

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
August 19, 2010

The DeKalb County Stormwater Management Planning Committee (SMPC) met on August 19, 2010 at 3:00 p.m. in the DeKalb County Administrative Building, Conference Room East, in Sycamore, Illinois. In attendance were Committee members Ken Andersen, Norm Beeh, Tom Thomas, Roger Steimel, Joe Misurelli, Bill Nicklas, Donna Prain, Pat Vary, and Paul Miller. Also in attendance was County Assistant Planner Rebecca Von Drasek.

1. **Roll Call** -- *Mr. Miller noted Bill Lorence, Joel Maurer, and Mark Biernacki were absent.*
2. **Approval of Agenda** -- *Mr. Misurelli moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Steimel, and the motion carried unanimously.*
3. **Approval of Minutes** -- *Mr. Nicklas moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Andersen, and the motion carried unanimously.*
4. **Draft Phase 2 Stormwater Management Plan** -- A brief discussion was held regarding the proposed changes to the DeKalb County Stormwater Management Plan. Mr. Miller noted that these proposed amendments, intended to represent Phase 2 of the Plan, had previously been presented to and discussed by the Committee. He stated that he thought the Plan was ready to be forwarded to the County Board for adoption.

Mr. Nicklas moved to approve the draft Phase 2 Stormwater Management Plan and forward it to the County Board for review and adoption, seconded by Mr. Andersen, and the motion carried unanimously.

Pat Vary arrived at 3:05 pm

5. **Draft Phase 2 Stormwater Management Ordinance** -- Mr. Miller explained that he had drafted revisions to the Ordinance, based on discussions held previously by the Committee, for review and approval. He asked for any questions and final suggested changes to the Ordinance.

Ms. Vary asked questions regarding definitions of the terms, “pre-development condition”, “Flood Fringe”, and “Wet Detention Basin”. Ms. Prain responded that the pre-development condition was the property status prior to the a grading or development project commencing. Mr. Miller noted that FEMA actually creates regulatory language regarding floodplain, flood fringe, and floodway. Mr. Beeh noted that the wet detention is slightly different that a retention pond.

Ms. Vary noted a spelling error on page 11 of the word “structures”.

The Committee asked that the header be removed from the document.

Mr. Andersen raised concerns that there were two different standards requiring a Site Development Permit for a project that effects 10, 000 sq. ft., and a project disturbing one acre or more. Mr. Miller responded that agricultural projects, which were previously exempt, would be held to the one acre (or 250 feet or less from a municipal boundary or occupied residential property) standards, however residential or commercial were held to the 10,000 sq. ft. standard.

Mr. Steimel expressed concern that many projects would fall into the 250 foot buffer area. Mr. Thomas noted that agricultural buildings, even though disturbing less than an acre, can cause flooding and water issues. He argued that this restriction would aid municipalities from preventing this type of problems near municipal boundaries. Mr. Miller also emphasized that the Stormwater Ordinance allows waiver of the Site Development Permit requirements. Applicants can request waiver where the project will not have negative impacts for adjoining properties. If the Planning Director and County Engineer concur, costs and requirements for Site Development Permits can be substantially reduced for a given agricultural project.

Ms. Vary suggested that the Ordinance language reference the County web site so that individuals were aware of all of the tools on the County web site. Mr. Miller agreed to include the web site URL on the Site Development Permit application rather than in the Ordinance itself.

Mr. Thomas agreed that the County information was a good resource but he noted that the without cross sections some aspects of projects were still not addressed even with a Site Development Permit.

Mr. Nicklas noted that for clarification purposes he thought section 7.2.(c) should be re-drafted to place agricultural projects which require a Site Development Permit (those affecting more than one acre or within 250 feet of a municipality or residence) in the section that lists when Permits are required. Mr. Miller agreed that this would be easier to understand.

Ms. Prain noted a word change on page 16 in Section 7.10 from “applicants” to “applications”.

The Committee briefly discussed the reduction of the financial guarantee to 10% of the value to be held by the County for a year after that the final grading is inspected and approved. It was agreed that the County should hold the 10% of the amount to guarantee continued maintenance and upkeep of the stormwater facilities for a period of two years following approval of the construction by the County Engineer.

Mr. Beeh suggested that “or alter a facility’s function” be added to Section 7.15 to make it a violation to alter existing stormwater features after installed and approved on a property.

Ms. Prain asked that “habitat” be added to Section 10.5 (a).

Mr. Andersen noted that he would like staff to confirm that the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) requires the same number of days as the Ordinance on page 26 Section 10.13 (d). He also suggested that all of the standards be as consistent as possible with related regulations

when applicable. Staff agreed to consult with the County Engineer in reviewing the SWPPP requirements.

Ms. Prain asked that language be added to page 24 Section 10.8.(a) requiring a professional to determine wetland quality.

The Committee discussed the acceptance by the municipalities to enforce these revised Stormwater regulations. Mr. Nicklas suggested that the engineers from each municipality be invited to the next meeting to discuss the revisions adopted.

Ms. Prain pointed out that a watershed-approach to stormwater management is encouraged by the second phase of the Stormwater Management Plan, and that although the revisions to the Ordinance being discussed were important, they do not meet this objective. Mr. Nicklas agreed and offered that the focus could now shift to figure out ways to apply a watershed approach. Mr. Miller also agreed with Ms. Prain and noted that there was a significant amount of work still to be completed, including identifying the most flood prone areas, prioritizing projects, and determining solutions. Mr. Miller noted that the Committee is required to meet quarterly and can move toward creating regulations which would take into account watersheds when grading and stormwater management projects are proposed.

Mr. Nicklas moved to approve and forward to the County Board for adoptions the Stormwater Management Ordinance as amended, seconded by Ms. Vary, and the motion carried unanimously.

6. Next Meeting:

After a brief discussion the Committee decided to meet November 4, 2010 at 3pm in the Conference Room East.

7. Adjournment -- *Ms. Vary 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