

MEETING NOTES

DATE: July 1, 2010
TO: Steering Committee
FROM: John Wills, P.E.
Wills Burke Kelsey Associates
SUBJECT: Steering Committee #13
(WBK Project 09-0039)

MEETING DATE: June 23, 2010

We held the thirteenth meeting of the Steering Committee for the update of the DuPage County Countywide Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance on June 23, 2010. The following is a general summary of the major points discussed and does not constitute a verbatim transcript, nor an attempt to capture either the speaker or the exact wording as presented. The following also represents the preparer's understanding of the discussion. If there are any discrepancies, inaccuracies, or major items missed, please notify the preparer.

Agenda Item I- Approval of Meeting Minutes

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Klepp at 9:40 a.m. The following were present at the meeting:

Members: Chairman Christine Klepp, David Winklebleck, Clayton Heffter, Karen Laskowski, Rob Swanson and Chris Vonnahme from DuPage County; Nick Hatfield, Village of Lombard; Vice Chairman Mary Lou Kalsted, Village of Lisle; Bill Novack, City of Naperville; Erskine Klyce (ex-officio); Roger Hopkins, Choose DuPage.

Members absent: Dale Durfey.

Alternates: None.

Also Present: John Wills and Kristine Meyer, Wills Burke Kelsey (WBK); Bob Murdock, Baker; Jedd Anderson and Thomas Burke, Christopher B. Burke Engineering (CBBEL); and Tam Kutzmark, DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference (DMMC).

A motion was made by Kalsted to amended the minutes of the May 26, 2010 meeting to include in Agenda Item 2: "Kalsted pointed out that although she volunteered for the Floodplain Subcommittee at the January 28, 2010 Steering Committee meeting, she was not notified of subcommittee meetings and has not participated in any of those meetings to date."

By voice vote, the amended minutes were approved.

MEETING NOTES

Agenda Items II - Continue Discussion Regarding Floodplain Language

2. There was a recent blog post regarding garages and floodplain ordinances requirements. Much time was spent discussing this topic. This issue is specific to Lisle as they have approximately 300 homes in the floodplain and 30% of those do not have garages due to the current ordinance requirements. It was noted that the discussion applies only to structures in the flood fringe, not in the floodway. At the conclusion of the discussion the following options was decided as a policy decision that should be brought to the stormwater committee, a consensus from the steering committee could not be met:
 - The DuPage County Ordinance should be the same as the State and FEMA requirements regarding accessory structures in the floodplain.
 - The DuPage County Ordinance should be the same as the State and FEMA requirements regarding replacement of accessory structures in the floodplain.
 - The DuPage County Ordinance should be the same as the State and FEMA requirements regarding new accessory structures in the floodplain when homes that are also in the floodplain are brought into compliance.
3. We then reviewed the “fast track” process proposed for streambank stabilization projects. It was discussed that since the majority of river and stream banks in DuPage County are below the 10-year elevation and because typical projects include extending the toe of the bank out into the river, in may not be realistic to require a balance of fill and cut at one foot increments. In addition, when causing impacts to the stream bed, it may be difficult not to require a hydraulic model. For Item 8 we discussed listing the techniques that are acceptable so the applicant does not need to “demonstrate” if they are applicable. Finally, it was discussed that that these projects would need to obtain site-specific topography, but that a site benchmark could be established.
4. FEMA's directions for treatment of floodways in a Zone A floodplain were briefly discussed. This discussion will be continued at the next steering committee meeting.

Agenda Item III- Additional Policy Issues for Matrix

5. Due to time this item was not discussed.

Agenda Item IV – Follow-up on Wetlands Discussion with Municipal Engineers

6. The comments that came from the last municipal engineer’s meeting were briefly discussed. The wetland subcommittee will meet one more time to discuss and finalize the riparian requirements as it relates to buffers and also performance standards. They will also look at any items that may need to be brought forward as policy issues. One item that was discussed as a possible policy issued is defining the limits of the buffer/riparian area. The current policy is to use the floodplain line as the limits of the riparian area. It was noted that the MWRD uses the 10-year BFE line as a limit.

Agenda Item V – Next Meeting

7. The next meeting is July 29th.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:25 p.m.

Steering Committee Meeting #13 Agenda

June 23, 2010, 9:30 a.m. ~ Room 3500A

- I. Approval of Steering Committee Meeting #12 Minutes
- II. Continue Discussion regarding Floodplain Language
- III. Additional Policy Issues for Matrix
- IV. Follow-up on Wetlands Discussion with Municipal Engineers
- V. Reminder - Next Meeting: Thursday, July 29th at 9:30 a.m.

**Stream/Riparian Rehabilitation
Criteria for the Dupage County Permitting "Fast Track"**

Existing Language	Proposed Language
1. The proposed work must result in a net increase of riparian functions and values.	1. Remove.
2. Documentation must be provided that proposed vegetation removal, if any, is necessary for ecological restoration purposes or logistically necessary for implementation of streambank stabilization measures. Vegetation removal for aesthetic purposes is not allowed under the "fast track" program.	2. Delete this requirement - it is in the new wetland text.
3. Proposed cross-sectional area of the stream must be the same as current field conditions. Cross-sectional area may be averaged between adjacent cross-sections.	3. The proposed cross-sectional area of the stream should match the existing cross-sectional area when feasible. <i>A change in cross-sectional area of 20% or less is allowable for the purposes of bank reshaping for waterways with less than ten square miles of tributary area. A change in cross-sectional area of 35% or less is allowable for the purposes of bank reshaping for waterways with ten square miles of tributary area or greater.</i> Cross-sectional area may be averaged between adjacent cross-sections.
4. There may be no net fill in the floodplain, beyond that required to meet Item 2. Fill may be placed near the normal water line of the stream channel in order to stabilize the sloped bank (scarp). This fill must be balanced by an equivalent amount of cut (1:1 cut to fill ratio) to be provided at the same incremental flood frequency elevation as the flood storage displaced (incremental levels of interest are between the 0-10 year and the 10-100 year flood plain elevations). The 1:1 cut to fill ratio shall be maintained at each cross section as described above in Item 3. If hard streambank stabilization practices are used, this criteria shall not apply.	4. There may be no net fill in the floodplain. Fill may be placed near the normal water line of the stream channel in order to stabilize the sloped bank (scarp). This fill must be balanced by an equivalent amount of cut (1:1 cut to fill ratio) to be provided at the same incremental flood frequency elevation as the flood storage displaced (incremental levels of interest are between the 0-10 year and the 10-100 year flood plain elevations). <i>For projects located in unnumbered Zone A areas, the fill must be balanced by an equivalent amount of cut in one foot increments.</i> The 1:1 cut to fill ratio shall be maintained cumulatively over the length of the project. Cut-to-fill ratios greater than 1:1 are only allowed in cases described in Item 3.
5. The proposed work may not adversely impact any wetland either directly or indirectly.	5. Remove this requirement - it is in the new wetland text.
6. There may be no grade control structures or other channel structures that may cause an increase in 100-year water surface elevations. Channel bed improvements such as riffle/pool structures will be evaluated on a case by case basis.	6. There may be no grade control structures or other channel structures that may cause an increase in offsite 100-year water surface elevations. Channel bed improvements such as riffle/pool structures will be evaluated on a case by case basis.
7. There may be no conversion of habitat type. For example, a wooded community may not be converted to a prairie community without any woody component. Installation of clumps of native shrubs is an appropriate substitute for removal of an invasive, non-native shrub layer. It is not necessary to replace trees or shrubs at a 1:1 ratio.	7. Remove this requirement - it is in the new wetland buffer section.
8. Acceptable vegetative techniques include bank reshaping, 100% biodegradable erosion control blankets, coir rolls (100% biodegradable), live stakes, fascines, and native seeding or plantings. Bioengineering techniques such as A-jacks, soil lifts, and lunkers may be used where it is documented that the technique is necessary and geomorphically appropriate. Hard bank stabilization practices, such as riprap, gabions, steel sheetpiling, or fabric formed concrete, are only allowed on a limited basis (e.g. at bridge abutments, pipe outfalls, or adjacent to existing building structures).	8. Acceptable vegetative techniques include bank reshaping, 100% biodegradable erosion control blankets, coir rolls (100% biodegradable), live stakes, fascines, and native seeding or plantings. Bioengineering techniques may be used where it is documented that the technique is necessary and geomorphically appropriate. Hard bank stabilization practices are allowed where naturalized surfaces will be at risk for failure or erosion.
9. A pre-application site meeting with DEC staff is highly recommended to discuss current field conditions and proposed activities. This meeting may double as a wetland field verification.	9. A pre-application site meeting with DEC staff is highly recommended to discuss current field conditions and proposed activities.

Additional Considerations:

1. Eliminate the requirement of site-specific topographic survey. Allow these types of projects to utilize DuPage County topography. Or, if site-specific topography is required, it might be possible to loosen benchmark requirements to lessen cost of survey.
2. Add Ordinance language specifying, "Because projects that meet the 'fast track' criteria are also meeting the requirements of this Ordinance, no hydraulic modeling will be required for these projects since the Ordinance prohibits adverse hydraulic impacts."

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: 6/23/10

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	MEM.	ALT.	GUEST/ OTHER
1. Nick HATFIELD	Lombard	✓		
2. Chris VANNATIME	DuPage County	✓		
3. ROGER HOPKINS	Chase DuPage	✓		
4. Bill Novack	Naperville	✓		
5. Bob Murolock	Baker	✓		✓
6. Clayton Heffer	DuPage Co.	✓		
7. Karen Laskowski	DuPage City	✓		
8. David Winklebleck	DuPage Co.	✓		
9. Robert Swanson	DuPage County	✓		
10. Mary Lou Kalsbe	Village of Lisle	✓		
11. Erskine Klyce	—	✓		
12. Jedd Anderson	CBBEL			✓
13. Kristine Meyer	WBK			✓
14. JOHN WILLS	WBK			✓
15. Thomas Burke	CBBEL			✓
16. Christine Klepp	DuPage Co.	✓		
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				
21.				
22.				
23.				
24.				
25.				