

# DRAFT

# MEETING NOTES

DATE: July 9, 2009

TO: Steering Committee

FROM: John Wills  
Wills Burke Kelsey Associates

ATTENDEES: See attached sign in sheet

SUBJECT: Steering Committee #1  
(WBK Project 09-0039)

MEETING DATE: July 9, 2009

---

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. Please see attached meeting agenda.

## **Agenda Item I**

1. It was discussed that a certain degree of formality would be desirable for a committee, like the Steering Committee, to function; that will lend credibility and a united voice to the decision making that occurs within Steering Committee meetings. Since the Steering Committee is ultimately accountable to the Stormwater Committee, it was decided that the pattern to follow would be the same as the Stormwater Committee. Meaning that the chairman of the Committee would be a DuPage County employee and the Vice Chairman would be a municipal member of the Steering Committee. Christine Klepp, of DuPage County, will be added to the Steering Committee and become the chairman of the Committee. A request was made of the five municipal members to decide between the five of them which one will be the Vice Chairman and to bring that back for the next Steering Committee meeting.
2. A set of rules of Committee operation were also discussed. Major decisions would be made by a motion requiring a second, with a vote taken. Other issues might be raised and voted on in the form of a consensus of the Committee with less formality and not requiring a formal second.
3. There are twelve members of the Committee and seven members present will constitute a quorum empowered to make decisions and act on the agenda.

# DRAFT

## MEETING NOTES

4. Alternates for each of the twelve positions will be allowed. We will not institute a formal process of determining who will be the alternate but it is expected that a current member designating someone as their alternate will also bring that person up to speed on the current discussion and issues as we will not “backtrack” within the Steering Committee meeting in order to accommodate an alternate.
5. Discussion was had regarding e-mail communication within the Steering Committee. If something is sent to the entire committee, it is assumed by the recipients that it is open for discussion and anyone who responds should “reply to all”. However, if something is sent to only one member, it should then be assumed that it is a private conversation and the summary for that discussion can be presented at a later time. In addition, it was suggested that we don’t add additional people to Steering Committee discussions via e-mail.
6. The consultant reiterated the importance of the Steering Committee members vote and that is the responsibility of the Steering Committee members to discuss intermediate work process within their municipality and/or community.
7. Meeting minutes will be taken by the consultant and sent to each of the Steering Committee members as a draft for their review prior to the next Committee meeting. Comments on the draft will be compiled and a revised draft also sent out. The revised draft will be the basis for voting at the next Committee meeting to accept the minutes as written or send them back for further revision or to accept them with corrections. A draft of the minutes will be posted on the website as soon as available with the final version of the minutes also posted upon their review and acceptance at the next opportunity at a Steering Committee meeting. It was asked of each member that they review the minutes once and then the updated version once, as well, so that multiple sets of reviews are discouraged.

### Agenda Item II

8. The County will host the website and blog on a new server that they are installing. Currently, they expect to have the new website and the blog and the server up and running within the next 2 weeks.

### Agenda Item III

9. The following summary represents the discussion in the order as represented on the agenda while it is recognized that the actual discussion did not take place exactly in the order as presented on the agenda.
10. We reviewed the history of the concept of a survey as indicated on the agenda and the consultant’s intent and purposes were reviewed and elaborated on. In general, it was

## MEETING NOTES

stressed that the intent of the consultant was to prepare a document that captures as much of the current range of anecdotal comment that goes on a routine basis within the county with regard to the ordinance as possible. In preparing the ordinance update, this captured set of comments will be referred to as a way of tracking whether we are addressing or not addressing what could be called the common complaints that elected officials, administrators and engineers have and receive. The Steering Committee was asked if they had any further purposes or intents with the survey and none were voiced.

11. We discussed who would be the target group of respondents. While the agenda talked about biased versus unbiased sampling, a better set of terminology would be to say that this is a focused survey and we are asking those who have been what we will term “users” of the permit process for their experiences. That helps guide the selection of the questions and the respondents to be polled. The choices of who to poll with regard to the survey was expanded to include those who might have been sighted for violations under the ordinance as well as the first four characterizations of agenda item III.b.ii. For the most part, this is reflected in Question 1 of the survey with the exception of option e, which will be replaced by property owners who were cited for a violation. We discussed the form and format of the survey itself. The consultant has researched the platform of Survey Monkey and found it very robust with some built in reporting tools that will be very helpful. All forms of question as we have them right now can be put into the Survey Monkey form. Survey Monkey is a third party provider of surveying services and is accessed by invitation to a website link. One of the discussed items was whether or not the survey respondent would receive a password so that only one response could be made. We will report back to the Committee further on those capabilities for a decision. The Steering Committee was unanimous in that the responses to the survey should be anonymous. Survey Monkey has a way to track who did respond and that information will be kept very confidential and only accessed by the consultant themselves. We will also put on the survey a note that that information will be available only to the consultant. We discussed the specific questions in the handout included with the agenda and it was decided to remove question 13. It is way too early in the process to create a contact response. We would not know how to respond to specific issues of the ordinance raised until we are further along in the process. We will, though, however, invite those who have taken the survey to follow along in the process of ordinance development at both the blog and the website. We will also promote additional comments left on the website. We will add as a first line in the actual survey itself a statement that better outlines the purpose of the survey to give respondents some sort of context for the answers that they are being solicited. We discussed how we would collect the contact information of people to be surveyed and it was decided that each Steering Committee member would submit 10-20 names and that we would also ask each of the municipalities to submit 10-20 names for people to be surveyed. We will then aggregate all of those and do a random sampling of the master list to create the final list of those who will be surveyed. E-mail addresses are preferable, however if e-mail addresses

## MEETING NOTES

are not available in some municipalities or jurisdictions, we will also then send out letters that request them to go to the link for the survey.

### Agenda Item IV

12. Bob Murdoch of Michael Baker Jr. was at the meeting and handed out a screening list of jurisdictions that also gave a matrix of either innovative or of interest aspects of the stormwater management ordinance for each of these jurisdictions. The discussion in the Steering Committee was that the list as presented did not include smaller municipal jurisdictions. All of the municipal jurisdictions were very large. So, they were asked to either add to the list or substitute on the list a couple of smaller jurisdictions. Baker will do this and then send this list out and the Steering Committee will approve that list by email or make revisions to it by email so that we can proceed to the next stage. We discussed at some length the purposes and intent of the national local ordinance review. The purpose is to reach out to jurisdictions outside of the Midwest where perhaps less is known by those practicing and to see what others are doing and to see how certain common challenges have been met. From the screening list, Baker will create a bulleted summary of important points and the Steering Committee will select up to twelve of those for further review and then comment as to whether the approaches in those communities will be applicable or not to DuPage County.

The meeting ended at approximately 9:45.

STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING #1 7-9-09

Add Guest/Alt  
column? - WPK  
↓

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>MEM.</u>	<u>ALT.</u>
Kristine Meyer	WBK	✓	
Bob Murchlock	Baker		✓
Erskine Klyce	Naperville	✓	
DALE DURFEY	OAK BROOK	✓	
Clayton Heffter	DuPage Co.	✓	
Karen Laskowski	DuPage County	✓	
Foxy CARLTON	" "	✓	
ROBERT JOPKINS	CHASE DuPAGE	✓	
Mary Lou Kalster	Village of Lisle	✓	
DAVE GORMAN	LOMBARD		✓
David Winklebleck	DuPage County	✓	
Rob Swanson	DuPage County	✓	

Steering Committee Meeting 1 Agenda  
July 9, 2009

- I. Formalize committee structure and procedures
  - a. Steering committee Chairman
  - b. Use of motions and voting for clear direction/decision
  - c. Quorum
  - d. Alternates
- II. Status update on Website/Blog-Will steering Committee members be the representative for their community?
- III. Discussion on Survey
  - a. What is the purpose of our Survey?
    - i. History-Consultant suggested scope item. Consultant intent:
      - 1. Give voice to concerns/complaints (de-mystify the issues)
      - 2. Focus on the mechanics/process of getting a permit
      - 3. Use as a set of guideposts to categorize some of the changes made.
      - 4. To be supplemented by the full public information/input process
    - ii. Not intended by consultant for:
      - 1. Changing the focus of regulation
      - 2. To be used as only input on changes/revisions to the Ordinance
      - 3. Gauging general public acceptance of regulation
    - iii. Steering Committee purposes and concerns
  - b. Who is the target group of respondents?
    - i. Biased or unbiased sampling.
    - ii. Some choices:
      - 1. Land owners who signed off on a permit.
      - 2. Applicants for a permit.
      - 3. Potential applicants who attended a preapp meeting.
      - 4. Engineers/scientists who prepared permit application documents.
      - 5. Any of the above, within a certain timeframe (say all of 2008 for instance)
  - c. Form/format of Survey
    - i. Clarify platform for survey-what are the capabilities?
    - ii. Anonymous or with contact info? Or give option for contact info?
    - iii. Will we follow up individually?
    - iv. Are we soliciting general comments along with answers to specific questions?
  - d. Questions for Survey
    - i. Current list of suggested questions-Dave Gorman e-mail (Handout)
- IV. Initial screening list for National/Local Ordinance Review (handout) (Bob Murdoch of Baker)

# Ordinance Update Survey (draft)

---

Survey Draft for steering committee meeting 7-9-09

Draft Questionnaire to Permit Recipients and Other Interested Parties of Record

1. Circle the item that best describes your experience with the “DuPage County Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance”:
  - a. Commercial/industrial or multiple-residences project owner or developer
  - b. Single family home owner or builder
  - c. Government project manager
  - d. Professional consultant
  - e. Neighbor/interested party to a recently constructed project
  - f. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Select the statement that best describes your experience with the Ordinance:
  - a. I submitted a permit application to a municipality, and the County was not involved.
  - b. I submitted an application to a municipality, and the County was also involved.
  - c. I submitted an application only to the County.
  - d. My experience of the Ordinance was indirect - I did not require a permit but became aware of it from an issue on some other property of interest.
  - e. I have had no direct or indirect experience with the Ordinance.
3. Circle all aspects that apply regarding your experience with the Ordinance:
  - a. Stormwater Detention
  - b. Erosion & Sediment Control
  - c. Floodplain Storage, Conveyance and Mapping
  - d. Wetland Avoidance and Mitigation
  - e. Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality

All questions should be answered by checking a number between 1 for “strongly disagree” to 6 for “strongly agree”. An option will also be given for “no opinion”.

1. The procedure to obtain a permit (the forms, instructions and the parties involved in the review) were clear per the Ordinance and supporting information.
2. I was able to determine the permit requirements per the Ordinance and supporting information.
3. I understood what I had to submit and why.
4. My cost to prepare the permit application was reasonable for the project scope.
5. The people I hired to help prepare the permit application were a value.
6. My cost for the permit review was understood before I made the submittal.
7. My cost for the permit review was reasonable for the project scope and the quality of the material submitted.
8. The Ordinance does a good job to protect all against new flood damages.
9. The Ordinance does a good job to protect and preserve natural areas, including wetlands and streams.
10. My application was handled in a timely manner, given the project scope.

## Ordinance Update Survey (draft)

---

11. It was more expedient to obtain a stormwater permit in DuPage County compared to other jurisdictions. (Skip if not applicable or provide the name of the other jurisdiction(s)): \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete as appropriate:

12. I have the following suggestion to better administer the requirements of the DuPage County Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance: \_\_\_\_\_
13. I would like to be contacted by DuPage County staff member to further discuss my response(s) to this survey: \_\_\_\_\_