

Approved January 31, 2003

**PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE**

*Minutes of Public Meeting*

*November 26, 2002*

Village of Downers Grove  
Public Works Facility Main Conference Room  
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove

**ROLL CALL:**

PRESENT: Commissioner Martin Tully, Public Services Committee Chairman  
Commissioner Marilyn Schnell

STAFF: Jack Bajor, Director of Public Works  
Jonathan Hall, Development Engineer  
Alicia Hightower, Stormwater  
Mike Millette, Assistant Director, Engineering  
Megan Dugard, Recording Secretary

*Visitors:* None

**Commissioner Tully** called the Public Services Committee Meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. The minutes for the October 29, 2002 meeting were approved as submitted.

This meeting is devoted to the continued discussion of Preliminary Stormwater budget recommendations.

**Mr. Hall** stated it was discussed in brief at a previous meeting the stormwater needs and proper direction. The focus for this meeting is the specific needs for the Stormwater Department. Additional staffing and funding are needed. He referred to his memo dated November 22, 2002 (Attachment one). Moving onto the permit fee adjustments, he stated there are areas that could absorb fees without causing additional issues and problems for applicants to obtain legal permits. A survey was conducted (Attachment 2) in comparison on fee ranges for surrounding community areas. Construction of a New Residence on a Single Parcel (Attachment 3) actual cost to the Village is \$465 for staff time and services.

**Mr. Bajor** asked if the information provided was for a regular review and not one involving an SMA or special wetland issues.

**Mr. Hall** confirmed this does not encompass an SMA. This is on an average. Some permits may be charged a little less in fees. If there are consultant fees for Special Management Areas (SMA) costs would be much higher, but this is an external cost generally and not the cost to the Village.

**Commissioner Schnell** asked if this was for new construction and not an addition to an existing home.

Approved January 31, 2003

**Mr. Hall** stated this is correct. The fees are for new construction, not additions onto an existing house. As indicated at the top of the page, this does not include run-off storage fees. This will be evaluated separately. Run-off storage fees are based on new impervious areas and areas that do not have stormwater detention. Using this information in comparison is how we came to the figure of increasing our fees to \$450 and will actually allow us to recover our costs.

**Mr. Bajor** asked for a break down of the actual costs for staff's time. It may be helpful to understand the permit review time averages of four hours and describe how the inspections are performed.

**Mr. Hall** agreed and explained the breakdown for review time in-house at four hours includes reviewing the plans and making phone calls for meetings with the applicants. Pre-permit inspections require staff to make a field visit to the site on every permit request filed. This ensures the plans submitted are accurate. Additionally, it gives staff a better picture of what is going on and enables staff to provide a better review. At the conclusion of any single family residential project or larger, there is a final grading survey. The surveyor must return to the site to re-survey critical elevations including the home elevation to confirm that the construction was performed according to the plans. There are various inspections performed such as soil erosion throughout the project and a final grading inspection. Additional grading inspections could be intermittently performed.

**Commissioner Schnell** inquired as to when was the last time fees were changed.

**Mr. Bajor** replied he was uncertain when the last time was that fees were changed.

**Commissioner Schnell** replied it has been quite awhile and that she had no problem increasing the fees.

**Mr. Hall** stated according to documentation found, the fees have been changed in the last few years.

**Mr. Bajor** inquired on the permit review process, if this process encompasses 80% of the reviews that are investigated by staff. There were roughly 370 reviews this year.

**Mr. Hall** replied 25% of the permit applications are for single-family residence. The vast majority of the Village permit applications are for additions and garages. This is another area we can look at for fee increases, but there is not much potential in that area.

**Commissioner Tully** stated according to the comparison chart, Hinsdale is quite high.

**Mr. Hall** replied that the figure needs to be double-checked. Presently we charge around \$125 for those projects. If we add \$100 to this fee, there would be several thousand dollars in additional revenue.

**Commissioner Tully** asked if there was any reason to draw a distinction in terms of the resources that are expended by staff vs. single-family residence projects.

**Mr. Hall** confirms he has put a great deal of thought to this matter, and feels it is more correct in leading to the fact that some large additions and garages could require as much staff time as a

Approved January 31, 2003

new single family residence. Again, there are a lot smaller additions that are very quick to review.

**Commissioner Schnell** asked if there is a way to break the two differences up by stipulating if the addition is 50% the original size of the house, these additional fees would be applied to the permit cost.

**Mr. Hall** replied that currently the break down is at 500 sq. ft. of disturbed area, which reflects a small addition permit cost at \$50, a larger addition permit cost at \$125, and new construction permit cost at \$250. We could look at further alternatives.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated she has a concern about the gap between the costs of \$50 to \$125. Some additions require just as much staff time as the larger new construction projects.

**Commissioner Tully** agrees. It depends on the project.

**Mr. Hall** added if a driveway is being enlarged for constructing a garage, this project could create problems worse than constructing a new residence.

**Commissioner Tully** asked if there is any reason not to look at increasing the permit cost on additions as well.

**Mr. Hall** replied he would like to review the cost of permits for additions as well.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated patios and sheds are the most common permit requests. However, a three-car garage with a concrete driveway could create or have stormwater potential.

**Mr. Hall** agreed.

**Commissioner Tully** added more fundamentally these permits require just as much staff resources as single-family new construction.

**Mr. Hall** stated prior to formalizing a proposal for an ordinance change, he would complete further research in this area.

**Commissioner Schnell** added it is necessary to secure the total average amount of staff time for garages vs. new construction. The philosophy of Council has always been to cover the cost incurred by staff.

**Mr. Hall** agrees. He asked if there were any further questions regarding single parcel residential inspection fees.

**Commissioner Tully** added in recent months the sentiment of both residents and developers is that they would be willing to pay a little more for the inspection permit fee, if they could get the permits sooner. We know these two issues go somewhat hand-in-hand since fees generate revenue if not directly, indirectly. Would it be legitimate to say part of the benefit of the higher fees would be the ability to process requests for permits in less time?

**Mr. Hall** replied it could be possible if we are directly tying additional staff or resources to this increase.

Approved January 31, 2003

**Commissioner Tully** asked if this were a fair statement to make that the permit cost would be more expensive but the time it will take to issue permits and inspections will be reduced.

**Mr. Hall** agreed it would be a key part of the overall process. One of several steps we need to take is to reduce the time of the permit approval process at a more reasonable level.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated it would help even if the permit approval time were brought down to where they were previously, before we were put on probation.

**Mr. Hall** added we have come a long way from where we were during the summer. We are certainly doing a much more thorough job on the permit reviews and inspections.

**Commissioner Tully** agreed. Much more important than the timeliness is the accuracy.

**Commissioner Schnell** added, there has to be an in between. The permits must be completed properly and on time for the public to accept the increase in fees. If we can express the fact to the residents that adding an engineer would increase the cost of permits, but will allow the permit request to be approved within the 2 to 3 week turn around, most people would be willing to pay the additional fees for this service.

**Mr. Hall** stated the second table on Attachment 3, which has not yet been discussed, is the Review by Outside Consultants. We have utilized C.M. Lavoie (CML) quite extensively in the last couple months to perform reviews. This has helped a lot in getting the permit review times down on complex projects. We could do a bit better in-house than externally. CML helped to bring us down to a better review time. He believes CML review time averages three weeks. The builders are paying more for the outside consultant permit review. The difference in cost is \$250 by village staff vs. \$690 for review by the consultant.

**Commissioner Schnell** asked if additional staff is available, would the outside consultant continue to be required.

**Mr. Hall** replied for the majority of the projects, there would always be a few permits that will have particular floodplain and wetland issues but not nearly as many as CML is presently reviewing.

**Commissioner Tully** added in those situations we are required by the County to utilize outside expertise.

**Mr. Hall** agreed.

**Mr. Bajor** added as background information, there are two separate contracts with CML consulting and they both are \$7000 each at the approval of the Village Manager, Rick Ginex, which has helped us immensely. CML costs are at a rate of \$65 per hour since they were anxious to help the village Stormwater Department. Even though we have an outside consultant there is internal staff time involved. Our stormwater staff must review the consultant work, make sure the documentation is in order, forward to CML for review and work with the applicant.

**Commissioner Schnell** asked if that is why staff recommended to keep the fee at \$250 for in-house reviews.

**Mr. Hall** stated he feels after completing estimates it appears to be an appropriate fee for single-family residential projects. Inspections are a significant part of the process.

**Mr. Bajor** added this process has worked out well. It may appear the permit review process is taking more time, but they are being completed more accurately.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated this was one of the county requirements. We are doing what is needed as instructed by county. It is just costing us more time and money.

**Mr. Hall** continued another area we feel which could be revised is the Sump Pump tie-in fee. It seems minor. We have been charging a \$15 fee. However, it could cost the village as much as \$200 to tie a sump pump into our stormwater sewer system. Presently we have about 7-12 requests per year to tie in a sump pump.

**Commissioner Tully** stated he had a quick question on item #2 pg. 3 of 5 (Attachment #1). The in-house fee of \$250 would remain where outside expertise is required for a single-family residence. Is this \$250 fee regardless of the cost of the outside consultant fee or in addition to the outside consultant fee?

**Mr. Hall** replied if the review were to be completed in-house the fee would be \$250. If there is an outside consultant required it would be plus the outside consultant fee.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated the fee recommendation is \$450 unless the consultant has reviewed the permit in which case the fee would be \$250 plus consultant cost.

**Commissioner Tully** stated he understands. The single-family residential project requires an outside consultant fee. They pay the village \$250 plus consultant fees at X amount of dollars if they are in agreement. The point where there is a break in fees is if the permit is reviewed in-house then the cost would be \$450.

**Mr. Hall** confirmed this to be correct providing there is no SMA involved.

**Commissioner Tully** stated if there is an SMA, developers will pay \$450 plus out of pocket costs for the review by the outside consultant. Is this correct?

**Mr. Hall** stated the chart does not include permits containing SMA issues.

**Commissioner Tully** stated item #1 is for a single-family residence, regardless if it is an individual developer, there is no SMA involved, the permit cost is \$450. Item #2 refers to the review performed by an outside consultant. In the future this may mean there is an SMA impact and the permit cost is \$250.

**Mr. Hall** added this is very interesting. There is another \$250 fee for SMA permit requests separate from this discussion. The permit review cost would be up to \$450. This makes a good point.

**Commissioner Tully** stated the reason he asked, is the cost for an outside consultant typically will cost more and if an SMA is involved.

Approved January 31, 2003

**Mr. Hall** added we are reflecting there is a difference for internal review time.

**Commissioner Tully** stated developers would not get a break. They will pay \$450 plus the outside consultant fees.

**Mr. Hall** stated he did not break the cost down between developers or individual residents.

**Commissioner Tully** stated then it would be equally applicable to both developers and residents.

**Mr. Hall** stated the recommendation was based on single-family single lot construction. There is a totally separate fee structure for commercial and subdivisions based on the percentage of the stormwater costs.

**Commissioner Schnell** added going back, the manner in which this was written, simply is for applying for a permit to build a house. If there is SMA involvement, additional fees are incurred. Now it is understood, \$250 plus consultant fees plus SMA involvement.

**Mr. Hall** responded currently for SMA involvement the fees would be \$250 plus the consultant fees plus \$200 to cover additional staff time. This would not change. The outside consultant is not reading just the SMA portion. They should be reviewing the entire stormwater plan for the whole site.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated then the cost could be \$450 plus consultant fees when SMA is involved.

**Mr. Hall** replied if we were to perform an SMA internal review, which would be rare, the fee would be \$450, right now before we adjust fees.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated in actuality what is being said, if this goes through, \$250 plus consultant fees, plus \$200 if an SMA is involved. If there no SMA issues involved the cost would be \$250 plus consultant fees. If no outside consultant used, the permit cost for in-house review would be \$450.

**Mr. Hall** stated this is correct. It is quite ironic how the figures total.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated there are three different versions. When presented to Council, it must be clear.

**Mr. Bajor** stated another area reviewed were driveway inspection fees at \$15. Bob Schiller shared that it is more in the area of \$50 staff time alone, at an hourly rate, for the inspector to grab a vehicle, drive to the project site to perform a field inspection and return to the office. There is a lot of ground to cover outside of stormwater fees.

**Mr. Hall** stated the sump pump is just an example of where some fees have not been updated. It is uncertain if the issue of covering costs was properly reviewed.

**Commissioner Tully** stated one thing generally on the topic of covering costs; speak more in terms of fees that are more commensurate with the resources that are being expended. We do not want a confrontation with our developers on costs.

Approved January 31, 2003

**Commissioner Schnell** explained the area of concern is covering man-hours.

**Mr. Hall** continued to explain another item reviewed for consideration of adjusting costs is the Runoff Storage fee. This fee is assessed for any new development that is not covered by stormwater detention. To date, the assessed fee is \$0.134 per square foot. If there is a new home constructed which never had detention, like the area of St. Joseph Creek Watershed, and a major portion of town, we assess this fee in addition to previously mentioned fees. The idea is, there is no detention and construction is creating runoff from the property, which could create problems for someone else downstream. This money charged is put aside for future stormwater detention projects community wide, or storm sewer projects, potentially even stream bank stabilization.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated this fee would be saved by the Watershed account.

**Mr. Hall** confirmed this is something already available and has been broken down. He is uncertain how far back the accounts go but it has been a few years. They are broken into six separate accounts by Watershed. Three accounts can be used on a regular basis.

**Mr. Bajor** stated last year the Watershed funds were used. There is \$500,000 available to help balance the budget in paying for the Cornell Avenue Storm Sewer Improvements. These funds would be better used for discrete watershed projects such as embankment stabilization, working with homeowner associations, Prentiss Creek, on Venard, or to help residents such as Mr. Savino. A lot of people ask for our expertise when we meet with the homeowners. These funds could be used appropriately by staff with Council approval to benefit situations, which evolve during the course of construction season.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated this would make sense. This is done with sidewalk projects. There are the quadrants and money that people put in towards constructing a sidewalk in a specific area.

**Mr. Bajor** explained his point is to preserve funds for special projects that cannot be anticipated.

**Commissioner Tully** asked how the runoff storage fee is distinct from the stormwater utility fee. They are both basically based on square footage of construction in an impervious area. Assuming the stormwater is adopted and in place. All property owners are paying a fee based on runoff. How is the runoff storage fee distinct from that if at all?

**Mr. Hall** replied he views the runoff storage fee as a development fee. It only occurs when a development permit occurs. The utility fee is an ongoing issue to cover operations and maintenance. This should be directed to CIP projects.

**Commissioner Tully** stated he understood.

**Mr. Hall** added as a note to this, material he has read on other communities who instituted a stormwater utility fee, give a discount on their ongoing perpetual fees to developments that have detention. They are having less impact on downstream areas because of less discharge.

**Mr. Bajor** inquired on areas that are unincorporated within the corporate area of our village, how would this be covered in terms of the stormwater utility.

Approved January 31, 2003

**Mr. Hall** replied he currently is not aware of having any authority over those areas, which is unfortunate.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated these areas would have to go through the county.

**Mr. Bajor** stated he would think there is a substantial amount of potential runoff.

**Commissioner Tully** stated this issue would create a debate of who should create the utility and who should run it. He understands this is a fee that is paid for detention as part of the development.

**Mr. Hall** stated this is correct. This fee is currently is based on, per our code, \$25,000 per acre. The county stated most of Downers Grove falls in the east branch of the DuPage River Watershed. They estimate for developing detention in the area \$106,000 per acre. There is a major discrepancy, which has not been addressed. This issue discussed by the Stormwater Committee some time ago and is documented in the meeting minutes. It is not certain if a recommendation was made to council. Something needs to be done to adjust this, but we cannot just quadruple the cost causing a shock to the developers. Here is where it has remained.

**Commissioner Schnell** asked if this fee is being paid in other communities.

**Mr. Hall** stated it is fairly unique. He has not heard of any other communities imposing this fee. In speaking with other communities, they are considering charging this fee. It is his feeling that it is not fair if there are a lot of homes being constructed in the older section of town creating more runoff, we can't force detention on site. If we allow these developments to occur it seems right that we have enough money to do something to correct a problem for someone down the hill. What we have been collecting is not enough. Do we phase in the cost or go for the whole amount up front is what we need to consider.

**Commissioner Schnell** asked to review future staffing and support needs. In lieu of reading the documentation, appears it will take two years to get utility in place. Your needs really can't wait two years. The question she has is what is the outlook or proposal as far as trying to secure at least one additional engineer in this year budget plan.

**Mr. Bajor** confirmed it is his hope to utilize the fee increases to support an additional staff member. He and Jon have spent time looking at this issue. Ultimately it is desired to put together a true responsive stormwater division. Stormwater is probably one of the more disciplined responsibilities of any Public Works department. Jon and he pulled some figures to work them into budget a little at time. Perhaps we could hire additional personnel 3 or 4 months down the road. As the revenue starts coming in at the end of the year, build onto it. One problem we have is, even with the Administrative Technicians on staff, we need one person solely dedicated to stormwater filing, phone calls and keeping the business flowing smoothly, allowing the technical engineers to spend their time on reviews and elements of the maintenance of the ordinance. We are working on a plan to essentially ramp this up as a function in time and not hire three new people at one time.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated the intention is to take these recommendations and put them into a plan for a year or two down the road. These two or three people would be phased-in over 1 ½ to 2 years. When we review the budget this coming March we will see the plan showing costs and revenue anticipated.

**Mr. Bajor** stated he would like the opportunity at the next upcoming Public Services Meeting to share at that time.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated additional personnel were not fully discussed in the past. This is a step towards that. When the whole council views it in the budget context, we want to make sure it is easier to absorb when in actuality it could cost us much more in the long run.

**Mr. Bajor** stated it is his desire to subsidize the operation and then come together with a real structured procedure and plan, which is being perfected.

**Mr. Hall** stated the utilization of outside consultants more often and the pass through ordinance was a key in allowing us a little more flexibility in phasing in additional personnel.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated she understands. It is nice to see the overall plan, costs and what we can do to soften the blow to the lowest cost in the budget.

**Mr. Bajor** stated he called the County Staff at DuPage County of Environmental Concerns last week and received a call from Bruce Mackie this morning. They are totally behind us on our removal from probation and in making a recommendation that we are full waiver status based on everything that has been completed this year.

**Mr. Hall** stated this is moving us in a positive direction.

**Commissioner Tully** asked if we are moving towards stormwater utilities. It is a fee not a tax.

**Mr. Hall** stated he would remove the word "tax". Among reports seen, there are not a lot of ideas considered, including a separate line item on the tax. The only reason it is there is because it is tax deductible. The "fee" breakout is a better idea.

Stormwater Utility is a long-term solution as discussed at previous meetings. There are growing demands on the Stormwater Program from environmental concepts such as NPDES. There are ongoing maintenance needs that are easy to neglect if they are not seen. Items are listed in Attachment #1 on page 3 of 5. Some of the goals of Stormwater are to have a steady funding source and obtain adequate funding for what ever needs arise providing a consistent level of service. Some specifics, recommended to be part of the rate structure overall, such as evaluations/calculations based on the impervious surface on a lot which is directly tied to how much stormwater runoff there would be; however to ease the management an average would be assigned to all family residential parcels or minor adjustments based on the overall acreage property. There are many different ways to calculate these fees.

**Commissioner Tully** stated he is interested to know what the administrative burdens are to having different categories based on square footage in impervious areas for calculation on single-family residential fees. Clearly having an average fee assessed against all single family residence is the easiest to administer, since there is a diverse range, impervious area, types of construction, lot sizes, etc. But it would make sense to investigate what the administrative burden would be in having three categories.

**Commissioner Schnell** one of the communities does have it broken down by square footage lot size. What concerns her is there can be an R1 Zone and have 4000-5000 square foot house on an

Approved January 31, 2003

acre lot where there can be a lot of places to have runoff. An R4 Zone, where a lot is 50' wide and 1600 square foot house where it is taking up a lot more lot. There is no place for runoff. Is there a way to take into account a larger lot than a smaller lot? There are a lot of areas where the water is going into the ground compared to areas where the water is running off.

**Commissioner Tully** stated this goes back to the question of in the most equitable sense; the fairest way to assess is based on how much you contribute to the system. The fee paid is based upon the amount of runoff created. What would the administrative burden be to administrate and try to make as equitable a process as possible taking into account not only square footage but impermeable an area.

**Mr. Hall** stated the overall density of a lot is very important. He will look into this and contact other communities who have imposed the fees.

**Mr. Bajor** asked to quickly introduce Ms. Alicia Hightower before she has to leave this evening.

**Ms. Hightower** briefly introduced herself and provided a little background information. She is very happy to be with the Village of Downers Grove.

**Commissioner Tully** thank Alicia. The discussion continued. When we are at the point and process to determine the structure, we need to provide the pros and cons. We need to make it uniform.

**Mr. Hall** agreed and stated it must be focused on Stormwater and the impacts.

**Commissioner Tully** stated it should be solely based on how much runoff is contributed to the system. How you calculate this could be complicated or simple.

**Mr. Hall** agrees and stated this is why some communities try to take the simple approach. He continued with the explanation of Recommended Key Elements and Anticipated Steps to Implement on page 4 of 5 (Attachment #1)

This one area he did not get an opportunity to emphasize. Many other communities have consulted with outside resources. We value how much we accomplish in-house. We need a lot of support from other departments such as the Finance Department and the Legal Department.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated in reading the information many consultants help with the mechanics of setting up the utility. We are in the preliminary stages.

**Mr. Hall** added in one statement it suggested the consultants were used to help determine an equitable rate structure.

**Commissioner Tully** interjected there are consultants who will help on a whole range, whole process or any portion.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated educating the people who have voiced their concerns is a large process. Providing an explanation for the use of the monies collected and that this is just not another fee. We need to let them know actually where the monies will be applied.

Approved January 31, 2003

**Mr. Millette** asked to make a brief statement. Previously he was sent to a seminar discussing this very topic. This is a two-tier system such as surface or subsurface pipe, which has to be maintained. A head tax could be developed such as \$1 per month per household to utilize as the maintenance fee. Above this would be the watershed basis, percentage of impervious basis, then the impact fee, and generators along those lines.

**Mr. Hall** stated public knowledge is important.

**Commissioner Tully** questioned points 1 & 2 under Anticipated Steps to Implement. Is there a plan available?

**Mr. Hall** stated any feedback or discussion would be appreciated. No plan is available at this time.

**Commissioner Tully** replied this is fine. It is understood these are the steps to be followed. The question is how do we go about it, how do you do it, when, who should be on this panel, etc. The other items are pretty much mechanical in terms of legal approval and certain statutory requirements and basic focus.

**Mr. Hall** stated one issue that comes to mind is public involvement. Are we referring to staff decisions or citizens on a committee?

**Commissioner Schnell** stated there could be an adhoc committee who could come up with a plan in six months focusing on both items.

**Mr. Bajor** stated this would be very helpful.

**Mr. Hall** stated he would see a committee composed of staff and non-staff.

**Commissioner Tully** stated he did not believe such a committee could tackle these two specific items. One issue is guarantee of public acceptance and awareness. It would have to be very exact, such as who is on the committee; what the committee is supposed to accomplish; by when and be very well defined in advance. It can be done if it is well planned.

**Mr. Hall** stated this is his concern. Distributing a survey would be a good start.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated if a path finding group was started to address these specific items, during the six-month period, newspapers would be following this process and residents would have access to the information. We would be moving from point to point. We would be moving forward.

**Commissioner Tully** stated staff and council would take the lead and conduct a number of direct and focused meetings with residents. Should there be a motion to recommend to Council that the Council as a whole explore or develop the possibility of having a Stormwater Committee.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated we could provide options. Explore is the underlined word. Some things in reading were not appropriate. By exploring and educating not only the public, but also ourselves will help us to crystallize as to whether or not this is something we want in the community. Explore is a good word. Case studies provided were great but she is still not convinced this is the best thing for the community and not convinced that it isn't a good thing for

Approved January 31, 2003

the community. She is just uncertain right now. Maybe give the council an idea. Maybe there could be a meeting on the fifth Tuesday of the month and get more ground moving forward.

**Commissioner Tully** stated we would simply point out to Council that this has been discussed and staff has recommended that in the Stormwater Area there be additional staffing. This will all be dealt with during the budget process. This committee is recommending that the Council consider adjusting stormwater review and inspection fees so they are 1) more inline with other communities and 2) more commensurate with the resources expended by staff in accomplishing these goals.

The other recommendation to Council is to explore the possible implementation of a Stormwater Utilities as soon as possible. Mentioning the two issues discussed. One way is to have an adhoc committee look at this and another way is to have Council and staff, direct a series of public meetings, which will allow for public input.

**Commissioner Schnell** stated that we workshop the items soon.

**Commissioner Tully** asked for public comments. No members of the public were present.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.