

B. Glen Ellyn Saves the Monarch -

Chairman Kreuzer recapped for the group the details of this event and went on to say the goal was to plant Milkweed at various locations in town. The event is this Saturday, June 20 from 9am-11am at both Crescent/Glenwood and also at Route 53/Pershing by Health Track. Commissioner Umlauf told the group there was an on-line sign up and currently there were about 100 people who were scheduled to plant that day. The Village and Park District will provide the Milkweed and Chairman Kreuzer told the group Public Works Director Hansen received permission to plant extra milkweed along the Prairie Path as well.

C. Mayor's Bike Safety Challenge

Chairman Kreuzer informed the group there was a video on YouTube regarding this event. He also shared the poster created by Commissioner Gregory that was hanging in various places around town to promote the event. Commissioner Pulver informed the group that he finished a video yesterday about the newly installed Bike Station. He was hopeful to have it online ASAP. Chairman Kreuzer lastly challenged the Village Board and all Commission members (including other Commissions) to take the bike safety quiz.

D. Garden Walk -

Commissioner Umlauf told the group this event would be this Saturday and six gardens would be featured. She said she would be on hand for the event as the District 41 Lambert garden is one of the gardens featured. She was hopeful to recruit volunteers through the walk. Lastly, she informed the group that there had already been one delivery of food sent to the Food Pantry from the garden.

E. Volcano Mulching -

Chairman Kreuzer informed the group that 96 letters were sent out to violators. He handed out a copy of the letter and also informed the Commission that he signed it as Chairman of the Environmental Commission.

6. New Business –

A. District 87 - Glenbard West Expansion -

Chairman Kreuzer opened the meeting up to the public to discuss the District 87 Glenbard West Expansion plan. He also recapped for those present what the Commission had been charged with doing by President Demos; they've been asked to review the project and report back to the Board with their consensus and point-of-view. The Commission will then send a recommendation in the form of a letter to help the Board facilitate a fair and complete review. He went on to say that he hoped to send this letter out as soon as possible. Lastly, he told all public participants that they should not use this meeting as a substitute for the upcoming Board meeting on June 22. The current meeting is to ONLY review the projects possible environmental impact to the location and to the community. To formulate an adequate and fair opinion the Commission asked if any members of the public would like to speak to this matter.

The following people chose to speak.

- George Zahrobsky, previous EC member, retired Glenbard West Teacher and namesake to the garden in jeopardy, spoke to the Commission about what he believed it meant to the community. He went on to tell the story about how the garden started and how he generated

the funding. He wasn't sure anything could be done at this point, but he wanted to make sure to express his concern. Chairman Kreuzer told Mr. Zahrobsky that in literature sent to the Commission by District 87, it was reported that he was in favor of the project. Mr. Zahrobsky told Chairman Kreuzer this was not completely correct; he supports the building but does not support all aspects of how it is being designed. Specifically, he doesn't understand the need for such a large use of space to accommodate a loading dock, cooling towers, a generator and other things that would cause a substantial area of the hill to be destroyed. Trustee Liaison Senak asked Mr. Zabrobsky what he would like to see. Mr. Zabrobsky's response was that he was not opposed to the project and didn't dislike the original plans he saw. However, new plans have been drawn up which are more extensive, with a large wall running right through the garden. Chairman Kreuzer read from the literature sent to him from District 87 and it stated "The goal is the improvement and educational adequacy of teaching spaces".

- Dan Buchnart, recent graduate of Glenbard West spoke to the fact that the hill is used by students as a teaching tool. Commissioner Van Gorp also said the space was used for some of his classes when he attended Glenbard West. Mr. Buchnart also told the group he believed one of the reasons the school wanted to develop the space was because more students were taking science classes. He said the number of students taking science classes has doubled as they are now allowed to take more than one. He believed the reasons behind creating the space was legitimate, but he wasn't pleased with the fact that so many trees would be cut down to accomplish the task. He would like to see the school find a way around causing the destruction of the hill as he believed it was a great learning tool.

- Gerould Wilhelm, PHD, Botanist, lichenologist, Director of Environmental Services of the Conservation Design Form and co-author of the 4th edition of The Plants of the Chicago Region, was hired to perform a study of the hill and report on its condition. He gave a very lengthy description of the condition of the hill and why it would be tragic to lose it. He explained that it was rooted in native land or "remnant" land and that there were many native species of flora there that were irreplaceable. Chairman Kreuzer wanted to note for the record that he received the report Dr. Wilhelm put together and will submit it for the record. Dr. Wilhelm suggested to the group that the District reevaluate the needs of the science department and see how those needs could be met while trying to save as much of the hill as possible. He said many of the plants could be relocated but the ecosystem that exists is irreplaceable. He went on to say that native untouched ecosystems of this kind accounts for 1/2 of 1% in the entirety of the state. Trustee Liaison Senak asked Dr. Wilhelm for his opinion on whether any construction would be advisable. His response was that he did not believe any construction should take place there.

- Ron Aubrey, previous Board member of the Glen Ellyn Park District, told that group that he has firsthand knowledge of large scale projects getting done with in the Village as he worked on many; Ackerman, Maryknoll, Village Green, the restoration of Main Street, etc. He told the group that he believed either through ignorance or lack of experience the School District did not follow a process to involve the public. He said in all of the projects he was involved with, he always got residents involved in the beginning so they were part of the process, then they became affiliated with the project and would "buy in". Following this path insures projects get done with little resistance. He went on to say that he was currently working with the school on some projects and was shocked he had not heard anything about

it. He was concerned because when he went to the April 15 meeting, he came away with the idea that there was not going to be a significant loss of trees; this clearly was not the case. He also doesn't like the fact that the project has happened with lightning speed. He referenced the much smaller Churchill Board walk project which took three years to finalize. He believed information regarding the District 87 was not openly shared and not enough effort was made to communicate with the public.

- *Lisa Fagen*, Glen Ellyn resident and parent of a Glenbard West student said she has not received any information on exactly what the school needs the new building for; do they need better equipment or is there not enough room? She hasn't received any literature from the school explaining this. Chairman Kreuzer read the response he received from the District which stated the project was needed to "renovate instructional space to add much needed quality instructional space for students and staff". He went on to say that the literature he received also states that the school "doesn't anticipate any increase in student population any time in the near future".

- *Christina Sedall*, Glenbard West student and incoming president of the ECO club said she didn't believe students and teachers were unanimously in favor of the project and also learned about it quite late in the process. She went on to say she believed learning from the current environment would be more beneficial than learning on top of a green roof.

Trustee Liaison Senak asked other students who were in attendance if they could give their input.

- *Taylor Moen*, a recent Glenbard West graduate said the fact that students don't know about the garden is unfortunate. She would like to see more hands on learning there in the future, as she believed it was an underutilized part of the Glenbard West Campus.

- *Nate Grail*, a current student at Glenbard West told the group that he was not sure what the need for the new space was since it seemed to him that students were learning just fine in their current environment. He would also like to see Honeysuckle Hill better utilized as outdoor learning and suggested that maybe that could be a mission the ECO club could focus on next year.

Chairman Kreuzer asked the students in attendance if they were aware that the school was going to cut down over 200 trees to accomplish this project.

- *Dan Buchnart*, recent graduate of Glenbard West told the group that he had been involved in fundraising thru student government for the new space for the past few years. Originally, he was told that it was for a green rooftop; then the project changed at the last minute. It was only after the money was donated at the end of this past school year that he was informed it was not just going to be a green roof but also a large addition. He went on to say that he was upset that the money raised by student government was now going to be used to cut down so many trees.

Members discussed the fact that it seemed clear to them the students were not aware of the scope of the project.

- Lydia Scott, from the Arboretum, thought the project was not sending a message of conservation to current generations. She talked about the significance of this unique ecosystem and hundreds of years it took to grow. She went on to say that the Hill was part of the beauty of the campus and getting rid of it would be tragic. She (and she was sure many others) moved to Glen Ellyn to experience these exact kinds of things. For the record Chairman Kreuzer said he had a letter from her addressed to President Demos. He asked if she would like it submitted for the record; she said yes.

- Steve Windsor, recent President of Wild One of Greater DuPage, mirrored what others had said previous to him. He also spoke about the uniqueness of the ecosystem on the hill and the fact that so many forms of life make their home there; is it irreplaceable. He also believed that the school was destroying science in the name of science.

- Mike Wilson, Citizens for Glen Ellyn Preservation spoke about how Glen Ellyn has changed throughout the years with bigger houses and greater runoff. He is disappointed that diversity now is created by landscapers and much has been lost. He believed that there were other possible locations that might be viable for the project; such as the small building across the street on Crescent next to the tennis courts. He shared with the group the response he received from the District when he sent in a FOYA request asking for information regarding the project. The response was that the information could not be collected until 6/23; which is conveniently after the Village Board meeting to approve the project. All members were concerned about this response and the letter from the District regarding the FOYA request was submitted in to the record.

- Jeff Gahris, from the Glen Ellyn Sustainability Group, informed the group that he was once a member of the Commission and wanted to speak to the group about communication among various groups in town and how it is decimated. He went on to say that he understood the needs to the school, but believed the project could have moved at a slower pace so that better communication and compromise could have been accomplished. He agreed with everyone who had spoken previous to him and said the school district could also have valid points; he doesn't know and doesn't want to take a formal opinion since he doesn't believe he has all the facts to do so. He believed it would be a good idea for everyone to be better informed.

Chairman Kreuzer asked the group if anyone knew if the referendum passed to fund the project stated anywhere that there would be such a mass tree removal. Attendees of the meeting say that this was not shared in the referendum; Chairman Kurezer commented that he found this troubling.

- April Sedall, Glen Ellyn Resident and mother of Christina Sedall (who spoke previously) told the group how important she thought "hands on" learning was. She spent many years teaching at the Arboretum and spent time with kids who didn't have this kind of opportunity. She believed it would be a tragic loss to destroy the hill. She also believed an alternate location would be a great idea. She would like to see the hill kept as is and used for learning.

- Tom Condon, representing Residents of Honey Hill, told the Commission that of all the meetings he has attended he didn't believe the District wanted to listen to any alternative locations. He spoke of building up; however that would require the district displacing

students through the year in portable class rooms. He also thought the district building at the corner of Crescent and Park would be a viable solution and could offer about 24,000 sq. ft. on one level alone. He told the group that this District project has been in the works for about 5 years now, but has been fast tracked in the past 6 months. He went to say he was sorry that the Conservation Foundation could not be here tonight but he does have a memo from Brooks McDonald, President/CEO of the Conservation Foundation, which details why they believed the property was special and should be saved. He would like to submit this memo for the record. Mr. Condon also offered up a folder of information the Citizens of Honey Hill put together; all of which he would like to submit for the record. Mr. Condon gave the group a detailed overview of the project and showed members exactly what was going to be built, what it was going to house and what would happen to the hill in the process. He also informed the group about the impact of the project in conjunction with the Crescent Blvd. round-a-bout. Starting Friday, the Village will start on the retaining wall adjacent to the round-a-bout. He wondered who would be available to monitor the trees that needed protecting. Chairman Kreuzer was concerned that the EC was not notified about some of the hill being taken and trees being eliminated to accommodate for the round-a-bout; he believed the Commission should have been consulted. Trustee Liaison Senak told the group that when he asked the question about why the round-a-bout was created he was told it was a compromise with IDOT. He said there were so many roads that accessed Crescent in such a finite space that IDOT recommended that one of the roads be closed; the compromise was to create a round-a-bout. Mr. Condon went on to say that the round-a-bout will use 50 pylons; he has no idea how many the retaining wall the district project is proposing will use, but it will be more than 50 and will be 25ft high. Mr. Condon explored with members some alternatives his group had. He went on to say they are not opposed to the project, but they are suggesting changes; moving the building parallel to the school, the use of fewer or no dumpster bays and an alternative location for the cooling towers and back-up generator. All of these changes could make a major impact in saving the hill and he doesn't believe it would be a burden to the project. He also showed the group photos of the 2008 flood and the flood that happened on June 14; he believed both of these would be exacerbated with the construction of the project as it currently stands. He also informed the group that a website was started just ten days ago to help generate awareness at www.savehoneyhill.com. He gave the Commission, for the record, a petition signed by over 1,900 people and commented on by over 500, asking for the District to seek out alternatives. In closing, Mr. Condon said he was in favor of building new science labs but would like the District to consider alternative locations.

- *Tom Whalls*, Glen Ellyn resident living on Crescent, discussed his concerns with the project; which mirror others. He informed the group that he didn't believe the design was well done, it was hurried and alternatives were not investigated. He asked members if anyone knew how hard it was to get a permit finalized when you are building a house or doing an addition. He sees a disconnect between the amount of time permits take and how quickly the Glenbard West Project was being approved. He also went over with the group some of the questions he asked at various meetings: such as what kind of noise will the two cooling towers generate when running? He asked if a noise abatement study had been done and the answer he got was "we did our calculations". He also asked if an EIP (environmental impact study) had been done and he again received no answers. He believed the District was stalling and that it was important for everyone to ask questions in order to obtain information. He was also concerned about the proposed 25 ft wall and how it would affect the view off the Lake. Mr. Whalls said part of the charm of the Village and

the campus is that view. He told the group he also asked to see mock ups showing an inverted view of what the location will look like post construction. He has not seen this and was told the cost was too great. Mr. Whalls told the group that having built two houses in town he doesn't believe this is the case and is concerned the District doesn't want the public to see that view.

NOTE: Bonnie Gahris, Lisa Fagan and Joyce Hetzel (all Glen Ellyn Residents) also attended the meeting but did not speak.

After the Public Participation portion of the meeting was over Commissioners discussed what had been brought to their attention. They specifically discussed the scope of the project, storm water issues and what they as a Commission were allowed to address regarding both. Chairman Kreuzer told the group that from what he could see the Planning & Development and Public Works Departments had done their due diligence regarding the storm water issue and must be comfortable with what they have seen thus far.

Members realize they have no authority to accept or reject plans but want to consider all the information they have received so that they can come to a unanimous decision on how they want to proceed. Chairman Kreuzer told the group they couldn't critique the design but could critique its environmental impact on the community. Commissioner Umlauf told the group that she was confident more trees would die than were predicted and that Oak trees especially could not withstand the kind of impact that would likely happen if construction moves forward.

Chairman Kreuzer asked PD Liaison Frigo for her opinion and she informed the group that she did have specific Park District concerns and she addressed those with her director. Her concern was the proximity of the project to the lake and stormwater issues; knowing that the area floods. She was also concerned with relocating any plants she could: it is not an optimal solution, but better than losing them all together. She also told the group that her director had made phone calls to various Village officials about the project to gather information. She went on to read a statement on his behalf. PD Liaison Frigo went on to say that as long as the project adheres to county storm water ordinances, and the Village has no objection, the Park District will go along with the Village's recommendation.

Commissioner Van Gorp read excerpts from the Kane-DuPage Soil and Water Conservation District Land Use Opinion 15-021 Report which Planning & Development Director Hulsberg sent to members. The report recommended some kind of storm water management and runoff system be in place where water could be maintained and released at specific rates. Commissioner Van Gorp expressed concerns that the project could exacerbate flooding issues that already exist in the area. Chairman Kreuzer told the group from what he understood the Village had already reviewed the land use opinion report. They have also approved the storm water evaluations that have currently been submitted. However, he added that there would be further permitting process moving forward. Chairman Kreuzer asked if anyone had further comments about storm water issues. Park District Liaison Frigo told the group that if the green roof was not maintained it would not be an effective tool for storm water drainage. Members are concerned no system was factored in to the plan to maintain this space.

Discussion was had about permits that would need to be obtained for the project. PD Liaison Frigo told the group that when she did the Board Walk project at Churchill she had to get permits from the Village, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Storm water Conservation District. Members wonder why the scope of the Glenbard West project doesn't require the same amount of permits. They were also concerned at the speed at which the project is getting approved.

Chairman Kreuzer told the group that their directive from President Demos was to review the District 87 project in terms of its environmental impact on the community. President Demos would like the review to help the Board understand the POV of the Commission.

Possible Items to Be Included in POV Letter:

- Should the project proceed at all with respect to its environmental impact to the Community and the Lake.
- Address alternatives to the site and ultimately to the scope of what is currently planned. They were not sure that they could address what a new location could be, but they could encourage exploration of options.
- Project should be slowed down to allow for more community involvement and research on the part of the Commission.
- Concerned over lack of public input and believed there should have been more community collaboration.
- Concerned about short notice given to the community.
- Would like to see more public knowledge and better deliberation about alternative sites.
- Explore decreasing the footprint.
- Deliberate/entertain alternatives to the current location and footprint.
- Comment on the invitation given to District 87 to attend this meeting, their declination to attend personally and their decision to send written information instead.
- Express concerns about the hill, the environment, the ecosystem, the history and weather the current plan has been sufficiently vetted and deliberated.
- Encourage Board to allow full and complete deliberation on this issue.

Members discussed the fact that District 87 wanted to have this project completed by the fall of 2016. This being said, any request for delay in the project would not be favorable to the timeline laid out by the District. Trustee Liaison Senak told the group that the Superintendent, the Asst. Principal of Operations and the Architect presented at the most recent Arch. Review Commission meeting and members may want to review those minutes. He also encouraged the group to make clear in any letter they sent to the Board, what the Commission did to formulate their opinion. Also, to note that public comment was solicited from the community. He encouraged the group to let the Board know whether the EC was in favor of the project moving forward or not. He also suggested the group explain their decision and what solutions they might have to address it. He also said he would like to know if the Commission was completely opposed or if it was a split vote; a completely opposed vote would clearly have more weight as far as he was concerned.

Chairman Keruzer motioned to proceed with a vote to approve or reject the plan as presented currently and is seconded by Commissioner Pulver. Commissioner Van Gorp motioned to reject the plan as presented, and was seconded by Commissioner Short and passed unanimously.

After some discussion Chairman Kreuzer, Commissioner Short and Umlauf decide they would draft the letter of recommendation that will be sent to the Board. Chairman Kreuzer would send out a final copy to all Commissioners after it was completed.

- 7. Subcommittee Reports**
 - A. Recycling Committee - NONE**
 - B. Health & Wellness Subcommittee – NONE**
 - C. Sustainable Landscaping Subcommittee Report– NONE**
 - D. Communications Subcommittee Report – NONE**
- 8. Other Business - NONE**
- 9. Chairman Report – NONE**
- 10. Trustee Liaison Report – NONE**
- 11. Staff Liaison Report – NONE**
- 12. Confirmation of Next Meeting Date and Adjournment –**
The next scheduled regular meeting will be held on July 21, 2015.

Respectfully submitted by:
D'Arcy Greenleaf, Environmental Commission Recording Secretary

Reviewed by:
Brendon Mendoza, Environmental Commission Staff Liaison