

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**August 14, 2008**

The DeKalb County Stormwater Management Planning Committee (SMPC) met on August 14, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. in the DeKalb County Administrative Building, Conference Room East, in Sycamore, Illinois. In attendance were Committee members Bill Nicklas, Roger Steimel, Don Pardridge, Joe Misurelli, Ken Andersen, Tom Thomas, Bill Lorence, and Paul Miller. Also present was Assistant Planner Rebecca Von Drasek.

1. **Roll Call** -- *Mr. Miller noted Donna Prain, Joel Maurer, Pat Vary, and Mark Biernacki were absent.*
2. **Approval of Agenda** – *Mr. Lorence moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Nicklas, and the motion carried unanimously.*
3. **Approval of Minutes** – *Mr. Steimel moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Thomas, and the motion carried unanimously.*
4. **Stormwater Management Plan Advocacy Group**

Mr. Miller opened the meeting by asking the Committee members if they had identified individuals whom would be willing to advocate for funding efforts related to stormwater and groundwater management projects.

Mr. Misurelli stated that he considered asking Gordon Jones from the Genoa Area Plan Commission.

Mr. Nicklas stated that he had contacted various individuals in Sycamore and that they specifically requested information on whom else, including representatives of farm families, would also be supporting the initiative. He noted that they were reluctant to pursue a referendum without support from property owners in the rural areas.

Mr. Anderson asked if the issue could be raised at communities' council meetings. Mr. Miller agreed that this would be a good idea.

Mr. Miller then asked if any other members had names to provide. Hearing none, he indicated that Committee member Donna Prain had sent him an e-mail in which she indicated she had no candidates for such an advocacy group. She also indicated that she did not feel there was enough justification for a referendum to fund a stormwater study. Additionally, Ms. Prain's e-mail noted that discussion has been held about the costs of producing two-foot contour interval maps for the whole County, and asked what would be done with such maps? Mr. Miller asked the Committee to consider what could be done without better contour maps?

Mr. Nicklas stated that he disagreed with Ms. Prain and suggested that the Committee should better define and quantify the need for better topographical information so that Committee

members and eventually the public will be willing to fund such mapping as part of a water initiative. Mr. Nicklas opined that the Committee was going around in circles without making any significant progress mitigating stormwater issues.

Mr. Steimel asked if the two-foot contour maps would allow for protection of depressional storage areas. Mr. Miller and Mr. Lorence agreed that the maps were essential to enforcing depressional storage protections because it would allow such areas to be identified.

Mr. Steimel noted that things were tight monetarily due to the economy and that he felt that given the amount time remaining passing a referendum in April may not be possible.

Mr. Nicklas agreed, due in part that the question would need to be on the ballot by January.

Mr. Miller then suggested that the Committee pass a motion supporting the creation of the contour maps through the USGS cost share program, which is a 80/20 match where the local jurisdiction bears 80% of the cost, and send that recommendation to the County Board. He stated that it is not necessarily the Committee's responsibility to come up with the funding mechanism, including whether it should be a referendum item or not. He argued though that the Committee is charged with determining activities that are necessary to better manage stormwater issues. Mr. Miller emphasized that the two-foot contour maps were integral to future abatement projects and he volunteered to also confirm the amounts of the USGS program as one option. He also mentioned that if the County were to order these maps they would expect to receive this information as a digital product that could be integrated into the County's GIS.

Mr. Thomas thought the information from the contour maps would be very useful to verify information from other sources which do not cover the entire County.

*Mr. Lorence then made the motion to recommend to the County Board that it procure two-foot contour maps for the entirety of DeKalb County. Mr. Anderson seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.*

Mr. Lorence extolled the benefits of better contour maps, which he argued would allow County staff to make determinations regarding watershed, depressional storage areas, and could be integrated into the County's GIS system.

Mr. Miller noted that the recent FEMA revisions of the floodplain maps were due to be adopted by the County prior to January 2, 2009. He also informed the Committee that the KREPS data can be included with the County's GIS system, and that he would try to report on the integration of the KREP data at the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Lorence noted that with two-foot contour maps the County would be able to correct FEMA information, which would most likely expand the floodplain areas and better protect property.

Mr. Pardridge reiterated that a referendum would have a better chance at a later time.

Mr. Thomas also agreed that the state of the economy is not very good for attempting to pass a referendum.

## **5. Regulation of Depressional Storage Areas**

Mr. Miller noted the existing definition of “depressional storage” as set forth in the County Stormwater Management Ordinance is: *A non-riverine depression where stormwater collects. The depressional storage volume is the volume contained in a depression below the high water level of the critical duration 100-year flood through the site in the pre-developed condition.*

Mr. Lorence then stated that this refers to areas that are not in proximity to a body of water, yet standing water can be found following a 100-year storm event. He also explained that when new developments occur in the County they are required to retain the amount of depressional storage already on the property, as well as account for the water displaced by the new development.

Mr. Miller asked if the current definition is adequate, and Mr. Lorence noted that it was a nationally accepted definition. Mr. Miller then emphasized that the protection and enforcement of depressional storage would be benefitted with the two-foot contour maps.

Mr. Lorence then noted that the conversation about wetlands on farms would definitely be better informed with the contour maps but also requires changes in the regulation.

Mr. Miller agreed that farms are exempt from many standards, and that the language in the current Stormwater Management Plan indicates that Phase II of the Plan should consider addressing stormwater management for farm structures and activities.

Mr. Steimel asserted that the farms currently need to abide with stormwater regulations for any new building to maintain their federal subsidies. He noted that Mike Richolson with the Natural Resources Conservation Service works with farmers on large grading projects that use Federal funds.

Mr. Miller suggested that the possible regulation of agricultural buildings could be on the agenda of the next meeting, and he would ask Mr. Richolson to attend. He stated that the current stormwater management regulations recognize the role of the NRCS and defer County oversight to that agency when it is involved in a grading project for a farm. Mr. Miller also offered to craft model regulations that could be added to the Stormwater Management Regulations for new agricultural buildings that do not utilize federal assistance to assure that such structures have adequate stormwater management facilities. He opined that in many cases, an engineer may be able to demonstrate that any new run-off from the impervious surfaces associated with new farm structures may be absorbed by the surrounding farm fields. However, there may be cases where detention is needed to avoid causing stormwater problems for adjacent properties and rights-of-way.

Mr. Steimel stated that he is not for more regulations but that he had witnessed an increase in the size of Ag-buildings and proximity to a neighboring lot may cause adverse flooding conditions.

Mr. Miller then noted the article submitted to the Committee by Pat Vary, and he agreed with many of the articles assertions. He also informed the Committee of his planned attendance at a stormwater management conference in Bloomington on September 23, 2008.

**6. Next Meeting:**

Following a brief discussion, the Committee agreed to meet at the end of September. *However, due to conflicts with several Committee members, staff is investigating rescheduling the meeting to October 2 or 16, 2008 at 3:00 pm, in the East Conference Room of the DeKalb County Administration Building in Sycamore, IL.*

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

Respectfully submitted,

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