

1  
2 **APPROVED**

3 MINUTES OF THE REMOTE/WEBEX STORMWATER COMMISSION  
4 VILLAGE OF NORTHBROOK  
5 COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
6 January 7, 2021

7 **Commissioners present (6):**

8 Chairman Thomas Burke  
9 Adele Sturgis  
10 Greg Hoeft  
11 Pedro Cevallos- arrived at 6:50 p.m.  
12 Leonard Rago  
13 Peter Rosner

14  
15 **Members not present (1):**

16 Craig Hetue  
17

18 **Others present**

19 John Albrecht, ACC Commission  
20

21 **Staff present:**

22 Matt Farmer, Village Engineer  
23 Jim Baxa, Civil Projects Engineer  
24 Colleen Brunner, recorder  
25

26 **Call to Order**

27 Member Burke called the remote meeting to order at 6:33 P.M. through a WebEx meeting.  
28

29 **Review of the Minutes from November 19, 2020**

30 Member Sturgis made a motion, seconded by member Rosner to approve the minutes as presented.  
31 On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.  
32

33 **Hear from the Audience on Topics not on the Agenda**  
34

35 John Albrecht from the ACC Commission is on the Climate Action Planning Team (CAPT). They have  
36 four workshops scheduled consisting of participants from the Village, school districts, paleBLUEdot, LLC  
37 (Village Consultant), and community members. On December 14, 2020 they met and identified goals  
38 and action plans concerning various issues.  
39

40 Member Rago, as the Stormwater Commission representative, also serves on the CAPT and stated  
41 there are several different sectors and he is on a subcommittee that is looking at ways to reduce  
42 greenhouse gases within the sectors. They will then screen criteria to evaluate and rank ways to  
43 achieve the goals. The CAPT would like to reduce Northbrook emissions 4-6%. The second workshop is  
44 January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021. The members will bring action ideas that can translate the goals into action.  
45 Examples are planting trees, increase the air conditioning temperatures in buildings and walking versus  
46 driving to destinations. In February, they will screen the criteria presented and determine who could  
47 help implement the plan. In March, the committees will review the consultant's report. The final goal is

1 to implement a plan to help Northbrook implement programs or processes to meet the world global  
2 restraints.

3  
4 John Albrecht added that at the beginning of the meeting Doug Gerleman stated that the Village  
5 should be doing more front yard gardens or native plantings to reduce stormwater flooding. Albrecht  
6 added that Gerleman stated the SWC needed more technical expertise in this area. Member Rago,  
7 explained to Albrecht the history of Gerleman's requests and presentations that included multiple  
8 meetings with Gerleman with the SWC. The Stormwater Commission felt that Gerleman was not able  
9 to provide adequate data to back up his claim of the benefits of his proposal to have plantings reduced  
10 flooding. The SWC did not take issue with the concept that deep rooted native plantings can have a  
11 positive impact for flooding. The SWC recommended that Gerleman approach the BOT with his  
12 proposal if he wanted to pursue Village funding. Albrecht stated that a letter was sent to Gerleman  
13 from Tom Poupard and from Kelly Hamill addressing Gerleman's concerns.

14  
15 Member Sturgis added that she and Burke met with Gerleman as a sub-committee of the SWC.  
16 Gerleman was not able to provide documentation of the benefits of his proposal. When Gerleman did  
17 provide a cost estimate, it was found that this method of stormwater detention was much more  
18 expensive than detention the Village was currently providing via underground detention.

19  
20 Member Sturgis asked Rago which sub committees he is on. Rago replied that he is on  
21 Transportation/Land Use, Buildings/Energy, and Water/Waste Water. He stated he would welcome  
22 comments from the Stormwater Commission that he could bring back to his sub groups.

23  
24 Member Burke thanked him for his volunteering for the Climate Committee.

## 25 26 **Old Business**

### 27 28 **a) Continued Discussion of Impervious Fees and Residential Detention Requirements from the** 29 **August 26, 2020 SWC Meeting**

30  
31 Matt Farmer explained that the SWC has previously seen most of this information at the August 2020  
32 SWC meeting, and the SWC requested additional information which will be presented tonight. Farmer  
33 recapped the current (1993) impervious fee ordinance for Northbrook. Farmer presented a slide show  
34 summarizing the policies and fees of a few neighboring communities. Next, he gave examples of the  
35 cost of detention per cubic foot using Bulletin 70, 0.15 CF/S, and the 115% multiplier. He gave multiple  
36 examples of what would be required with small and large scale projects. The Village's current policy is  
37 to provide on-site detention for any SFR improvement over 2,500 SF. He asked the Commission if the  
38 current fee structure needs to be revised.

39  
40 Member Sturgis – the impervious fee was instituted in 1993 and increased in 2003. It's been 18 years  
41 without an increase. She was concerned with the cost of detention that Farmer provided in the slide  
42 show. You don't want to make the cost so prohibitive that no one invests in improvements, but  
43 properties need to be protected from flooding. Perhaps the fees could be broken into 4 categories  
44 related to when they were constructed. Currently, we have a 3-tier fee system. The reason for the  
45 impervious fee in 1993 was to slow down further impervious coverage and make people think more  
46 economically about the stormwater runoff. The current fee is a one-time fee, so it hasn't deterred  
47 impervious coverage. The fee shouldn't be a license to flood downstream neighbors because you can

1 afford it. She would like to see the fee charged in a way that is related to actual impervious coverage  
2 of a lot rather than a percentage of the water consumption.  
3

4 Matt Farmer & Jim Baxa shared observations of residential design plans that have come in for review  
5 over the past several years. Any residential lot in Northbrook can be improved up to 50% coverage and  
6 detention is required after 2,500 SF of additional impervious coverage. Contractors are finding ways to  
7 side step the intent of the requirements by constructing 2,499 SF or less additional impervious, but  
8 eventually adding more than 2,500 SF with future permits. The Village does not keep a running total of  
9 impervious added. An example would include building a new home and at a future date adding a pool  
10 or patio and only paying a fee, rather than providing detention. Farmer presented a slide show with  
11 multiple examples of new construction and when detention would or would not be provided.  
12 Detention for commercial tear down improvements is required with no credit for existing impervious,  
13 and if an existing commercial adds impervious, the site will provide detention for any additional.  
14 Farmer presented different scenarios of impervious increases and if the situation would or would not  
15 require detention.  
16

17 Member Burke- he felt it was well presented and clear. One issue is that even the original storm sewer  
18 installed with the original subdivisions in Northbrook may have only handled the 5 year rain event.  
19 This is compounded by additional impervious, and more precipitation in 2021 than Northbrook  
20 received 60 years ago. The potential fee near \$11.88 is about 5% of a new home cost if the new home  
21 cost is at \$250/SF. For some homes that are higher price per SF, the percentage is less than 5%.  
22

23 Member Sturgis- impervious fees were originally deposited in the General Fund, which originally  
24 funded all stormwater management projects. However, often fees paid by redevelopment such as in  
25 the Northbrook Manor subdivision may be used in a completely different area of the Village. The  
26 money collected from impervious fees like Northbrook Manor may not be spent in that area, so  
27 flooding is compounded in these areas. Sturgis feels we are late in the game after so much  
28 redevelopment has occurred. How are we going to be fair to properties that have redeveloped and  
29 properties that have not when applying future fees? Sturgis feels the SWC should consider  
30 recommending a stormwater utility fee that is not a one-time cost.  
31

32 Member Hoeft- detention on each site is more valuable to us than stormwater fees. Increasing fees  
33 does not stop flooding.  
34

35 Member Burke- could the Village do aerial checks to detect new impervious areas, with or without  
36 permits. They could track increases cumulatively as related to the piece meal additions previously  
37 mentioned. Is there a reason why the Village has not picked a date (example 2008) where we would  
38 say anything installed after the date is 100% detained? Farmer said that once the SWC has an overall  
39 recommendation for how detention and fees work, Village staff can work towards collecting the data  
40 to enact the requirements.  
41

42 Burke asked how often new home owners complain about the detention required for a new SFR. Baxa  
43 stated most residents & contractors are agreeable to Northbrook's requirements. From year 2000-  
44 2008 any improvement greater than 5,000 SF required detention. In 2008, the threshold was reduced  
45 to 2,500 SF. The 2,500 SF rule works well for large lots but smaller lots often don't reach the 2,500 SF  
46 limit, so detention is rarely required even in areas that have developed to 50% coverage.  
47

1 Member Sturgis- she asked if the number of tear downs & new SFR's increased impervious could be  
2 provided. Farmer wasn't sure that information could be easily found, but will look into it. He doesn't  
3 think the impervious change is tracked in any way other than on the plan sheets. The Village does  
4 track tear downs from year to year.

5  
6 Member Rosner- several examples of incremental additions for SFR's was shown in the presentation  
7 Farmer gave. Could the incremental additions be provided or tracked by Village staff? If staff could  
8 start to track those going forward that would be beneficial. Farmer said that moving forward, tracking  
9 would not be too difficult if we figure out what we are going to do with the information so that we  
10 ensure we collect the proper data. Tracking past construction would be time consuming. Any change  
11 the SWC recommends would need to be changed in the municipal code. Rosner asked how long  
12 Northfield had been using the 1" restrictor. Farmer did not know how long they were using this size  
13 restrictor. Burke stated that there are good systems out there that work well for 1" restrictors.

14  
15 Member Sturgis – there is a report called Land Use System and Impervious Fees Paid developed by the  
16 Engineering Department from January 22, 2002. In the report it showed an addition of 90 additional  
17 acres of impervious for a certain time period. She feels there have been hundreds of acres covered  
18 since then.

19  
20 Member Cevallos- no comments.

21  
22 Member Rago- The increased impervious on smaller lots doesn't require detention but the streets will  
23 flood from the loss of pervious area. All the improvements contribute to the downstream problems. He  
24 asked what Village fund the impervious fees go to. Sturgis said it used to go into the General Fund.

25  
26 Member Sturgis- perhaps the percentage of a lot that could be covered could be different for different  
27 areas of Northbrook. Glenview used to allow lower percent coverages (45%, 40%, 35%, etc.) depending  
28 on the size of the lot.

29  
30 Member Burke- he asked that everyone comes back with some ideas relating to fees, classifications,  
31 SFR detention, and other possible changes.

32  
33 Farmer – he will provide the presentation to the commission and asked the SWC if they need more  
34 data so the SWC can make recommendations. He can put together different scenarios if the SWC  
35 requests.

36  
37 Member Sturgis – asked for a revised map of the Class I, Class II, and Class III areas in the Village. The  
38 PDF on the website is from 2003. She thinks the GIS that was shown in an earlier slide is more up to  
39 date.

40  
41 Member Hoeft – what fund do the impervious fees go to and how much have we collected annually?

42  
43 **Hear from the Commissioners concerning new topics**

44 None.

45  
46 **Next Meeting Date**

47 No Meetings Scheduled

1

2 **Adjourn**

3 There being no further business, Member Hoeft made a motion, seconded by Member Sturgis to  
4 adjourn the meeting. On a voice vote, the motion was unanimously carried and the meeting adjourned  
5 at 8:15 pm.

6

7 Respectfully submitted,

8 Colleen Brunner