

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
April 3, 2008**

The DeKalb County Stormwater Management Planning Committee (SMPC) met on April 3, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in the DeKalb County Administrative Building, Conference Room East, in Sycamore, Illinois. In attendance were Committee members Bill Nicklas, Joe Misurelli, Roger Steimel, Don Pardridge, Donna Prain, Ken Andersen, Joel Maurer, Pat Vary, Tom Thomas, Mark Biernacki, Bill Lorence and Paul Miller. Also present was DeKalb County Assistant Planner Rebecca Von Drasek.

1. **Roll Call** -- *Mr. Miller noted committee members Mr. Nicklas and Mr. Biernacki were absent but would most likely arrive soon.*
2. **Approval of Agenda** – *Mr. Lorence moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Steimel, and the motion carried unanimously.*
3. **Approval of Minutes** – *Ms. Prain moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Misurelli, and the motion carried unanimously.*
4. **Review and Discussion of Potential Action Items**

Mr. Miller recapped the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) meeting on March 27, 2008 during which the RPC passed a resolution supporting a future groundwater study. Mr. Miller also summarized a meeting earlier in the day on April 3, 2008 with representatives from DeKalb County, City of Sycamore and the City of DeKalb at which time the members discussed combining the funding efforts of the stormwater and groundwater projects. Mr. Miller highlighted that both initiatives are in need of funding and that voters might be confused if there are two separate water initiatives on the ballot. He then distributed the prospective language for a referendum and asked the Committee members to note that it did not include the word “water”. He emphasized that legislation restricts the ballot language, therefore to pass any funding mechanism the County and municipalities would need a coalition of willing citizens to undertake an informational campaign. Mr. Miller then referenced the February 14, 2008 staff memo which outlined various potential action items for the SMPC to consider as future activities. He suggested going around the room and asked the Committee members to add activities to the list that they would like to see completed.

At this time, Mr. Nicklas and Mr. Biernacki arrived.

Mr. Steimel began by noting that he supported the idea of a Comprehensive Water Map and updating the Stormwater Management Ordinance. He indicated that the staff memo set forth all of the important tasks.

Mr. Lorence noted that much of the needed data for such a map already exists and that the Committee needs someone to pull all the information together. Some information, such as the

depressional storage areas, would require collecting new contour data as this existing information is out-of date.

Mr. Thomas reported that the City of Sandwich was having aerial photographs taken and that Sandwich had joined Kendall County's water study and might not benefit from additional water projects.

Ms. Prain stated that to accomplish a watershed approach to stormwater management, the Ordinance needs to be upgraded. She suggested using DuPage and McHenry Counties' ordinances as models and building from there rather than starting with creating a stormwater map. Additionally, she requested that identifying the woodland and recharge areas should be added to the list of important information. Ms. Prain agreed that it was difficult to separate water quantity from water quality issues, and that she supported combining the funding effort with that of the groundwater project. Ms. Prain also asserted that the Committee would be well served by identifying which items were regional, and focusing on implementing solutions.

Ms. Vary emphasized that a redraft of the Stormwater Management Ordinance would be necessary prior to implementing solutions to stormwater problems. Mr. Miller suggested that, if assisted by consultants, the Committee could concurrently gather information and begin a redraft of the Stormwater Management Ordinance. Ms. Prain again suggested that other County ordinances were available, and Mr. Miller agreed that the existing ordinances could be utilized to articulate which questions the data collection should answer. Ms. Prain also suggested that by reviewing other ordinances the Committee would be able to ascertain what should and should not be implemented. She inquired who would provide the staff to implement the Stormwater Management Ordinance once amended.

Ms. Vary pointed out that another funding option, rather than a referendum, is the creation of a water authority, which once created would have an on-going funding source and the means to hire staff to implement the Ordinance. Mr. Miller and Mr. Lorence noted that DuPage, McHenry, and Lake Counties created "water guru" positions to manage their ordinance implementation. Mr. Steimel suggested that the Committee was not prepared to decide this issue yet.

Mr. Pardridge noted that filter strips were a proactive means to filter water. Mr. Steimel noted that the Soil and Water Conservation District actively promoted farmers to use filter strips and other water quality techniques. He noted that Dean Johnson, from the Soil and Water Conservation District, had offered to meet with the Committee if requested. Lastly, Mr. Pardridge agreed this was a big issue and that it should be reviewed in conjunction with the groundwater study.

Mr. Lorence felt that the agricultural areas need to be addressed, since farms effect water quality and are often exempt from County regulations. Mr. Steimel agreed that farms are often under only State jurisdiction. Mr. Lorence stated that the recommendations would generally be

voluntary. Mr. Steimel asked if golf courses have greater runoff problems. Ms. Vary noted that 88% of the land in DeKalb County was agricultural. Ms. Prain pointed out that the rural and urban areas need to cooperate to resolve issues, she also noted that the KREPS study would recommend 100 feet filter strips with the hope of getting 25 feet, which was better than nothing. Mr. Steimel noted that conservation methods were often abandoned due to economic strain.

Ms. Vary asked if the Committee needed the money now or if it could be split between entities to begin information collection. Mr. Thomas pointed out that there were a lot of unknowns. Mr. Lorence repeated that most of the data the Committee was seeking is available but that the consultant was needed to pull the information together.

Ms. Prain briefly explained the water cycle for the Committee's benefit and to emphasize that wetlands are continuing to disappear. Mr. Lorence concurred that the wetlands served a significant purpose in filtering groundwater.

Ms. Vary then provided the Committee with her list of priorities; 1) promote protection of wetland and storage areas; 2) create strategies for regional detention and retention; and 3) implement conservation and water quality programs.

Mr. Maurer stated that he agreed that the Committee needed to include the delineation of wetlands on a comprehensive water map. He emphasized that in order to create regulations the Committee would need to understand the problem, he then gave an example of the regulation of siltation if the Committee had adequate information. Mr. Maurer provided Committee members with an example of a water map created for the Village of Frankfort. He agreed with other members that conservation methods would be important future task for the Committee. Mr. Maurer also added that the location of severe repetitive loss properties should be included on the Comprehensive Map, and that he supported the fee-in-lieu program.

Ms. Prain submitted information pertaining to the watersheds, including the directional flows and associated municipalities. The handouts also included a map of the Kishwaukee and Fox River watersheds, as well as, a copy of Kane County's Watershed map.

Mr. Anderson stated that he thought the fee-in-lieu program was a good idea and that he agreed with the general direction of the bullet points from the February 14, 2008 memo. Mr. Miller added that prior to beginning of a fee-in-lieu program the Committee would need to identify appropriate locations for regional detention. Mr. Anderson then inquired if new wetlands were being created, a brief discussion followed, concluding with the understanding that less wetlands were being created than are being destroyed.

Mr. Nicklas thanked Mr. Miller for creating a preliminary menu for the Committee to discuss. He stressed the need to combine the funding efforts of the groundwater and stormwater projects to create a single initiative dealing with "All Things Water". He reiterated the proposed funding efforts which had been discussed included a referendum, a water authority, or bonds. Mr.

Nicklas pointed out that basing the cost spread on EAV would place the burden on the larger communities, which may make the initiative less feasible.

Mr. Steimel observed that without a water inventory neither project could determine what steps should be taken. He stated that both the RPC and the Committee needed to determine what the group would need help with and how to pay for it. He then questioned if a water authority was needed. Mr. Pardridge stated there were pros and cons to such a proposal, but that it would be a hard sell to the public. Ms. Vary noted that a water authority in the current legislation once created cannot be removed. Mr. Miller suggested that the County could lobby for revisions of the legislation governing water authorities.

Mr. Nicklas stated that in order to continue moving toward remedies, a funding mechanism must be decided.

Mr. Lorence asserted that to convince voters to buy-in they needed to be reminded of local water issues. Mr. Miller reiterated the need for a coalition of the willing since governments cannot advocate on behalf of items that are on a referendum.

Mr. Biernacki asked that the creation of a mechanism to force maintenance of detention facilities with a dormant SSA be added to the list of menu items. He indicated that he was a proponent of a referendum that would energize people to take consider water issues. He also indicated support of combining the funding of the water issues, and advocated the creation of a resolution similar to the RPC.

Ms. Vary agreed that the Committee needed estimated costs of items to consider if consultants should be hired.

Mr. Thomas again reiterated that the Committee should determine which watersheds they were discussing because the watershed changes south of Hinckley. He asserted that individuals in that area would not vote for a referendum.

Mr. Miller then asked the Committee to determine which of the bullet points in the February 14, 2008 staff memo would be appropriate for in-house preparation versus a consultant. He also volunteered to contact prospective firms and ask that they provide rough cost estimates for the Committee to consider. Mr. Miller endorsed Mr. Biernacki's idea of creating a resolution which would go from the Committee to the County Board.

Ms. Vary noted that KREPS might be willing to provide some data voluntarily, and Ms. Prain agreed. Ms. Vary also expressed a concern that voters will wonder why this water project was not already done. Mr. Miller noted that only since 2005 have water authorities been permitted. Mr. Nicklas pointed out that this type of study was the only way for the communities to plan rather than just react.

Mr. Miller than read the bullet point from the February 14, 2008 staff memo and the additional suggested items. Committee members provided a general consensus if items should be given to a consultant or completed in-house, resulting in the following tasks being identified as those that need funding:

- 1). A comprehensive water map should be generated by a consultant, although Ms. Prain noted that most of the data could be provided to the consultants. Such a map would include: all rivers, streams, creeks, waterways and key drainage ways; floodplains; limits of existing drainage districts; limits of the major and minor watersheds; updated wetlands inventory, including "isolated" wetlands; an inventory of existing "depressional storage" areas; an inventory of important wooded areas; inventory of recharge areas; and other stormwater problem areas; and
- 2). Identify and prioritize regional stormwater management projects which should be done with the assistance of a consultant. After some discussion the item was split in two parts so that Phase II would include identifying the projects and Phase III would prioritize them and generate cost estimates.

Ms. Prain asked if a stormwater utility could be created, and the Committee generally suggested that this was a Phase III item.

Mr. Miller reiterated that he would try to gather cost estimates for the mapping and identification for the items to be completed by a consultant. Following an estimation of the costs, Mr. Miller stated staff could create a resolution proposing a course of action for the Committee to consider.

Ms. Vary noted that a presentation of the information already collected by KREPS could be presented at the May meeting to continue to inform the Committee of the available information.

Ms. Prain asked what was the Committee's recourse is the proposal fails to receive funding. Mr. Miller expressed hope that citizens would respond to both the flooding and clean water issues. Ms. Vary noted the similarities between this and the County Jail initiatives, and asserted that individuals would need to see the issue as the County's response and solution to water problems.

5. Next Meeting:

Following a brief discussion, the Committee agreed to meet next on May 15, 2008 at 3:00 pm, in the East Conference Room of the DeKalb County Administration Building in Sycamore, IL.

6. **Adjournment** -- *Mr. Lorence motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Anderson, and the motion carried unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,

Paul R. Miller, AICP
Chairman, DeKalb County Stormwater Management Planning Committee

RGV:rgv
P:\Grading\CountywideOrd\Minutes\April08.wpd