



Hamilton County Storm Water District

Administered by the Hamilton County Engineer's Office – Theodore B. Hubbard, County Engineer

In partnership with H. C. Soil and Water Conservation District, The H. C. Department of Planning and Development, H. C. Public Health, the City of Cincinnati Stormwater Management Utility, and the Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati

Website: <http://www.hamilton-co.org/stormwater>

Hamilton County Storm Water District

71st Oversight Board Minutes

June 25, 2015

2:00 p.m.

Springfield Township Administration Building

Allen Paul Room

Board Members Present	Board Members Absent
Joseph Honerlaw – Springfield Township Trustee	Russ Jackson – Anderson Township Trustee
Mark Quarry – Village of Silverton Councilman	Chris Monzel – Hamilton County Commissioner
Theodore Hubbard – Hamilton County Engineer	Tim Gilday – Hamilton County Engineer's Office
Gena Bell – Hamilton County Commissioner's Office	
Jenny Kilgore – Village of Glendale	
Alternates Present	Alternates Absent
Jim Obert – Symmes Township Resident	Frank Birkenhauer – Colerain Township Assistant Administrator and Director of Development
Richard Osgood – City of Sharonville Building and Planning Director	Tony Parrott – Director – Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati

Guest Name	Organization
Tom Alderfer	Village of Glendale
Brian Bohl	Hamilton County Soil & Water Conservation District
Andrew Bohlen	CDM Smith
Chris Calpin	CDM Smith
Nancy Ellwood	CDM Smith
Dora Hamblin	CDM Smith
Brad Johnson	Hamilton County Public Health District
George Kipp	Village of Indian Hill
Todd Long	Hamilton County Engineer's Office
Ron Ripperger	Delhi Township
Richard Shelly	Anderson Township
Holly Utrata-Halcomb	Hamilton County Soil & Water Conservation District
Jim Welber	Hamilton County Planning and Development

1) **Meeting Called To Order / Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Quarry called the 71st Oversight Board Meeting to order at 2:07 p.m., and then led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2) **Introductions**

Introductions of the Oversight Board and Alternate Members were made.

3) **Approval of Minutes:**

Board Member Hubbard moved to approve the minutes from the 70th Oversight Board Meeting dated April 23, 2015; seconded by Vice Chairman Honerlaw, the motion carried.

4) **Unfinished Business:**

None

5) **New Business:**

A) Mr. Long presented the 2016 District Budget while referencing the handouts provided.

- 2016 budget would not raise the rates - keeping things even with the budget trends from 2012 through 2016 shown in the handout.
- Anticipated revenues are expected to be less than estimated expenditures.
 - Member jurisdictions left and no Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) state match.
 - Can cover 2016 shortfall with dollars available through program efficiencies.
 - 2016 budget is the last time the District can make the difference in revenue up based on efficiencies.
- Reviewed the breakout of the budget in terms of how revenues are collected - tax bills or direct bills. The breakout of the partner agencies associated with the District shows the expenditures for their District activities.

Question: Vice Chairman Honerlaw asked Mr. Long what the first graph represents.

Answer: Mr. Long Indicated that this shows that the trend in the budget from 2012 through 2016 is relatively static overall. We are reducing slightly what we are spending in 2016 compared to 2015.

Question: Vice Chairman Honerlaw asked Mr. Long whether the data shown were expenses.

Answer: Mr. Long indicated that yes these are the overall expenses that we budgeted for in each of the given years.

Question: Vice Chairman Honerlaw asked Mr. Long to provide clarification regarding the project revenue. Specifically, can the difference be covered by carryover.

Answer: Mr. Long answered, yes.

Question: Vice Chairman Honerlaw asked Mr. Long what are we forecasting.

Answer: Mr. Long indicated that the District is putting together forecasts for 2017 through 2019. The District received notice from the City of Cincinnati on May 13th that they will be leaving the District. 2017 will be their first year out. Due to the services selected, the consequences of the withdrawal of the City of Cincinnati are driving impacts to the budget and will affect what we do. The District will be holding a work session to discuss this in more detail so that we can deal with the impacts. The District will need the further discussion before we can present a plan to the board.

Statement: Board Member Hubbard stated losing the ODNR match and Cincinnati will have a serious impact in 2017 through 2019. I support Mr. Long one hundred percent in delaying the analysis until we get a better picture of what is going on. We might need to make some adjustment.

Question: Vice Chairman Honerlaw asked Mr. Long if Cincinnati's fee payments are current to the Storm Water District.

Answer: Mr. Long. Yes through 2014. They will be billed again as a direct bill in October of this year for 2015 services and again the following year for 2016. Approximately \$600 thousand of invoicing will be sent to the city. The District has been trying to work with Cincinnati for a long time - months if not years to bring a direct line of communication regarding their fees. The District has reached out many times with no response. It is my belief that they should have stayed with the District, but unfortunately it did not work out.

Statement: Board Member Hubbard, indicated that we have been lenient and accommodating, and tried every way possible to keep the partnership going. It is disappointing.

Question: Chairman Quarry asked Mr. Long what was the state match.

Answer: Mr. Long. The state match is about \$225,000 in a given year. The City fee was \$588,000 with \$300,000 direct billed. Cincinnati services were base services. SWCD now has another challenge as they perform the lion's share of the base services, primarily the public education and outreach components.

Mr. Long described the four containers for services and funds stating that the challenge is that we can't currently apply money from one service fund to another service.

Mr. Long stated that he has requested to meet with the Prosecutor and will be seeking guidance as to whether the District can use funds from one area of service to another. The Prosecutor asked the District to write to the Civil Division requesting an assembly of their staff to help us study the matter. Board Member Hubbard and Mr. Long will create this request.

Question: Chairman Quarry asked Mr. Long how long will it take to get the Prosecutor's opinion.

Answer: Mr. Long explained that in his experience it depends on which of their staff is free. In our favor, we do have time to deal with this. The 2016 budget is solid. We have six months or so to figure out 2017 and beyond.

Statement: Board Member Hubbard. We have asked for special representation from the Prosecutor's office so we can get this question answered. It is critically important for us to understand what we do with these four funding accounts. If funds are truly restricted this will have an impact on our budget from 2017-2019. It may take a couple months to get a good answer.

Question: Chairman Quarry asked Mr. Long does Cincinnati know two more bills are coming.

Answer: Mr. Long, I was not given any opportunity to communicate with any of the city leaders. In other communities, the few that have left, we had that communication and they knew about it and understood the policy when they voted on it back in the creation of the District. It is not clear what the City leaders do and don't know. The City won't talk to us.

Question: Chairman Quarry asked Mr. Long should we make a formal communication.

Answer: Mr. Long. The District could send a letter with the October (2015) bill to remind them. The District is being consistent with sending the bill in October as we have in the past. The District is still providing the services and the District is still going to cover them in the annual report, they are still receiving benefit.

Question: Chairman Quarry asked Mr. Long do you need a formal direction to do that.

Answer: Mr. Long. You are more than welcome to make a formal recommendation to send a letter.

The board made a recommendation to send a letter.

Question: Alternate Board Member Obert from the audience asked when was the last time we initiated contact with those jurisdictions that either left or have never been part of the District to see if we could off-set some of the lost revenue? Should we reach out to others that have left the District? Mr. Obert stated the overall rate of the Storm Water District has been static over the years and perhaps with the change in economy it may be time to research the rate structure. I am not an opponent of any increase.

Answer: Mr. Long. Each year when the District sends out the Level of Service forms the jurisdictions are contacted. Historically the District does not contact a community if they are not part of the District. Through yearly activities the District has discussions with individuals at an administrative level. One jurisdiction has suggested from an administrative standpoint they would like to return, but don't feel that their council is ready to make that decision. It would certainly not hurt us to reach back out. A re-invitation letter is not out of the mix at all. As for the rate structure it has been static since at least 2010 or so. The maximum rate we charge for a single family unit is \$8.13 per year. This is a small rate in comparison to our peer groups in other counties. The District is going to have to look at the rate structure. It will be a part of our analysis.

- Mr. Long requested approval of the 2016 budget as presented.

Board Member Quarry moved to approve the 2016 budget; seconded by Board Member Kilgore, the motion carried.

B) Mr. Long was to present a summary of the budget forecast for fiscal years 2017 through 2019 and implications for District services.

- Mr. Long stated that this had been covered under the previous topic. The item was passed over for further discussion.

C) Mr. Long presented a recommendation to reactivate the Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

- Mr. Long briefly covered the concept of the CIP program noting that there was a prior request to form a committee to study incorporation of greener project elements and to look at the CIP application and award process. This has not happened due to difficulty in getting municipal representatives to participate in the committee.
- Mr. Long requested to rescind the committee formation request. Mr. Long stated that a lot of member jurisdictions have been helped by the CIP and have said good things about it. There is a need to advance the program now.

Statement: Board Member Hubbard indicated that the CIP is the "carrot" to keep member jurisdictions in the District.

Reply: Mr. Long stated that they get a good return on investment and the CIP is an important element in what the District does.

Question: Vice Chairman Honerlaw what would be the funding level.

Answer: Mr. Long. Using the 2014 and 2015 budgeted dollars would give about \$880,000. We are not using money we don't have. We are opening up the program to dollars we have previously committed.

Question: Board Member Hubbard asked if it comes from the IDDE program.

Answer: Mr. Long. Correct, it comes from the IDDE portion of the program. It is a tangible part of the program.

Statement: Board Member Hubbard indicated that at this time, I do see the wisdom in having CIP embrace green infrastructure. My concern now is that we don't want to lose more communities by delaying the program. Move some projects forward and see where we stand on a budgetary point a view - after we talk to the Prosecutor and know what type of impact their feedback is going to have - and then come back and evaluate a CIP that involves more green elements.

Board Member Hubbard moved to continue with the Capital Improvement Program but postpone the effort to evaluate the potential for more green infrastructure until a later date; seconded by Board Member Bell, the motion carried.

6) Further Announcements:

A) Next Meeting Date:

- Oversight Board Work Session; September 23, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. in Springfield Township
 - May propose an earlier date if needed. Need as many Board Members and Alternate Members to participate as possible. Board members offered to assist in encouraging other Board members to participate.
- Oversight Board Meeting; October 22, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. in Springfield Township

B) Copy of the 2015 meeting schedule is on the table in the back of the room.

7) Other Business:

None.

8) Adjournment:

With no further business, it was moved by Vice Chairman Honerlaw and seconded by Board Member Hubbard that the 71st Oversight Board meeting be adjourned. The meeting concluded at 2:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Theodore B. Hubbard, P.E.-P.S.
Secretary/Treasurer for HCSWD