



Stormwater Commission Meeting Summary Thursday February 20, 2020

Members Present: Fred Kudert, Steven Vinezeano, Thomas Powers, Andrew Vitale, Joseph LoVerde, Robert Callero, Fred Braun, and Chuck Ostman. Rich Wlodarski arrived after role call.

Residents in attendance: Barbara Mendelson (Renaissance)

Others in attendance: Jeff Wickenkamp, Hey and Associates; Jack Grana, Village of Niles

The Stormwater Commission meeting convened at 8:00 a.m. in the Council Chambers at Village Hall.

Resident Concerns: Ms. Mendelson, 7031 Touhy noticed how water collects along the St. Andrews cyclone fence. She wanted to know what causes the problem as it has been there since she moved in 1997. Community Development indicated that the overland flow route is to the east toward St. Andrews.

Hey and Associates presented the historic hydraulic atlas which showed a historic stream through the area. The property was developed with a sewer that do not have capacity to convey the stream flow. Ms. Mendelson wanted to know whose responsibility to fix the issue. Hey indicated that the Village has been working on flooding issues throughout town and has primarily been focusing on fixing structural flooding. Since this location was subject to naturally occurring flooding and does not affect buildings, it would be a low priority to resolve the flooding.

Old Business: The following topics were presented and discussed.

November 14th 2019 and July 2nd 2019 Meeting Minutes. The commission approved the minutes

Back Yard Flooding Program Considerations

Hey and Associates presented a study on the effect of yard drainage connections to the combined sewer. They used the Merrill neighborhood as a test case. They studied three scenarios 1) 8" pipe connection 2) 3" restrictor, 3) sump pump connection. The end result was that an unrestricted pipe does result in increased flooding downstream (0.25' to 0.38'). The restrictor does mitigate the downstream impacts but does not eliminate the downstream impacts. Similar

to the basement study removing the backyard storage does result in impacts to the sewer system.

Commissioner Vitale asked whether this type of analysis would need to be completed for every location in Niles. Hey indicated that many situations would be similar and it would be to use the study as a guide for the policy discussion. Hey recommended that the study indicates that requiring the restrictor would be prudent. The Village engineer indicated that a small increase in the elevation of basement flooding could be a big deal. The connection to the combined sewer should be reserved from the most impacted properties only and not for nuisance problems.

Commissioner Callero asked about what the cost of restrictor would be. The cost varies from \$1000 for stainless steel vortex to much cheaper versions for plastic or grouted pipes. In the end the restrictor would be the private property owner's so the maintenance/quality would be up to the owner. Community Development recommended that a standard restrictor detail be prepared.

Hey and Associates presented a summary of the Yard Drainage Assistance Program. The program as presented was a draft and not a recommendation. In particular the highlighted elements should be discussed by the Commission.

The definition and prioritization of eligibility was based on duration, depth, footprint, extent of damage, frequency, offsite water, and seepage impacts. There was not a minimum standard submitted. The Village engineer indicated the combined sewer should have a minimum eligibility standard.

The Commission discussed some of the highlighted solutions listed in the program including. The first item discussed was the downspout redirection and whether that should be eligible. While there is a cost to redirecting downspouts they can be for the smaller scale drainage problems. The commission decided that downspouts should be a private property owner responsibility. For small scale problems, the property owner should redirect their downspouts prior to becoming eligible for the program. The commissioners felt redirecting downspouts should be a pre-requisite for the program except for cases where the downspout is only a small contributing factor to the problem.

The second item discussed was the reduction in impervious as an eligible expense. Commissioners were concerned that reduction of impervious would not solve individual cases. Reduction in impervious could have benefits when implemented system wide. By its nature, green infrastructure only addresses smaller storms. The commission felt reduction in impervious was a laudable goal but should not be part of the program. Some commissioners were supportive of a smaller scale incentive for lot level permeable pavements. Commissioner Ostman was in favor of investigating additional permit fees to encourage permeable pavements. Hey indicated that they have seen a credit given to the stormwater utility fees. In general, the commission supported incentivizing permeable pavement outside of the yard drainage assistance program.

The commission discussed a list of ineligible project costs. The commission discussed eligibility for the program in combination with the Flood Control and Overland Flooding Program. The commission recommended that residents be eligible for the Flood Control Program and Yard Drainage Program, each application would be accepted on their own merit. If staff turns down an applicant the resident can appeal to the commission.

Chair LoVerde stated that property owners who are violating the grading ordinance must also be required to bring their property into code compliance prior to being eligible for the program. Hey confirmed that the program would not pay to correct drainage issues that residents have created for themselves. The commission discussed how to address projects with multiple properties. There are a lot of situations where multiple properties are affected. Elk Grove Village has a policy of projects must address a minimum of four properties. Some commissioners were willing to prioritize group projects. Chair LoVerde was interested in helping residents who were lower income. The Village Engineer indicated some communities use income as a prioritization method. Ultimately, the issue of multiple properties was tabled for the next round of discussion.

Stormwater Ordinance Update

Hey and Associates provided staff with a mark-up for the ordinance revisions. The work plan is for staff to meet and review the edits prior to presenting them to the Commission.

Next Meeting Date

The date of the next meeting will be at the call of the chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 am