
CALUMET STORMWATER COLLABORATIVE

MEETING SUMMARY – June 27, 2014

Metropolitan Planning Council

140 S. Dearborn Ave, Suite 1400, Chicago



Attendees

Brent Denzin, Ancel Glink
Dan Bounds, CDMSmith
Mason Throneburg, CH2M HILL
Jason Novota, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Nancy Williamson, Chicago Wilderness
Jason Berry, City of Blue Island
Michael Berkshire, City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development
Aaron Koch, City of Chicago Department of Water Management
Amy Ellingson, Cook County – Office of Commissioner Gainer
Gene Ryan, Cook County Department of Homeland Security & Emergency Response
Matt Harrison, Delta Institute
Vanessa Roanhorse, Delta Institute
Peter Nicholson, Foresight Design Initiative
Peter Toth, Foresight Design Initiative
Lyndon Valicenti, Foresight Design Initiative
Eric Otto, Forest Preserve District of Cook County
Dennis Dreher, Geosyntec
Joe Baldin, Hitchcock Design Group
Lisa Cotner, Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Catherine Kemp, Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant
Margaret Schneemann, Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant
Edith Makra, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus
Josh Ellis, Metropolitan Planning Council
Abby Crisostomo, Metropolitan Planning Council
Kaitlyn McClain, Metropolitan Planning Council
Bana Zayyad, Metropolitan Planning Council
John Watson, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
James Yurik, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
David St. Pierre, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
Brent Shraiberg, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
Mollie Dowling, OAI Chicago Southland
Emy Brawley, Openlands
Marry Pat Mattson, University of Illinois



Pre-meeting Exercise: Ranking Fundamental Challenges in Millennium Reserve/Calumet

Peter Opening:

- The more people you have, the harder it is, and that is why we are laying this foundation
- At this meeting, we are defining the optimized system

Of the 9 fundamental challenges below, CSC stakeholders identified numbers 1, 3, 4, and 7 as being the priority challenges that they, as a collaborative, have the ability to impact and the capacity today to address.

- 1. Consequences of non-overbank flooding.**
2. Consequences of overbank flooding.
- 3. Drain on public resources from repeated, ineffective, partial interventions.**
- 4. Drain on private resources from repeated, ineffective, partial interventions.**
5. Degraded water quality from non-point source pollution.
6. Degraded water quality from point source pollution.
- 7. Declining infrastructure performance and sufficiency over time.**
8. Overconsumption of potable water for non-potable needs.
9. Underutilization of existing assets.

The group was broken into four groups where they were asked to accomplish the following tasks.

- Define success
- Decide what optimal systems look like
- Identify root causes (even if we don't have a capacity)
- Look at what has been done to build on past successes/challenges
- What roles need to be filled?
- What expertise does CSC have?
- Learn how to work with people in the system

Group Discussions resulted in the following:

Key Root Causes to these Challenges

- Lack of clear understanding/data of extent of the problem, specifically issue areas (MWRD has data)
- Lack of strategic plan and models to inform targeted responses and smart investments
- Lack of understanding of cost-effectiveness of solutions
- Lack of coordination among efforts of organizations, municipalities, and agencies
- Fragmentation of governance
- Lack of public awareness
- Lack of sewer capacity, sewer system built too small for growth
- Lack of investment in maintenance on both property and infrastructure sides
- Rapid development without controls
- Increasingly intense and frequent rainfall (climate change)
- Outdated data on storm definitions
- Lack of understanding of economic impacts of flood risk
- Lots of uncoordinated, overlapping, small, and possibly ineffective projects producing little actual results

Key Stakeholders Needed at the Table

- Developers need to be a part of the solution, bring in to frame goals

- Developers and redevelopers; need to reduce dependence on public money
- Community groups and residents
- Businesses & Chambers of Commerce
- Elected officials (Commissioner's offices)
- Tax assessors
- Economic Development Departments
- Contractors/LAs/engineers
- Property owners
- Academic/design community can help translate engineering to compelling imagery and projects that improve the urban landscape/neighborhood improvement
- Land acquisition organizations and agencies

Current/Past Projects

- MWRD's 100-year Stormwater Management Plan: Blue Island is 1 of 5 pilot communities, receiving GI in right of ways
- MWRD Phase 2 of 100-year Stormwater Management plan, contacting 136 communities to identify flood problem areas, not yet mapped, "dangerous" to share it publicly
- Collaborative effort between CPS, DWM, Openlands, MWRD on retrofitting 4 schoolyards
- Cook County's Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Cook County Disaster funds for flood management/resiliency (\$70m)
- IDNR's GLRI-funded pilot projects
- IGIG-funded projects in Midlothian and South Holland projects (IEPA)
- IL Clean Water Initiative/State Revolving Loan Fund (IEPA) can be used for stormwater management
- CMAP LTA program helping communities identify policies to help target investment
- MWRD's Rain Barrel/Downspout Disconnection Project
- DWM's Sewer Capital Program
- City of Chicago (DWM's) Green Infrastructure program (\$50m over 5 years)
- Watershed Management Ordinance (MWRD)
- Chicago's Green Streets program will require green infrastructure; CDOT is changing the paradigm for street design
- SSMMA is looking for green infrastructure investments from many sources and trying to get less affluent communities to buy in
- Landscape architects are designing functional streetscapes
- MWRD stormwater model of regional system, but not local systems
- DWM sewer model of local capacity in Chicago (by CH2MHill)
- City (DPD) has surface flowpath model for the entire city (by Hey & Associates)
- SSMMA is mapping resource layers in order to identify opportunity areas
- GIV map identifies connectivity and opportunities (including FEMA floodplains), particularly for land acquisition orgs (CCLBA, So Suburban Land Bank, FPDCC)
- CCLBA wants to overlay vacant properties (and buildings??) with stormwater management/flood problem areas to identify stormwater management opportunities (including alley drainage improvements and returning it for public use)
- City Green Healthy Neighborhood (DPD) maps identifies properties with SWM potential, could be shared with CCLBA

Key Needs and Roles for Collaborative

- Identify shared desired outcomes, goals, targets, and metrics

- Compile and share information and look for overlaps and gaps
- Identify and fill gaps in knowledge (research agenda?)
- Coordinate functions, projects, investments (shared database of projects, funding, etc.?)
- Get everyone working off of same map and understanding of problem
- Identify concrete actions that we need to take; formalize process for action steps
- Goal of CSC is to bring niche projects together; how can we unite them to reach a larger goal?
- Do we need a central organization leading the charge? Should MWRD have this role?
- We need a guide for green infrastructure in Calumet communities; how do we move beyond the first adopter municipalities?
- Get community buy-in by integrating infrastructure development with job creation
- Adopt a pledge for mayors; MMC air quality pledge got 114 mayors on board
- Public education on context of problem (increase availability and accessibility of information on every scale i.e. from homeowners/individuals to business owners)
- Coordinate bulk discount on materials and implementation

Mission & Vision Statements Review

Members were asked to provide their feedback on three draft mission statements and three draft vision statements.

Draft Mission Statements (should describe purpose of organization):

Option 1) The Calumet Stormwater Collaborative seeks to improve the capacity, knowledge and technology of stakeholders and stormwater managers throughout the Calumet to minimize the negative impacts of precipitation and maximize the positive impacts.

Option 2) The Calumet Stormwater Collaborative seeks to build intergovernmental and cross-sector partnerships to improve the Calumet region's ability to manage precipitation now and into the future.

Option 3) The Calumet Stormwater Collaborative seeks to increase the effectiveness of stormwater management initiatives throughout the Calumet region through knowledge sharing, coordination, and deployment of solutions at appropriate scales.

Draft Vision Statements (should describe the desired end-state and is best present in the future tense)

Option 1) The Calumet region will be a model of coordinated deployment of knowledge, technology, and financial resources to manage stormwater efficiently and sustainably.

Option 2) The Calumet region will be able to minimize the negative impacts of precipitation and maximize the positive impacts in a wide range of foreseeable storm scenarios.

Option 3) The Calumet region will be a better place to live, work and recreate as a result of coordinated stormwater management investments and initiatives.

The following feedback on the **mission statements** was collected:

Jason's Table

- Options 2 and 3 were most preferred.
- Terms people liked to keep:
 - Capacity

- Minimize negative impacts of precipitation (rainwater) and maximize positive benefits
- Intergovernmental and cross-sector partnerships
- Effectiveness of stormwater management
- Coordination
- Deployment of (effective stormwater management solutions) at appropriate scales
- Might be missing:
 - Community and environmental impact (“sustainable” was mentioned as a surrogate term); thriving communities
 - Get implementation projects going on the ground to have real impact and improvement on the ground
 - Results driven

Emy’s Table

- Calumet? Millennium Reserve? Calumet region?
- Preference: Option 1
- Liked:
 - “Stakeholders” as an inclusive term, no need to include “Stormwater Managers” redundant
 - Option 1 is more specific about what you get out of partnerships: capacity, knowledge, technology...
- Missing: “collaboration” or “coordination” needs to be added... i.e., to Option 1: The Calumet Stormwater Collaborative promotes better coordination to improve the capacity, knowledge and technology of stakeholders throughout...
- Disliked: Option 3 does not capture “new” initiatives.

Ryan’s Table

- "Intergovernmental & Cross-sector partnerships" is very important
- Don't necessarily need the "how" in the mission; can reside in goals, objectives and strategies
- 2 & 3 preferred
- 2 is concise, yet broad/general enough...
- "Through knowledge-sharing" etc. implies action. Action is good.
- Don't imply solved or say "solution". There will always be problems. Ideal is continuing improvement. Always moving towards an evolving ideal.

The following feedback on the **vision statements** was collected:

Jason’s Table:

- Options 1 and 2 were most preferred.
- Terms people liked
 - Deployment
 - Deployment of knowledge, tech, and fin resources
 - Foreseeable storm scenarios (long term view)
 - Quality of Life (i.e., the live, work, and recreate stuff)
 - Coordinated stormwater management investments and initiatives

Emy’s Table:

- No need for Option 2 if we stick with Option 1 for Mission.

- Option 3 has the “Why”... however the why is not aspirational enough i.e., “better” does not describe how much better. The idea of setting a new bar or serving as a model gets to being aspirational.
- Liked: “deployment” as way to capture our action-oriented approach.

Ryan’s Table:

- Allow for multi-objectives (more than just stormwater) to co-exist, but stormwater is OUR collaborative focus. Can provide specific stormwater guidance in goals/objectives/strategies
- Aspire to a higher vision/ideal
- 3 is preferred, but maybe somewhere between 1 and 3.
- 2 is “lifeless”
- 2, however, implies a need to be flexible in changing climate, etc.

Fundamental Challenges Discussion

Of the 9 fundamental challenges, CSC stakeholder breakout groups took one of the challenges identified (1, 3, 4, and 7 listed above) and provided key issues related to each challenge. Each group discussed the following:

Jason (Issues 3 & 4):

- Problem of ineffective investments
- Lack of coordination between government foundations, communities—need “one stop shop”
- Lack of mapping to understand problem areas
- Piecemeal projects are not effective and lead to wasted money
- Assessment of recent investments and do they align with problem areas?

Erin (Issue1):

- Problem of flooding related to sewer issues
- CSC should promote sharing and coordination
- Data sharing to drive impactful development
- Public engagement, elected official engagement
- Green infrastructure→ Who?

Ryan (Issue 7):

- People and property should be safe
- Buildings should be resilient
- Need financing mechanisms to develop and maintain projects
- Developer community not held to high enough standards
- City’s WMO is great effort and we should build on this
- Developer and public communication is crucial
- Coalesce around shared idea

Backbone organization to move this forward

Millennium Reserve Update

- MR Report is available to public
- IEPA grand funding for green infrastructure/planning for Calumet Region/Cook County
- Coastal management program: draft doc is up on website and feedback is welcome
- MWRD: Chicago Calumet River Fund is now open for applications

Meeting Summary/Debrief

Josh:

- Overview of homework assignment
- Goal is to determine an organization that will be the home for these ideas by April 2015
- MPC will send out groups identified in exercise
 - Groups will meet and present at next meeting
- By August 1, CSC will have concrete action plan and future meetings will focus on those working groups

Next Meeting

Friday, August 1, 10:15am to 12:00pm
Blue Island City Hall Annex
2434 Vermont Street, Blue Island

For more information contact:

Josh Ellis
Metropolitan Planning Council
312.863.6045
jellis@metroplanning.org