



Champaign County Hazard Mitigation Plan Planning Team

1 **Date:** December 4, 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 **Approved as Distributed**
9

10 **Members Present:** Bill Keller, Steve Clarkson, John Dwyer, James Haake, Jeremy Leevey, Todd Short,
11 John Barker, Dan Culkin, Tony Foster
12

13 **Members Absent:** Von Young, Rob Kowalski, Robert Myers, Bob Mahrt
14

15 **CCRPC Staff:** Susan Monte, Zach Kennedy, Mary Cummings
16

MINUTES

17
18 **1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

19 Mr. Keller called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. Roll was taken by written record and a quorum
20 was declared present. Mr. Haake was welcomed.
21

22 **2. Approval of Agenda**

23 **There being no changes or additions, Mr. Foster made the motion to approve the agenda as**
24 **distributed. Mr. Dwyer seconded the motion. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.**
25

26 **3. Approval of Minutes –**

27 **A. October 9, 2008**

28 **There being no changes or additions, Mr. Dwyer made the motion to approve the minutes as**
29 **distributed. Mr. Haake seconded the motion. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.**
30

31 **4. Project Status**

32 Ms. Monte stated that the project is on schedule. She mentioned that the schedule had been updated.
33 She explained that it had been updated because the public outreach and participation efforts of the
34 project staff eliminated the need to schedule a public event. She stated that making allowance for
35 public participation is very important aspect of this project, and it will be discussed further. She
36 explained that this meeting will be followed by a Feb. 5th meeting, and then a meeting in May. Ms.
37 Monte concluded by saying the project is coming along nicely and on budget.
38

39 Mr. Keller praised Ms. Monte and the project staff. He stated that the staff had done an outstanding
40 job, and he was impressed with the work. He responded to a question about the dates for the
41 upcoming meetings explaining that the next meeting is February 5th. He said there was no date yet set
42 for the meeting in May.
43

1 Ms. Monte interjected explaining that according to the schedule the meeting in May would be on the
2 7th. She stated that an optional meeting in April that may be considered, depending on project
3 progress.
4

5 **5. Old Business**

6 ***A. Revised Stage 2 - Risk Assessment Report***

7 Ms. Monte reminded the committee that at the last meeting they were provided with CD of draft of
8 first two stages of the report. She stated that the project staff had been receiving suggestions for
9 revisions from the advisory group. She explained that draft comments were requested to be returned
10 by the end of October, however comments will still be accepted and revisions will be made as
11 necessary. She stated that an updated version of the draft will be available in the next couple of
12 weeks either on CD or as PDF files that can be accessed. Ms. Monte concludes that the draft should
13 not be put on the publicly accessible plan website until corrections have been completed and the team
14 agrees on its release to the public.
15

16 ***B. Review Draft HMP Goal and Objectives***

17 Ms. Monte referred to handout 1 and explained that the handout contained word changes to the
18 project objectives and goals which were discussed at the previous meeting. She stated that the goal is
19 still very general, and that the objectives are also relatively general. She explained that FEMA does
20 not require detailed objectives. She stressed the need to be careful that mitigation actions and their
21 implementation strategy are very clear and easy to understand. She suggested that this should be no
22 problem with these general goals and objectives. She asked the committee to review the suggested
23 word changes. She explained that the language of the goal was changed to focus on the natural
24 hazards being considered in the plan instead of all natural hazards. She mentioned that the other
25 language change to the goal clarified that the HMP will only seek protect lives and property within
26 the HMP planning area. Ms Monte opened up these proposed changes discussion. There was no
27 discussion and the consensus agreed to the changes.
28

29 Ms. Monte explained the language changes to the plan objectives. She stated that the word changes
30 for the first objective point out that the plan is multi-jurisdictional and that each jurisdiction will
31 adopt one or more mitigation action. She noted that the word changes to the second objective were
32 also made to make the objective applicable to a multi-jurisdictional plan. She further explained that
33 language was added to the second objective to clarify what was meant by “vulnerability.” She stated
34 that the third objective was also altered to make it compatible with a multi-jurisdictional plan. Ms.
35 Monte asked the committee if there were any objections to the word changes.
36

37 Mr. Culkin asked if the objectives might include updating information regarding improvements to
38 jurisdictions’ plans and facilities. Ms. Monte responded that Mr.Culkin’s suggestion was more in the
39 realm of mitigation actions than plan objectives. She explained that Mr. Culkin’s idea will be
40 documented and that it will be helpful when thinking about prioritization standards for the mitigation
41 actions.
42

43 Mr. Keller asked the planning team if they approved the language changes. The changes were
44 approved.
45

46 **6. New Business**

47 ***A. Encouraging Public Participation: Poster, HMP Mitigation Measures Survey, Press Release***

48 Ms. Monte stated that project staff had developed a survey. She mentioned that the committee
49 members received a cover sheet with survey instructions via email. She pointed out that the
50 committee had just been given a copy of survey. She explained that she and Mr. Kennedy had
51 developed the survey, put it on line, contacted all of the smaller jurisdictions and provided them with
52 the information to publicize this survey to their village trustees and other interested parties. She
53 stated that the intent of the survey is to collect public feedback about mitigation actions. She stated
54 that ten hard copies of the survey were sent with letters to the smaller jurisdictions. She explained

1 that the hard copies would be useful for individuals who will not take the survey online. She
2 requested that planning team members think about how they could distribute or publicize the survey
3 in their respective jurisdictions. She suggested contacting city councils or trustees, or using whatever
4 means is best for their jurisdiction.
5

6 Mr. Keller inquired whether a link to the survey could be publicized in Champaign and Urbana on
7 their cable television stations. Mr. Foster responded that that was possible, and that a link to the
8 survey could also be put on the municipal website. Mr. Foster asked when the deadline for the survey
9 was. Ms. Monte responded that the survey will be online until January 16th.
10

11 Ms. Monte asked the team members to contact their jurisdictions IT person to request that a link to
12 the survey be placed on their website. She mentioned that Mr. Kennedy worked on the creation and
13 distribution of a poster containing a summary of the project and information about how to get online
14 to take the survey. She stated that the poster was sent to eleven libraries throughout the County. She
15 explained that in April when the date for the public hearing has been chosen, new posters will be sent
16 out with that information. She stated that a copy of the poster was available to the team members
17 upon request. She stated that a press release for the project was still needed, and would be completed
18 soon. She mentioned that the planning team should contact her or Mr. Keller with any other ideas for
19 public participation. Mr. Dwyer mentioned that he had taken the survey and information to the
20 Champaign County board of health. Mr. Foster requested that the planning team members are
21 contacted before the press release is issued. He stated that he wants to ensure that survey is linked to
22 the municipal website and that the information is on UPTV. Ms. Monte responded that that was a
23 good idea.
24

25 Mr. Clarkson raised a question about the damage inducing lightning probability statistic in the
26 introductory section of the survey. He stated that he responds to at least a half a dozen lightning
27 damage calls a year. He mentioned that the stated probability of 7 percent seemed low in comparison
28 to the stated probability of other natural hazards. He asked if the project staff was sure of the statistic.
29 Mr. Kennedy responded that the statistic comes from the National Climactic Data Center Database.
30 He explained that if the event is not reported, it does not appear in the database. Ms. Monte
31 suggested that a note on the survey could be made that explains the tendency for the damage inducing
32 lightning events to be underreported. Mr. Clarkson asked Mr. Keller if he agrees that damage
33 inducing lightning strikes are more frequent. Mr. Keller explained that when his office does severe
34 storm reporting to the National Weather Service he does not include every fire call for possible
35 lightning damage. Mr. Keller and Mr. Clarkson suggested that this is why the statistic is so low. Mr.
36 Clarkson mentioned that lightning strikes are not something that is reported to IEMA. Ms. Monte
37 stated that the tendency for underreporting could be noted in the report.
38

39 Mr. Clarkson suggested that the probability will lead the general public to think that damage inducing
40 lightning strikes are not likely. Mr. Keller stated that the statistic may be for the total number of
41 structures. Mr. Clarkson mentioned that it would matter how the percentage was figured. He asked if
42 it was the percentage of lightning strikes versus lightning strikes that cause damage. Mr. Kennedy
43 explained that it is the number of years in the database in which lightning data is recorded versus the
44 number of years in which a damage inducing lightning strike is reported. Mr. Foster stated that
45 insurance companies may have more accurate information because of damage claims.
46

47 ***B. Identifying Existing and Proposed Mitigation Actions for each Jurisdiction***

48 Ms. Monte explained that the main focus of this stage is identifying current and proposed mitigation
49 actions. She mentions that project staff had been in contact with some of the planning team members
50 including Dan Culkin. Ms. Monte referred to a handout with an Excel spreadsheet that showed the
51 format of how the mitigation action information was being recorded. She stated that project staff will
52 be requesting that the planning team members think about possible mitigation actions for their
53 jurisdictions. She explained that handout #2 provided to the planning team contains examples of

1 mitigation actions. She explained that the FEMA worksheets provided to the planning team members
2 will be used by project staff to make sure the correct information is collected. She mentioned that
3 project staff will be talking individually to all planning team members as to where they are in the
4 process of identifying mitigation actions. She stated that planning team members should feel free to
5 coordinate their efforts and work together.
6

7 Ms. Monte stated that project staff has started identifying mitigation actions for each jurisdiction and
8 the planning team will eventually talk about prioritizing them. Ms. Monte explained that it should be
9 understood that the FEMA categories for mitigation actions are prevention, property protection,
10 structural projects, emergency services, natural resource protection, and public outreach and
11 awareness. She mentioned that FEMA requires an indication of whether proposed mitigation actions
12 address new or existing structures and infrastructure. She stated that mitigation actions, hazard ranks
13 and prioritization standards are all things that the planning team members will need to think about.
14

15 Ms. Monte stated that she would like to talk more about flood hazard and potential mitigation. She
16 indicated that Mr. Kennedy has collected information on National Flood Insurance Program.
17

18 Mr. Kennedy explained that the project staff was interested in identifying repetitive loss structures,
19 and that data was obtained from the State Floodplain Administrator. He stated that five jurisdictions
20 have had repetitive loss structures. He mentioned that Champaign had nine, St. Joseph had five,
21 Sidney had two, and Broadlands and Fisher each had one. He explains that some of the structures
22 have been addressed. He states that one building in Champaign was demolished. He mentioned that
23 two properties in Champaign had been damaged nine times, but the most recent damage was ten years
24 ago and he assumes that these are along the Boneyard Creek and have been addressed. Mr. Clarkson
25 asked Mr. Kennedy if he had the addresses of the repetitive loss structures. Ms. Monte and Mr.
26 Kennedy responded that they could provide the addresses to the planning team members, but that the
27 information may not be released to the public.
28

29 Mr. Kennedy stated that there are three programs with the NFIP to address these repetitive loss
30 structures. He explained that the first program is the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program which
31 provides project grants. He stated that the qualifying requirements were that the structure had two or
32 more losses each with claim in excess of \$1,000. Further, the structure must have been flooded twice
33 within any ten year period since 1978. He explained that the jurisdiction that applies for a project
34 grant must come up with a twenty-five percent fund match for the grant. He stated that the second
35 program is the Repetitive Flood Claims Program. He explained that this program is similar to the
36 first program except that it is for jurisdictions that do not have the resources to come up with twenty
37 five percent matching funds or the capability to administer the subgrant. He stated that this program
38 provides money for a wide variety of flood mitigation projects, with funding limited to \$1,000,000.
39 He stated that the third program is the Severe Repetitive Loss Program, which is restricted to
40 residential properties. He explained that the requirements include four claims and each over \$5,000
41 each, or there must be two separate claims in which the cumulative amount of the building portion of
42 the claim exceeds the market value of the building. He mentioned that for both of the aforementioned
43 criteria two of the recorded claims must have occurred in a ten year period and greater than ten days
44 apart.
45

46 Ms. Monte stated that the jurisdictions with repetitive flood losses will be provided with that
47 information. She asked the planning team to refer to a handout that lists hazard mitigation projects
48 that can be funded by FEMA. She suggested that this list might be used to inspire the identification
49 of at least one mitigation action.
50

51 Ms. Monte mentioned that Mr. Keller had raised a concern about the liability implications for
52 designating safe public shelters. Mr. Keller explained that if citizens are told to go to a certain place

1 in severe weather, and the facility were to become damaged, the jurisdiction would be liable for any
2 injuries which occurred. He stated that this is the reason why there are no designated public shelters
3 in the County.
4

5 Mr. Culkin stated that the newest version of the ICC building codes may include the construction of
6 safe rooms and Rantoul has been monitoring that and how to adopt it. He mentioned that he is not
7 sure that it is a liability that the City wants to take on. He explained that this issue is something that
8 Rantoul had been trying to address in mobile homes. Mr. Keller mentioned that the State Emergency
9 Management Association tried to push legislation through the state that would require that any new
10 trailer park developments have a storm shelter. He explained that this measure met resistance from
11 mobile home lobbyist, and in addition it would be difficult to decide who would be responsible for
12 unlocking the shelter, and it may attract vandals.
13

14 Mr. Kennedy mentioned that there is a contract with Red Cross to provide shelters. Mr. Keller
15 responded that the agreement with Red Cross works well from both an administrative and liability
16 standpoint. He explained that the Red Cross constantly enhances their agreement with different
17 facilities. Mr. Clarkson mentions that it is important that all these issues be coordinated through Mr.
18 Keller's office.
19

20 Mr. Foster stated that it is important to provide information and education to the public. He explained
21 that it is important for each family to have their own plan and to be self reliant.
22

23 Ms. Monte reiterated that the planning team members will be asked to identify mitigation actions and
24 priorities for their respective jurisdictions. She explained that if any question arises with the process,
25 project staff will help in any way they can.
26

27 Ms. Monte asked Mr. Keller why it is not a good to track vulnerable populations including the elderly
28 or disabled. Mr. Keller responded that it was something that ESDA had tried before. Mr. Keller
29 explained that there are two problems. The first problem is that there are potential HIPA violation
30 implications. The second is that it is difficult to maintain a viable database about where the elderly
31 are. He mentions that it is not efficient, because the database does not get updated when people move
32 or pass away. He explains that they have a good idea of how to keep track of the folks in group
33 homes or managed care facilities, but not other individuals. Mr. Dwyer stated that this issue can be
34 addressed if people are good neighbors. He explains that people need to take care of themselves and
35 their neighbors. Mr. Clarkson reiterated the importance of telling people that they need to be
36 responsible for themselves. Mr. Keller stated that a major component of the public education should
37 be that the emergency services cannot take care of everyone all the time.
38

39 Ms. Monte stated that these ideas could be useful in prioritizing mitigation actions. She explains that
40 project staff will be persistent with email contact until February in lieu of face to face meetings.
41

42 Mr. Keller clarified that project staff is interested in information from planning team members on the
43 current mitigation activities in their jurisdictions. Ms. Monte added that the planning team members
44 should try to assess their jurisdictions capabilities.
45

46 Mr. Clarkson requested that some deadlines be set for these requests. He stated that it would be
47 beneficial to have a set of sub-steps for things that need to be accomplished before the February
48 meeting.
49

50 Ms. Monte stated that the tasks that need to be completed by the planning team members include
51 identifying mitigation actions, identifying prioritization standards, and to complete the information
52 about the jurisdiction's capability assessment. She referred to Worksheet #3 and stated that project

1 staff needs to know about what programs and current mitigation activities are in place, as well as
2 possible sources of funding. SM – database sheet could be used for you. She stated that project staff
3 would provide the planning team members with a spreadsheet to record the mitigation actions.
4

5 Mr. Foster asked if the tasks are to be completed by February 5th via email. Ms. Monte stated that the
6 project staff will create 3 benchmarks which outline the tasks that need to be completed and the dates
7 they should be completed by.
8

9 Mr. Clarkson asked for clarification regarding the prioritization of the mitigation actions. He asked
10 whether low cost or no cost items should be given the highest priority. Ms. Monte responded that
11 other prioritization strategies could include saving lives versus property, though the distinction
12 between these is not always clear cut.
13

14 Ms. Monte stated that the next meeting will be about implementation strategies. She mentioned that
15 the planning team members will be provided with bench marks to make the next meeting more
16 productive. She explains that it will be important to have the information in front of them so that the
17 actions may be discussed as a team. She says this will aid in the coordination of the prioritized
18 actions, which could be important as cost savings might be realized if actions are undertaken on a
19 larger scale.
20

21 Mr. Keller mentions that the different jurisdictions may have different priorities. Mr. Culkin stated
22 that there may be more than one priority.
23

24 Ms. Monte reiterated that the planning team would receive an email about benchmarks.
25

26
27 **7. Public Participation**

28
29 **8. Other Business**

30
31 **9. Adjournment**

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