Champaign members. Mr. Clarkson inquired about obtaining a copy of the existing and proposed
22 mitigation actions from the University of Illinois. Ms. Monte stated that she would send out an
23 updated jurisdiction mitigation action spreadsheet to all planning team members. Ms. Monte
24 introduced Ms. Burgess who is a new planning team member representing Parkland College. The
25 next meeting will be April 2nd.
26

27 **7. Public Participation**

28 **8. Other Business**

29 **9. Adjournment**

30
31 Mr. Foster made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Clarkson seconded the motion. Upon vote, the motion
32 carried unanimously. There being no further business, Mr. Keller adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.
33