

Approved May 27, 2003

PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Public Meeting

January 31, 2003

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
Mike Millette, Assistant Director, Engineering
Megan Dugard, Recording Secretary

Visitors: Charles Johnson
Dave Tatterson
Bill Bollenberg
William Waldack
Marilynn Gerloff
Wally Brown
William Dinchak
David Talbott
Don Eckmann
Christine Fregeau
Chester Kochan
Kurt Greisham

Commissioner Tully called the Public Services Committee Meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. The minutes for the November 26, 2002 meeting were approved as submitted.

The item of business on our active agenda is the discussion of a potential Stormwater Utility program (SWU). The protocol for our meeting is for staff to give their presentation and then the committee has an opportunity for discussion and questions. Afterwards we will, if there is an opportunity, take questions from the public. Since there are a number of different components of tonight's discussion on potential Stormwater Utility, we will stop along the way for questions. Part of the reason we chose 5:00 p.m. separate from our normal Tuesday meetings is this way we are not running to a Village Council meeting at 6:30 p.m. and we have a bit more flexibility towards the end. Our goal is to have the meeting end after 1 ½ hours, 2 hours maximum. The discussion will now be turned over to Mr. Hall for staff presentation.

Mr. Hall explained this evening we will present our first discussion focusing on Stormwater Utility. We will be covering a very broad topic. He provided a power point presentation (Attachment 1) starting with pictures from flood areas. The presentation also broke down areas

Approved May 27, 2003

of existing Stormwater programs, present and future needs, benefits, implementation steps and possible utilization of outside expertise.

Commissioner Tully stated before the committee presents their questions, the purpose of this exercise is, over a series of meetings, to essentially determine what a Stormwater utility might look like in one or more forms in the Village of Downers Grove. Then a recommendation would be made to Village Council for further action. Unless the council knows exactly what it is that a Stormwater Utility Program might look like, how it would work and how much it would cost, what it would raise in terms of revenues and what goals would be accomplished, it is very difficult to determine whether such a program is a good idea. We are building a prototype, in the virtual sense in order to present one or more options to the Village Council.

Commissioner Schnell asked for clarification, characterizing our present Stormwater program is it proactive or reactive.

Mr. Hall replied our present program is reactive.

Commissioner Schnell continued, within the budgeting process, we have allocated roughly 5% towards cleaning storm water drainage and maintenance. This was for only minor repairs.

Mr. Hall stated this percentage was figured for the overall quantity of pipe 5%. There are a small number catch basins cleared out yearly. The funds do not allow for a substantial amount of pipes to be cleared out every year.

Commissioner Schnell stated in looking at some of the pictures presented, there appear to be definite areas where there are problems. Dry timbers are broken up. This goes back to a discussion at Council. One question at that point was how we can stabilize stream banks in speaking with the county. It appears many years ago this practice was to use timbers. Obviously they are a maintenance problem as seen overtime.

Mr. Hall agrees timbers are a problem due to lack of maintenance and in not being allowed to utilize a proper design. Timbers were a compromise in many cases due to low cost. It is very common or a trend to use native grasses along stream banks supplemented with natural stone along the water to create a more natural appearance.

Commissioner Schnell stated it was her understanding with the existing Stormwater and drainage program many projects were completed.

Mr. Hall confirmed this was correct. He came across files recently where projects were completed over the decades. There are still problems, which do not occur until after a big storm. There is a current list of larger projects, which are on public property and separate from residential property.

Commissioner Tully questioned the existing Stormwater and drainage program. What are the functions of the existing Stormwater and drainage program?

Mr. Hall replied there is an annual contract for Stormwater jetting and ditching. There are five full time staff members in the village Drainage Department who assist the contractor. There are in house projects such as extending storm sewers to allow for additional inlets on new construction or sump pump connections. Each year it is necessary to replace or repair collapsed

Approved May 27, 2003

storm sewers. Our Drainage Department is in the process of replacing concrete inlets in one subdivision, which are falling apart. The department presently is involved in the snow removal schedule and they are also conducting inspections during the winter months.

Commissioner Tully questioned what types of projects should the village be involved in as part of the Stormwater Drainage Program that they presently are unable to do or do not do?

Mr. Millette replied the catch basins should be cleaned every year. The intent of the catch basin is to catch debris before it is discharged into the receiving stream. It also has been shown as a water quality issue. The sludge and sediment in the catch basin traps the contaminants washed off the road. If this sits and builds up it then flushes through discharging into the streams. As part of NPDES Phase II Program, is to have a comprehensive, meaning more than 5% per year, catch basin cleaning program. Ditching is secondary for storm sewers on roads, which do not have storm sewer pipes.

Mr. Hall added NPDES requirements will become more of an issue with the water quality over the next five years. We will have to look more closely at the list of discharges into our storm sewers. If for some reason an industrial area has floor drains connected to storm drains rather than a sanitary drain, which is not allowed. Septic tanks fill up and will be running, not treating the waste effectively, which could be discharged into the storm sewers. We need programs available to inspect these areas and to deal with the situations.

Mr. Millette added the key element Jon indicated on one of the slides in the presentation as alluded to by Commissioner Schnell as proactive/reactive. The area shown should not have deteriorated to this point if the mechanism were already in place and necessary repairs would have been completed.

Commissioner Tully asked Jon Hall and Mike Millette to reintroduce themselves for those who may have arrived after the meeting started.

He continued to ask about the current sources of revenue presently in existence contributing to the Stormwater and Drainage Program other than what is coming from the general fund.

Mr. Hall responded to his belief the general fund it what is available. Occasionally grants are applied for such as the Lacey Creek project.

Commissioner Tully asked to have the revenue information available, outside the general fund, for the next meeting scheduled to discuss Stormwater Utility Program.

Mr. Tatterson questioned the revenue amount in the presentation, 60% of 1200.

Mr. Hall replied this was referring to other than single family residential home, commercial zoning and industrial. These are approximate numbers.

Commissioner Tully explained this is an estimate assuming the Stormwater Utility Program is put into place.

Mr. Tatterson stated the County has just recently started to address the clean water situation. There is a whole chapter in the stormwater ordinance that was developed and added. There was no funding involved but they did apply for and received grants.

Approved May 27, 2003

Mr. Hall stated it is unknown what the costs will be at this point. He mentioned earlier in his presentation it could cost as much as \$100,000 per year which is a fairly small portion overall for Stormwater. Much of the current budget is what is being spent.

Commissioner Tully stated he would like to continue to discuss the overview of the existing stormwater program such as what a utility might accomplish and where we are heading.

Mr. Tatterson replied that some pictures in the presentation appear to be in pretty bad shape and questioned why they aren't just repaired.

Mr. Hall replied that many projects are being completed with borrowed staff and above the scope of their capabilities due to equipment and time required.

Commissioner Tully asked if there were any further questions on the existing stormwater drainage program before moving onto the present and future stormwater management needs.

Resident, Flood insurance was mentioned for flood plains. Has the percentage of the village within a flood plain decreased or increased over time.

Mr. Hall replied the official floodplain area was mapped in 1981-1983. This is officially the floodplain. Whether the level of water will actually rise does not affect the requirement for flood insurance. Unless a larger scale project is going to be taken on which will change a section of the creek, this can change the floodplain. It is difficult to determine. Some areas will be reduced if it involves isolated drainage and a lot of storm sewer drain installation. There are a lot of redevelopments in Downers Grove with no detention, which goes down the St. Joseph Creek. We are putting in detention for the new parking deck downtown. We are adding more than what is required in hopes of helping the situation there now. In some areas the actual flood level may be up and in some areas it may be down.

Resident asked when County would complete the current study.

Mr. Hall replied the current study has been ongoing for years and there are several years left to complete the process. There two main stages to the process. FEMA is currently reviewing revised digital flood plain maps that the county has produced. The same elevations are taken from the early FEMA maps in the 80's and then they super-impose them on the latest county topography from 1990-92. It is a slow process. This could be available sometime this year. The benefit here is some areas, which are filled, will be taken into account in the new flood plain map. It will be available digitally and we can overlay it on a parcel map to more efficiently determine where a floodplain is located.

Resident stated his concern, for example Lacey Creek, a lot of money has been spent over the last 25 years. Recently, stream bank stabilization program was completed. What measures do we have here that tells us exactly the money spent was effectively used and will reduce the problem of flooding.

Mr. Hall stated the main objective of the project was not to reduce flooding, but to stabilize the erosion of the banks, to prevent property loss and minimize the sediments going into the stream. Also the higher vegetation functions as a filter to stormwater runoff into the creek. Environmental benefits and erosion benefits are difficult to see and quantify.

Approved May 27, 2003

Resident stated one of the pictures in the presentation from 1982 Highland Avenue was under water. How is the program effectiveness being measured? Money is being spent. How do we know we are getting our money worth?

Commissioner Tully replied that this is a very unique project and he would rather move onto the topic for this evenings meeting, the existing stormwater drainage program and the stormwater utility program. The money source for this project came from other places.

Resident asked to generalize his question. If the utility program is developed, how is the effectiveness going to be measured? Will we reduce the amount of the floodplain? Will it reduce the incidents of flooding?

Commissioner Tully stated stormwater management is a broader area than just flood control. There are requirements for floodplain and stormwater management such as state, federal, county, and local. Consistent compliance with these requirements is one measure of success.

Resident stated he repeats his question. If the village implements this utility, how is the effectiveness going to be measured?

Commissioner Tully the utility is a source of funding that allows stormwater drainage actions to be taken.

Resident stated it is being indicated that he is going to be taxed and take revenue, which will be spent. He is asking what measures will be used to see if the actions are effective? As a taxpayer, how will he know if he is getting his money worth?

Commissioner Tully replied that the taxpayers are already paying for stormwater drainage through the general fund. It is a different form. It can be measured in terms of compliance with the state, local and federal law. What metric is it exactly that is being implied?

Resident questioned what metric would the village use to measure the effectiveness to reduce or improve the stormwater drainage in this community. If he is already paying for this, why is it being broken out?

Commissioner Schnell stated one way it can be measured and if we are indeed doing a better job of stormwater management, is by better compliance with the county rules and regulations, turning over resident permit requests quicker. We need to make sure we are adhering very strongly to the intent of the county ordinances. One of the items mentioned leading to our probation status was the interpretations we were using were not what they should have been and at times we were not reviewing matters thoroughly. With a stormwater utility, we could enhance staff, allowing us to do a better job managing a stormwater program itself. This could translate into neighborhood stormwater projects to help eliminate flooding in areas, identify those areas, it would give us a stream funding, not just residential property taxes. We would actually tax individuals producing the largest stormwater runoff in the community. It would allow us to better monitor all aspects of a stormwater program.

Commissioner Tully added it is a good question. It is one of those items that these series of meetings is supposed to address. How do you measure the effectiveness of an improved stormwater management program? To answer the question fully is difficult, but is one of the items we will be discussing. Perhaps we need to have built into the proposal some sort of metric

Approved May 27, 2003

for success or percentage towards a goal could be measured in an effective way to demonstrate the kind of results questioned.

Ms. Fregeau asked for clarification if there was an ongoing review by FEMA. There were concerns about wetland and floodplains when the sidewalks were installed.

Mr. Hall replied it was not FEMA directly but we enforce county regulations, which involve FEMA requirements as well. This is mainly directed towards new development. Following the ordinance is a way to ensure new development would have minimal impact if any impact in making matters worse. This is why we have permitting. We need to make sure we are not increasing the problem with new development. It is an economic situation as well. We don't want to shut off all development. Permitting is a key part. Capital projects and permitting produce the money assistance we can utilize.

Ms Fregeau stated this was a concern in looking at the Capital projects funds and what they are dedicated for we involve quite a large expense in making certain we are in compliance with the County. As we look forward to present and future needs, it is an on going process. It is her understanding the NPDES could be costing hundreds of thousands of dollars to be able to comply. Some projections have been frightening. As a resident, right now with budget meetings taking place, resident services have to be cut. Sales taxes are down. She realizes residents are paying for this program now. However, all the taxpayers are being charged the fee, which may not necessarily impact all of them. Is this a clear assessment in terms of looking for a dedicated fund and having it more user-based as a utility?

Commissioner Tully replied part of the reason we are looking into the utility program as we get into the next point is there is a list of stormwater needs. One question is how many of these items are we required to complete? For example in terms of maintenance, if we do not maintain drainage on an appropriate schedule in the long run it will cost more down the road. This is one way to measure effectiveness-compliance with maintenance schedules. Other items that must be included are compliance with the Clean Water Act. Permitting fees have paid some maintenance costs but most costs were covered by the general fund. Turning to the future stormwater needs, which has been somewhat introduced, what items need to be completed due to regulatory or maintenance issues. This committee needs to make a recommendation that provides more than one option.

Mr. Hall agreed this is a good question. NPDES state enforcement is going to be very low if in existence over the next year or two. The state is in a budget crunch as well. They are struggling to comply with the Federal government as directed. DuPage county communities have taken the view that something must be done rather than doing nothing. The concern is the infrastructure and environment. If we do nothing, we expose ourselves to legal challenges by environmental groups. This could be a greater threat to a municipality than state fines financially. If you refer to the requirements set by NPDES, we are fortunate that County is taking a fairly aggressive role in working with the communities and engineers. We are already involved with 3-4 of the measures because the stormwater ordinance is aggressive with stormwater and erosion. We are in a better situation than some of the surrounding communities. Two of the six minimum control measures that would be most burdensome are the illicit discharge connection and municipal operation housekeeping. We would have to look at our operations on how we store salt and where we put our street sweepings. We may have to change some of our practices over the next few years.

Approved May 27, 2003

Mr. Millette added housekeeping includes cleaning catch basins as mentioned earlier. Street sweeping is considered good housekeeping method for reducing pollutants before it is swept into the catch basins and eventually winds up in the stream.

Mr. Hall continued to explain the requirements sound strict when you read the general Illinois permit. However, it does state how to actually measure the reduction of all pollutants concerned. We do everything within our ability to improve water quality. This fits into another part of legislation coming strongly but recently postponed, TMDL's, Total Maximum Daily Loads. Legislation stipulates how much of certain pollutants, or what concentration of given pollutant such as phosphorous, sediment, nitrogen, or salt that you can have in a creek or stream. There has been so much legal challenge on those items, it has been postponed. Those regulations may have happened in the next year. There was a good point made earlier that this committee and the whole procedure in holding public meetings for Stormwater Utility will help fine tune and determine what is a problem and what is not. We will look at NPDES, but also will look at maintenance. What level of a problem should be considered a problem for the village vs. a private concern? These questions will help us determine the amount of money needed. We can certainly provide additional details on what could be the absolute minimum requirements. He feels the county has worked with municipal engineers on the NPDES portion. They have a compiled a list of requirements to be completed over the next five years. This will be going before Council soon. No one knows exactly what is required until it has been challenged.

Commissioner Tully stated it would be helpful, we can't determine funding, until we know what needs to be completed.

Mr. Hall replied we have a better idea with the county village ordinance but unfortunately we have been a little lean in that area. Enforcing the county writs the way we should has been very difficult with what staffing is available. We have experienced many permits were applied for over the last summer. There were delays. Builders were saying it takes two months or extra month or two to get a permit, that is a lot of tax money paid. There is an economic affect on people throughout the community. There was one thing mentioned earlier on Capital projects. If you just look at the base line of what was spent over the last few years, it has varied \$400,000 to \$900,000.

Commissioner Schnell inquired on determining future and present needs, do we actually have access to where older Stormwater systems exist. There are some older systems in place and when teardowns are constructed, old systems may be compromised during construction. Every so often we hear from residents they are experiencing problems due to new construction. How do we meet the needs of the entire community? There are areas we have not even touched on in the community and need to plan for the future.

Mr. Hall stated one way is the Stormwater master plan for the entire village. We have done this in the past. There is a plan on file from 1950 showing installation of storm sewer recommendations. A lot of the sewers were installed. Water does not know property lines so a larger area must be covered to evaluate the issues. This requires funding and a consultant must be involved since it is beyond the magnitude of what could be accomplished in house. There are many levels to achieve with a Stormwater master plan. Mapping on the admission is required by the NPDES. Some mapping has been completed, and will be required over the next five years. It is a good tool.

Approved May 27, 2003

Commissioner Schnell asked how to identify and address the future needs, in a cooperative way.

Mr. Hall replied a few years back the Village council sketched a policy saying we should pursue easements over creeks so the village can maintain these areas. Where we have easements we perform a higher level of maintenance. We have completed a few stream bank stabilization projects but it is not a formal wide program. We do a certain amount each year. It is a huge cost issue if the village decided to actively address all the erosion in the village along the stream banks.

Commissioner Schnell asked if erosion has an affect on stream quality.

Mr. Millette confirmed erosion has a very large affect on stream quality.

Commissioner Schnell asked if ultimate compliance, later down the road, would be something to address and be a future need.

Mr. Hall agreed. NPDES and TMDL's down the road would put more burdens on the village to address those exact issues.

Commissioner Schnell stated than this would be part of this whole portfolio as future needs.

Mr. Millette added this can show measurable benefit because sediment in streams takes up space. When you flood, you flood worse than when streams are kept clean.

Commissioner Schnell added it has been stated numerous times in the past, that backyards, private property, flooded from streams going through the property. Obviously what can be measured as we perform this study, can identify where these areas are located. With the Stormwater utility, these would be identified as future needs.

Commissioner Tully asked if there were any questions with respect to present and future Stormwater management needs.

Mr. Tatterson stated his only comment is, he would like to see put into the program the maximum utilization of the county staff available once a week to go over any new development point to point with the developer, or even a city engineer enabling us to conform with the ordinances. To have an outside consultant perform such a task would add up to an enormous amount of money.

Mr. Hall stated we have consulted with county staff in the past.

Mr. Tatterson suggested utilizing engineering students.

Mr. Millette replied unfortunately we have had to cut seasonal staff this year for budget requirements.

Mr. Bajor reminded **Mr. Hall** about the LPDA map.

Mr. Hall replied this is a good example. The Localized Poor Drainage Areas (LPDA) localized flooding areas, which have been identified throughout the village over the years. In order to

Approved May 27, 2003

better manage these areas, better information available for developers, our GIS manager has coordinated with students at Eastern University in compiling these maps.

Commissioner Tully asked if there were any further questions for the potential benefits of the Stormwater Utility Program. No further questions were asked at this time. He continued with the discussion as to what is the process for implementing a stormwater utility, which is part of the proposal to Council. The committee should recommend a timetable for implementation if the program is ultimately adopted and what form it is adopted. Fundamentally, this committee needs to develop a time frame. Action plan with deadlines for meeting different portions of what the prototype would look like. He asked for staff views in terms of who ought to be involved in planning. Obviously those present here in addition to finance and legal.

Mr. Hall responded those departments as well those affected in the village. Planning Services would be involved. We need statistics, database information, number of lots, as well as lot sizes. The GIS Department would be needed. It will affect everyone.

Commissioner Schnell asked if we have had the opportunity to speak with three communities in Illinois who have recently committed to such a program, to find out the initial process.

Mr. Hall stated some people at the village have had some conversations. He has not had the opportunity due to researching the Internet for information.

Commissioner Schnell suggested meeting with someone from Rolling Meadows who has been through the initial process and have the program in place. It would save staff time.

Mr. Millette suggested meeting with Elmhurst who has been looking at the program for sometime.

Commissioner Tully stated it is important, and possibly for the next meeting have an idea who the different staff members are that ought to be involved. Finance and legal should be involved right away for their input. He agreed with Commissioner Schnell it is a good idea to contact other communities to determine all that will be involved.

Mr. Bajor added he would like to suggest to initiate meetings with internal staff legal and finance as well as engineering immediately to discuss the work to be completed internally.

Commissioner Tully asked when it would be possible to have a break out of steps in doing the type of investigation, communicate with communities, as suggested by Commissioner Schnell, and in discussing the matters with staff to get an idea.

Mr. Bajor suggested at least two weeks.

Mr. Hall added it would be much longer. Other communities have taken a year to three years to go through the process. It can be completed quicker.

Commissioner Schnell stated the whole process does not have to be ready, but an idea on what is involved in the process.

Mr. Hall stated he understood.

Approved May 27, 2003

Commissioner Tully stated the important items are 4b & 4c (Attachment 2). Evaluating the needs and objectives and defining what the funding raised by implementation of a utility would go towards accomplishing.

Commissioner Schnell explained in providing options and choices with a clear understanding if the Stormwater Utility Program is not active, what is the bare minimum that would be done. This goes back to education of council and the public. We are performing minimal repair work due to budget restrains. With the Utility Program can we do more or better.

Commissioner Tully stated defining what the goals of an effective Stormwater Management Program is the paramount consideration. What would it cost to accomplish those goals is the next step.

Commissioner Schnell asked in reference to the budget process, it was mentioned consultants would have to be utilized. We need to consider the cost involved. If we can't afford consultant fees how far can we go needs to be taken into consideration?

Commissioner Tully continued the discussion with the issue of consultants. He prefers not to utilize consultants. From the labor perspective there is information available to us. There are other communities to consult. Literature is available. We have the expertise available to us here in the village.

Mr. Hall stated the other issue would be the time restraints. We have mentioned we are stretched to the limit with permits and other matters. Looking at Stormwater Utility Program puts an additional burden on staff. One example in looking at our rate structure, some communities are looking at the degree of commercial and industrial properties within the village to figure the rates. A consultant can absorb the peak. A consultant can also provide helpful advice in the area of making sure we are legally sound.

Mr. Millette added we can get to the point if Council directs the Utility Program to be up and running, consultant expertise would be better utilized for the Watershed planning.

Mr. Hall replied we need to determine if the watershed planning would be part of the Utility program.

Commissioner Tully stated in addition to staff, there is other expertise within the village with residents and members of our Stormwater & Floodplain Oversight Committee, some who are present this evening. Part of this is not only for public education discussion but to solicit thoughts and comments as well.

Mr. Waldack stated in review of the agenda, he noticed it is stated as Stormwater Utility rather than Stormwater Program. It makes the outcome a Utility which is sad to see. He prefers to see it as a program. His view is the work process and payment before the paperwork. There is a need for the repairs obviously. The problem he has with a Utility is the increase in paperwork. Adding one clerical person for billing creates an additional expense which could be applied to the work cost. He would rather see the work completed and come out of the capital budget. He is not against the project, just skeptical, and he recommends the approach be an adhoc type committee.

Commissioner Tully replied there were some good comments made by Mr. Waldack. There already is a stormwater program which has been in place for many years. Whether it

Approved May 27, 2003

accomplishes everything that it should is another question. Whether funding is there to support what is being completed is another question. The utility is being discussed as a source of funding which would be different from simply carving a chunk out of the general fund which is how it being paid for now in addition to some revenue that comes from permitting and inspection fees. Advantages of a utility program are it is a dedicated source of funding. Same concept used for water which is basically what water you use is what you are billed. Stormwater Utility concept is that you are charged a fee based upon the amount of runoff you contribute to the stormwater system. It is more equitable and user based instead of whether you need it or not, you pay for it which is the general fund. Historically the general fund amounts budgeted for stormwater drainage programs have not always been available or are insufficient. A good question raised was what is the administrative cost of the stormwater utility vs. what we are doing now? This area needs to be looked at more closely.

Mr. Griesheim stated he owns property on Springside Avenue which is designated as an LPDA by the village. He has been attempting to secure information on why the property is categorized as an LPDA. There is no documentation available.

Mr. Tatterson asked what is an LPDA?

Mr. Hall replied LPDA is Localized Poor Drainage Area. It is not on the FEMA maps. It is an area which is inundated with water.

Mr. Griesheim continued, to add to his frustration there is a storm sewer across the sidewalk from the property. He feels possibly the property was designated LPDA prior to the installation of this sewer. The village has no record of when the sewer was installed. He has been waiting two months for the information. He had the property on the market to sell and has taken it off the market. The burden should be placed on the village to prove this is an LPDA and if they can not prove LPDA then the status should be removed.

Commissioner Tully replied this issue should more appropriately go before the Stormwater and Floodplain Oversight Committee, but any meeting is a good opportunity to raise a question.

Mr. Hall added this leads to maintenance and construction. One matter we did not get to mention, in addition to permitting, is long range planning. To be proactive, we have such areas in the village. Every time a developer wants to build on one of these properties, our regulations and the combination of county regulations, states they must be 3' above the water level. A survey must be provided showing the water level.

Mr. Millette explained and confirmed as stated earlier by both Commissioner Schnell and Commissioner Tully on questioning, how do we know about these areas that have not been adequately maintained. If we have a dedicated source and we can provide long term planning, we could answer questions as presented by Mr. Griesheim. If we have certain dedicated people involved, a five year plan in place stating we will evaluate 20% of the areas confirming if they are still valid or have changed since originally mapped or improvements have been made nearby to alleviate the area, then the property could possibly be removed from such status. Water mains last a fixed amount of time and so do storm sewers last a fixed amount of time. The question is valid.

Approved May 27, 2003

Mr. Griesheim added part of his frustration is the discussions are all future plans. He has an immediate situation to address. He has been told the village does not have time.

Mr. Hall replied a meeting took place Thursday, January 30th. He and Mr. Bajor spent quite a bit of time with Mr. Griesheim reviewing the situation and providing as much help as possible. We are still trying to locate information. This meeting is more a future issue. If similar situations were to occur ten times per year, it may be sooner. If every developer were building and incurs a certain cost through the process of lobbying and surveying and the village could do all of this at once, for half the cost of all involved, is it worth it or should it be whoever is developing, and the benefit of selling the property, should they bear the cost.

Commissioner Tully stated this is a good question designated or undesignated. I assume you will follow up with Mr. Griesheim.

Mr. Hall stated he would follow up. However as the policy reads, the burden is on them to hire an engineering consultant to prove that the water level is lower than what is mapped. The desire is not to incur the cost if you are not going to hear favorable information.

Mr. Bajor stated it is a very expensive undertaking.

Mr. Eckmann several comments have been made in better education on stormwater utilities. He received a brochure from the American Society of Civil Engineers who has a very large continuing education program. In June, 2003 there will be a 2-day seminar on this subject. He will forward the information.

Mr. Millette responded he was also sent the brochure. No budget funds available to send staff.

Mr. Eckmann continued the council will have to give some advice to staff. A utility can be everything from an entity completely without any control of a council to semi-control.

Commissioner Tully agreed this is a good question and has been raised previously in other context by many different people. The fundamental question is would a utility make sense? Do we continue as in the past and figure how to do it better? Is a utility a good idea or not? The next step is if you have a utility, what is the shape, form of the entity and who runs it? Taken to the extreme, it could be overseen by the Sanitary District?

Mr. Dinchak complimented the village on a proactive approach. The public education and selling this to the public should be a major priority.

Commissioner Tully asked for further questions, thoughts or comments from the public.

Mr. Tatterson asked how many towns were involved in such a program and if it mattered. Our situations are different than other communities. If we knew what they experienced it may help.

Mr. Millette replied Carol Stream is in the initial planning process.

Mr. Johnson stated there are quite a few active in the plan. Peoria is being introduced to the Council. Four different communities are being consulted in Indiana. Most people are looking at the plan as a funding source. A new and fair way of paying for the handling of stormwater. The regulations are going to get even tougher as both Mr. Hall and Mr. Millette are aware.

Approved May 27, 2003

Mr. Tatterson asked if we are the pioneers in DuPage.

Mr. Millette stated Downers Grove is fairly unique. We are the second or third largest municipality. We have three definitive watersheds. Three fairly large tributaries to the east branch and three minor tributaries. We have terrible flooding problems.

Commissioner Schnell added the purpose of this exercise is not necessarily to say we have to have a utility. Really what it amounts to are the dedication of the needs in our community and how we best serve those needs. It may be utility or just having a dedicated source within the general fund to pay for those needs. We need a good stormwater plan.

Commissioner Tully concurs with Commissioner Schnell. This all started because it was perceived that the Village could do a better job utilizing the existing stormwater program and providing additional resources. The concept of utilities has been successful in many communities. It is not the only solution.

Commissioner Schnell agrees education is the biggest key. Council has to be educated and the public has to be educated. This is not something that can be completed in two weeks. It is a long process.

Commissioner Tully would like an action plan before we leave this evening. The next meeting can be whenever is practical. The items for staff to work on for the next meeting include:

- Specific delineation of what the stormwater and drainage needs are here in Downers Grove.
- What we can anticipate additional needs both now and in the future.
- Cost associated with meeting these needs.
- Sources of revenue that currently exist
- Effect on tax/cost to resident
- Specific advantages of a utility vs. paid for out of the general fund

Mr. Hall stated this was mentioned earlier in the presentation. The water bill has the break down and shows the amount going to stormwater.

Commissioner Schnell stated in addition to identification, as part of the this, if an action plan on how to educate residents could be available.

Commissioner Tully replied that cable is available for this.

Mr. Hall will put together the information.

Commissioner Tully thanked everyone for coming and wishes to encourage everyone to keep attending future meetings. He especially thanked Stormwater & Floodplain Oversight Committee members for attending and hopes to see them at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.