

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting
June 23, 2016
Downers Grove Public Works Facility
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove, Illinois

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gorman called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Gorman, Mr. Civito, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Ruyle, Mr. Scacco, Mr. Schoenberg

Members Absent: Mr. Wicklander

A quorum was established.

Staff Present: Nan Newlon, Director of Public Works
Kerry Behr, Development Engineer

Public Present: Mary Jane & Jim Haley, Mike Ricklefs, John Possidoni, Jim Koziol, John Kahovec, Rich Kulovany; Jim Zajicek; Scott Krafthefer; Greg Nammari; Richard Karuhn; Chris Salman; Richard Kus; Kent Conness

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 12, 2016

Mr. Ruyle moved, seconded by Mr. Scacco to approve the May 12, 2016 minutes as corrected. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Mr. Jim Haley of 4717 Saratoga Avenue explained that the house behind them at 4712 Saratoga is a two-story structure on a 70' lot with an unattached garage. Since the construction of that house, he has experienced water issues on his property. The sump pump at 4712 has a large hose emptying into his yard, and a recent heavy rain resulted in a large amount of water runoff into his yard and family room, which is 3' below ground. The builder told Mr. Haley he should construct a ditch on his side of the property. Mr. Haley believes the builder should do that. He asked the Committee what can be done about the situation.

Ms. Behr replied that she has been to the site and the builder has not increased the amount of impervious area with the new construction. Staff is working with the developer to get the water drained to the front of the construction site. The back yard downspout also impacts the drainage. The high clay content of the soil impacts the drainage as well.

Mr. Haley commented that the developer or landscaper has actually created a little ravine on one side of the 4712 property, and has affected another of their neighbors as well. Staff will look at the plans to determine where the runoff goes for both the new construction and the existing properties.

2. John Kahavec of 406 Lincoln commented that his story isn't much different than other stories the Committee has probably heard. When new construction comes into an area the water runoff negatively affects the existing homes in that area. He believes it is the newer policies instituted by the Village that has put them on this path. Builders come onto a site, dig down nine or ten feet deep removing all the clay, and using that same clay as backfill to top off the property. He would like to see the Village immediately come up with a policy requiring developers to use an appropriate soil mix as backfill in the new homes. Mr. Possidoni has lived in his home for 15 years. His home was built in 1947, and many of the neighborhood homes are of that age. The Village allows the clay to be dug up, left on top and allows the developers to skip on the sod, which is the case in two of the homes near his home. Those homeowners literally have clay for their front and back yards.

Mr. Kahavec said he has attended Village Council meetings to discuss stormwater and instead the Council discusses fees, how they are going to charge them, and how much money they will collect from the mismanagement of stormwater in the Village. He believes this decision has to be made right now instead of discussions about how residents will be charged \$39 a month to manage the problem that the Village created. He said that everything he has read does not address businesses, and looking around the Village he is curious about businesses with massive parking lots, or the car dealerships along Ogden Avenue that have a significant problem right now. He asked what the Village is charging these businesses to help cover the stormwater runoff costs. As a resident he would like to know that the Village has a comprehensive plan all the way around.

It was recommended that Mr. Kahavec speak to someone in the Building Department regarding how issues can be addressed during construction. Mr. Kahavec replied that if he has to talk with all of the staff people in all of the individual departments that might address this issue it would be his full time job. He noted that there are three new houses in his neighborhood, and as a result sump pumps of the older homes are going constantly. He said that this is happening all around the Village. Staff said that is why this Committee is present to meet with property owners who are experiencing these water issues in their back yards or property in general.

Mr. Kahavec said this water issue is affecting the whole area south of Ogden and near Stonewall. He said that the Ford dealership that is moving was required to meet with the residents and they said they would be paving over almost ten acres of property. The Village has come out already to drain water out of that section of land, which is a natural wetland. Part of Ziegler's plan was to do a slow release detention plan for the property. Residents need to know that this is happening before the problem starts, and not wait until it's too late.

Ms. Behr asked Mr. Kahavec to call her because the Ford dealership is required to address all of the issues including stormwater, wetlands, drainage, etc. Mr. Kahavec replied that paving ten acres of property on Ogden Avenue sounds like a pretty serious problem to him.

3. Greg Nammari of 4914 Bryan Place said that on the 14th of the month there was a very big rainfall and the sewer at the bottom of the hill backed up past the sidewalk, and about 90% of his front yard was flooded. They also had an inch of water in their basement. Neighbors said that the water coming down so fast couldn't be handled by the one sewer to bring the water downstream. He said he has lived there a year and a half but the neighbors have lived there 19 years and have told him that flooding and backup problems are getting worse. He also said that they are going to tear down the area across the street from him and build new homes. That is a concern to him and his neighbors. He asked that they find out more information on this. Ms. Newlon suggested he call Public Works to meet with Staff and they can schedule a meeting with him and neighbors.

4. Richard Karuhn of 5134 Lee lives on St Joseph Creek, which he said has turned into St. Joseph River and has ended up in his back yard. They are seeing more and more erosion occurring. In 1962 the Creek was dredged by the County for a 10' wide dredging. The Creek is now 40' wide and in his back yard. It bisects his property. His property has a drop off of six feet to the Creek, and when there's a rain they can visibly see the erosion taking place. Mr. Karuhn said it looks like the Mississippi River during flood stage. He asked whether this Committee addresses the erosion problem. He is familiar with the floodplain map. Chairman Gorman commented that the County has worked recently on the Creek for some erosion control. Mr. Karuhn replied that the program lasted one year and the State pulled the money. He said that he has two lots side by side for 150' width. His major concern is that the Creek is literally changing its position due to erosion upstream and sending silt down. When the water level drains about 12 hours after a major event you can see swales down the Creek. He noted that during the summer the water is stagnant. He said he has photo documentation for the past ten years of erosion, and does not know what to do or who to speak with.

Ms. Newlon responded that last year Staff did a complete survey of St. Joseph's Creek and is working with the County to try and free up some money to continue working on problem areas identified in that section of the Creek. Mr. Karuhn said that the section along Lee Avenue, before Belmont, is the worst that the County inspectors have seen.

Chair Gorman commented that as far as funding for erosion control, they are fortunate to have had some assistance from the Village and County and hope to see that continue. He said it is a costly project involving construction of structures to stabilize the area. It takes time and money. Mr. Karuhn said they had a quote from a contractor for \$10,000 to do 150 feet on one side of the Creek. It is difficult to see thousands of dollars being flushed away with every rainstorm. Ms. Newlon informed Mr. Karuhn that every year in reviewing the Village's budget there is capital budgeting for stormwater projects. She advised him that budget meeting would occur in October.

5. Richard Kus of 1852 Grant Street said their house was built in 1976. He has two lots resulting in a lot width of 250' and a depth of 567'. Water comes down the area in large volumes. He explained that a ditch was placed in front of his house; however, the adjacent lot has a problem caused by the ditch that is eroding and getting close to his gas and electric lines. They will soon be exposed. The other problem is that they have a drain next to their property that is supposed to take the water into a larger pipe. It does not flow into the larger pipe but goes along the driveway, and roadway. It's affecting his neighbors' yard as well. They'd like someone to come out and look at it, especially after a larger rain

Ms. Behr said she would have someone come out and see what is happening there. Chair Gorman asked whether this property is the same wetland they are referring to with regard to the Ogden Avenue issue. Mr. Kus said it was, and they had a contract with a developer to take the back portion of his property. Chair Gorman instructed Mr. Kus to bring that up when staff comes out to investigate the site.

6. Mr. Kahavec spoke again, saying that something needs to be done with all the construction that is creating the problems for current residents. They have to correct the mismanagement of the stormwater in the first place, and he hopes they address that. Chair Gorman replied that when projects are going before the Plan Commission public hearing process and variances are requested, that is the time that the public should bring up these issues.

Mr. Kahavec responded that it would be nice if the Village was level and all houses were at the same level, but his neighbor's property is two feet higher than his. He would hope residents could count on the Village to be involved in the variances and prevent problems for the existing residents. He will attempt to make as many meetings as he can.

7. Jim Zajicek of Clarendon Hills said he is a builder and has a project in Downers Grove. He would rather contribute to a comprehensive stormwater plan as a builder. He worked with seven or eight communities in the western suburbs, and rather than contribute money to a system that doesn't work, he would consider contributing \$10,000 toward a comprehensive stormwater plan. It would address issues better than digging individual holes and filling them up with gravel. He said he would rather see that money given to the Village to improve the existing stormwater system, or a type of "deep tunnel" project. If they are paying for things that don't work it's also frustrating for the builders. He's had frustrating developments in Hinsdale and Western Springs as well as other communities. He'd rather see the money go toward a project that would work on a larger scale than on a smaller scale. If every builder is held to the same standard it creates an equal playing field.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed Amendments to Stormwater & Zoning Regulations

Ms. Newlon provided background information on stormwater in the Village going back to the 1970s. She then summarized the 17-page staff report, which had been distributed to the members of the Committee.

Stormwater runoff generated by new home construction, additions to homes and construction of accessory structures that comply with current Village regulations sometimes negatively impacts some adjacent properties. The negative impacts, primarily standing or ponding water and saturated ground conditions, are generally caused by:

- New impervious area constructed in established neighborhoods that lack adequate stormwater management systems and infrastructure
- Significant grade differences causing increased stormwater runoff from the construction site to adjacent properties
- Sump pumps that serve large, deep basements discharging substantial amounts of water
- Lack of stormwater infiltration into the ground due to high clay content in soils

To address the issue and causes the Village staff has identified the following changes to regulations for review and consideration by the Stormwater and Floodplain Oversight Committee:

Require the following for the construction of all new homes; and additions and accessory structures that result in a net increase of 700 square feet or more of impervious area:

- stormwater detention with an outlet that connects to an established minor drainage system in the right-of-way (storm sewer, ditch, creek, etc.) or other similar approved location
- sump pumps to discharge into a minor drainage system, detention area, rain garden, dry well or cistern
- additional detention capacity to manage sump pump discharge for basements with a depth of greater than nine feet
- foundation and finished grade elevations to be aligned with the properties located on either side of the site
- Repeal the current requirement for the construction of Post Construction Best Management Practices (PCBMP's) for construction resulting in 700 square feet or more of net new impervious area (return to the 2,500 square foot threshold)
- Increase the site runoff storage variance fee and the fee in-lieu-of constructing PCBMP's
- Reduce the minimum drain tile size requirement from six-inch (6") diameter to four-inch (4") diameter
- Increase the minimum required side yard setback in the R-4 zoning district to the greater of six feet (6') or 10% of the lot width
- Include detached garages and front porches in the calculation of building coverage (eliminate the exception for these items currently included in the code)

Ms. Newlon emphasized that there is no silver bullet that will work in every situation. Each of the options presented is intended to reduce the amount of stormwater runoff negatively affecting adjacent properties and to reduce the amount of staff time spent responding to resident calls for service regarding stormwater runoff. She noted that in 2015, the Village adopted a revision to its stormwater ordinance that requires all developments that result in new impervious area of greater than 700 square feet to install Post Construction Best Management Practices (PCBMPs) to mitigate the stormwater impacts of new development on neighboring properties. Examples of

these include dry wells, rain gardens or permeable pavers. These regulations are intended to improve water quality and reduce the amount of runoff flowing onto adjacent properties and entering the public portion of the stormwater management system.

Chair Gorman suggested opening the floor to discussion from the Committee. Ms. Newlon commented that Staff's intention is for people to be satisfied with the Village's response to complaints. Properties that never had water problems in the past are now facing flooding issues. Chair Gorman commented that the Committee would be better spent in looking at the design rather than construction. Sump pumps are an area they hear complaints about constantly. Downers Grove doesn't have any requirements. Residents are complaining that they have more water in their yard since the onset of new construction, and that has to be addressed. Somehow drainage paths are not responding to the conveyance of the water, which has been somehow blocked. The issue appears to be more important than simply grade differences. It is important that there is a path established for the water to travel without negatively impacting existing properties. There was also discussion of the importance of consideration tree preservation and how that impacts the design of a site.

Ms. Behr responded to a question regarding requiring builders to measure the release rate both pre-development and post-development, saying that this is not a requirement now within the Code. Where possible they attempt to determine the discharge rate for the front half of the house draining toward the street, and the back half of the house draining toward the back yard. She said that Staff attempts to match the existing drainage patterns when possible. She noted that some communities do require this; however, she has spent many years doing design and consulting work and has found that modeling isn't always accurate. They can have a situation where the same square footage of impervious area exists, yet there is a change in the amount of flooding to surrounding existing buildings.

As to what the engineer sees in terms of drainage from lot to lot, Ms. Behr said that they look at the front half and the back half and attempt to maintain the existing drainage patterns. She referenced the use of rain gardens in some cases, where the water flow is concentrated because the rain garden has a limited capacity and when it overflows, it may be concentrated to one particular spot. She further responded that the Village attempts to encourage designers to get as much water flow out to the street as possible as a general policy, but it doesn't tell them to tie directly into the storm sewers. She noted that in some cases when they see downspouts going out to the back of a property, they can request that they be buried and redirected out to the front because perhaps the lot grade is not conducive to improving the drainage.

As to what is policy and what is practice, Ms. Behr replied that there is nothing specifically stated in the Code as to directing builders concerning lot drainage. She noted that staff spends a good amount of time on every single-family home, and in some cases, builders complain that staff is spending too much time analyzing them. Ms. Behr said they do spend a fair amount of time because if patterns are changed, residents come back to staff saying that the property did not used to drain that way before construction, and staff wants to try and match patterns as closely as possible.

There was some discussion with the County regarding standard dry well design and whether the size should be increased and placed at a depth below grade. The subject of soil borings was also discussed, noting that soil borings provide only a snapshot of the water level, and often it is not appropriate for design purposes. There is no specific regulation as to the depth of the borings and this could be a matter for future discussion.

It was noted that often a neighbor might see that the house next door to theirs is much higher, and they'll expect to be flooded; however, often because of how the next door house roof is sloped, or the lot grading or location of the downspouts, the water might drain smoothly with no runoff issues. This is not always an intuitive issue.

As to the Village's intent for stormwater control, the intent is not to create a situation whereby the Village can handle the 100-year event. There is a limit as to what people can be charged to create a balanced stormwater system. Unless the Village can afford to create a "high and dry" situation, there will still be wetness depending upon the kind of event that occurs. There are portions of the Village that do not have an infrastructure to handle the type of construction that's occurred over the years. Newer homes possess larger footprints than many of the older homes in the Village.

With regard to how developers removes soil prior to construction, and how that soil is replaced on the property upon completion, it was mentioned by a member of the Committee that removing topsoil and replacing it with clay is not an acceptable practice and should be addressed by the Village in a timely manner. Topsoil should be replaced and sod used to finish off the front and back yards. Preservation of drainage paths should be put on the list of issues. Lack of infiltration doesn't address that.

Resident expressed concern about builders changing grades and not putting back good black dirt. Chair Gorman responded that it's hard to do but we can require at least 6" of topsoil to be put down.

Mr. Scacco asked a general question, why can't we require the discharge from a site after it's built be the same as before it's built and take into account a regional bypass even if the engineering fees double. Aren't they still going to be much less than \$10,000? I don't understand why it can't have the same hydraulic characteristics as before it was built. Staff responded it could be an option that we consider. However, we do have a number of vacant lots, that wouldn't be able to be developed or would need detention to match existing release rates. Chair Gorman said this means that you have retention instead of detention.

Chair Gorman further explained, that's what I was getting at for sizing the sump pump for the depth. There is a requirement that Council passed, increase of 700sf of impervious requires BMPs and having it be part of the approved plans so it's part of the design and a known cost. Staff explained that if we find a sump pump to be active, we require an additional BMP for the discharge. We have them note this on the plans if sump pump is found to be active, an

additional BMP is required. It's sized for 25% of the volume of what would be required for the house. Also have code requirements for nuisance problems caused by sump pumps. Typically 80-100cf of additional storage.

Chair Gorman said this is where I am advising a drywell or chamber as a known and planned cost instead of something unknown. It should be more formulaic. Jim Z, local builder, stated in the real world drywells don't work. The reality is after CO is issued, homeowners pump it into the sanitary. What you are trying to solve with \$10k system ends up taxing the sanitary system.

Chair Gorman stated that for successive rains, they may not work, but what's the better plan? You need volume somewhere. Staff explained this is the problem they are having with drywells, there is no conveyance system to connect to. No storm sewer, no ditches.

Mr. Schoenberg made a follow up to Mr. Scacco's comment. He don't like the flow speed rates, everyone ends up with a big volume of water on their property. Typically to keep that rate, you have a very tiny outlet, a glorified straw. Whatever it is we propose, it has to be effective, it can't be too disruptive, or too costly, or people won't do it, and must be easy to maintain. If you have a big volume of water, tiny outlet, it won't be maintained people and will try and avoid using it. We are talking large areas where a lot is turned over and small amounts of water detention. This would be different if we had porous soils everywhere, but we don't. That's why requiring these features on every single lot, for relative small areas of development, won't meet any of those criteria. I would hesitate to require these and mind you, in other capacities, I do require these in some cases, but only for sump pumps and not for an increase in impervious. Sump pump discharges are different and should be treated differently. Staff Behr explained the concern of residents trying to maintain very small restrictors, the size of a pencil. Leaves, grass clippings, would clog it. Need to keep it clean. Another concern is the lack of a gravity discharge would require a pump with a back up power source, a pump with natural gas back up to make sure it operates.

Chair Gorman thought this is definitely not the first option. In 20 years from now, pumps will burn out. But we've run out of options. I think we are focusing on local impacts, I think we have talked about the larger downstream floodplain issues. Our discussion here is running parallel to the comprehensive plan committee. Staff stated that we should go through the potential revisions to see where staff should focus time.

Option 1: - Single Lot Detention w Conveyance System

Mr. Scacco wanted to know from builders if drywells don't work, what else does work? Jim Z. stated he has put in a large drywell in Hinsdale, first rain the drywell filled up, so Village had us put a connection into the storm sewer. He's unsure what happens downstream, but that new lot is good. Chair Gorman stated option for detention in backyard isn't going to help and would be a long term concern on how Village would maintain these systems and inspect them. Mr. Scacco felt otherwise and would like to have retention considered. Staff explained the size of

detention on a typical R-4 lot would be 1800 cubic feet of storage. A 20'x20'x4.5' vault in the back yard, almost the entire back yard.

Jim Koziol, a local consultant, stated other municipalities use detention, but you have storm sewers to connect to. But in general the BMPs don't work. Builders would rather pay a few dollars and let Village buy or build something. However, these are separate issues. One is detention, and one is for BMPs, which the County treats as two separate issues. Every time I put my stamp on the plans, I know the BMP won't work, but it will get me a permit. This starts with feds, goes to the County, and is passed to Village. It won't take care of your stormwater issues.

Chair Gorman explained the Contech systems, etc. have their place and can be used for detention or, more appropriately, retention. It's a way to get 100% of the effective volume. I think the first priority is to convey the water offsite to a ditch or sewer, then look at a drywell. A BMP has to be handled separately. First I consider, can I get water off to a storm sewer or ditch so it won't cause problems via grading or a pipe sometimes with a back flow preventer, and if that fails, then a drywell kicks in. Drywell is not the best solution, but it helps some. It catches some water. And it does help with nuisance issues when neighbors complain their yard is wet, can't use yard, dog is muddy, it's not flood control. It also acts as a dis-incentive, to building a detached garage, and extending a driveway, or adding a patio. That's why we are looking at open space requirements. You can pave the whole thing. There is nothing in our code except the 700sf to quantify that. That's why a simple ordinance could put some limit on it cumulatively.

Mr. Koziol explained it would be nice if everyone was on a level playing field and just paid the money instead of tweaking numbers to have one site not provide BMPs and the next site needs them. Chair Gorman said I think we will take that comment, if the Village can take money and buy property that's one way to go. It doesn't address issue between neighbors.

Mr. Scacco said this Village has different problems in different areas. I think all of these solutions should be brought to bear. But we have different zones, some places that don't have low lying areas and you can't get the water to the system, and the system is overtaxed. If you can do those things, there is no need for on-site detention for those lots, as a third alternative, retain water on-site, maintain entry and discharge points in existing points, one of those three tactics will get rid of the issues between neighbors. I think all of this becomes extra stuff. Let water that comes into you site still come to your site and maintain the amount of water coming off of your site to existing conditions.

Staff explained the Village is variable and complains vary. For example, recent drainage complaints on new homes found the change in existing and proposed impervious to be all over the place (33% to 36%; 22% to 23%; 30% to 29%; 9% to 14%; 17% to 40%). We can't find consistency, defining zones could be difficult. It looks good on paper and then part way through design we see problems.

Mr. Crilly was concerned about impervious at ground level and if the development calculating amount of dirt and clay below displaced for the basement. Staff explained that is not part of the review.

Chair Gorman stated it sounds like what may work best is a decision matrix. We are not a one size fits all community. Some have ditches, some have sewers, some have a curb inlet, some flows down the street. To help guide the process, it should be understood by both sides equally. Does it have drainage in back yard? Maybe a drywell, or infiltration trench. No other community has this complicated of a system.

Staff said it sound like a combination of the options. Committee has engineering concerns with top of foundation requirements. Mr. Schoenberg stated to throw out the top of foundation option as it only works with uniform sloped land. Allowing neighbors to comment on the design choice of others is a really bad idea. Chair Gorman agreed.

Local code 6" foundation drain may be increasing sump pump drainage.

Staff explained this to be a local amendment. Mr. Schoenberg stated the volume of water is greater from the runoff, but the sump pump runoff can last for days and days. Staff explained the sump pumps are long term nuisance, the rain has stopped, but why is yard wet 7 days later? Chair Gorman thought the size of foundation is immaterial. I wouldn't want to encourage water backing up against a foundation.

Side yard setbacks in R-4.

Staff explained currently it is 5' or 10%, whichever is larger. Proposing 6' or 10%, whichever is greater. This adds more green space, but house will likely just get longer. Chair Gorman stated five feet is small. With a window well you get three feet, side yard swales are calculated well, icy ground, many of our flood problems come from flooding in window wells, lack of fire access between homes. Mr. Schoenberg stated it preserves the overall conveyance that has been missing and we haven't paid enough attention to conveyance. We have identified low spots carefully, and pipes, but not how water gets from low spots out. Identify them, preserve them. But having wider side yards increase the chance to preserve them. Mr. Koziol suggested having the Village prepare a document to coordinate with adjacent neighbor's to install a mutual side yard swale. Chair Gorman thought we could prepare a form stating importance of drainage, but not get involved with negotiating of the work. I hate to put this on the builder, go to each home owner on the side, have a common swale. Suggested a sign off sheet to each neighbor to make a better swale now.

Incentives for garages in rear and front porch.

Staff explained building coverage is calculated based upon house, accessory structures or items 18" in height or greater. However, if you have a detached garage, you can subtract 500sf. It was an incentive item done to reduce the snout houses and give a nicer front look. Front porch, you get a 250sf reduction, again aesthetics. Done as part of building permit process. No maximum lot coverage, but a building coverage. Chair Gorman stated he is less inclined to talk about aesthetics and rather what affects stormwater. I would rather talk about open space

requirements and retention and detention. The way that the Ordinances are addressing some of those things are not adequate. We are very glad to get the 700sf, we wanted 500sf, we are more concerned about volume and rate of runoff instead of front porches. I don't think we should be talking about it. This is building coverage, not lot coverage. Ms. Newlon stated you won't make this decision; it would go to Plan Commission if you thought it should be looked at.

Mr. Scacco: I would like to add a few things. Look into requiring discharge points to match the existing site, both in location and in sheet and concentrated flow, in situations where you can't connect to storm system. Another thing, flow through site should be maintained. You need to pass that flow. I think all of these things tie together.

Staff passed out various handouts that showed lot coverage for all Village property, then it breaks it down for R-1, R-2, etc. It shows how much pavement is down. The second sheet showed impervious for just newer homes that have been closed out since 2013. Shows most of our homes are between 30-50% impervious. New single family homes are where staff is seeing the most amount of complaints.

Ms. Newlon stated Council did approve a variance last month at 174 63rd, stormwater medallions have been placed, and there is one new item. Ms. Behr handed out info for an appeal for a violation we had issued for fill within a FEMA floodplain.

Chair Gorman stated we need to determine schedule of next meeting. Would the 20th of July be possible? Any further public comments:

Kent Conness from 1846 Grant: Stormwater utility tax calculations? I would love to see how this is calculated and thought it could be improved, maybe take a ratio. Chair Gorman stated yes we have a stormwater utility and that was an option looked at. Mr. Conness continued, everything we saw and heard was about residents. Is there a Village Comprehensive plan to deal with water? Chair Gorman stated yes, the Village did a dozen years ago, and then another more recent one done. The WIIP in 2007 and most recent 2014 Stormwater Plan. But what we are talking about tonight is nuisance, those plans are more about flooding of structures. This is really focused on nuisance. Our staff works within the Countywide ordinance. It's more we can give you in one sheet. Start on the website and staff can help you with more.

Ms. Newlon stated that Dan asked about status of referendum questions, first reading on Tuesday, and slated to be voted on next Tuesday at Council. It is about questions regarding how revenue is collected for stormwater.

VI. Staff Report

No staff report

VII. Public Comments

No further Comments

VIII. Old Business

No Old Business

IX. Adjourn

Mr. Schoenberg made a motion, seconded by Mr. Scacco to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.