

Meeting Minutes

Advisory Technical Panel – Updating Infiltration and Inflow Control Program

Location: MWRD LASMA Visitor Center

Date: March 21, 2012 1:00pm to 4:30pm

Attendees: See attached

- A. Ms. Maureen Durkin, Supervising Civil Engineer, MWRD, welcomed the ATP Members and introduced Distinguished Guest Speakers. She then discussed items that required follow-up from the previous meeting.
1. The MWRD is working on a draft mass mailing expressing the need for communities to enforce enacted ordinances and taking a stronger stance on removal of private sector I/I sources.
 2. A request was made by the COGs to the MWRD Director of Engineering to have representatives from MWRD present the status on the Updating of I/I Program at the next round of watershed counsel meetings. The schedule can be found on MWRD website under Stormwater Management.
 3. The MWRD Law Department has been requested to determine if MWRD has authority to require mandatory home inspections, and to require municipalities to enforce I/I removal work through the MWRD ordinances similar to floodplain and overhead plumbing requirements. Currently, we are waiting for a response.
 4. The MWRD Law Department was also requested to determine our authority to spend funds on private property programs. Currently, we are waiting for a response.
 5. Mr. Adam Gronski, Principal Civil Engineer, MWRD, provided the following information relative to the cost of treating excessive I/I:
 - The MWRD treats about 500 billion gallons a year and has an overall budget of \$1 Billion per year, which translates to \$2,000 per million gallons of treated flow.
 - The Egan and Hanover Park Wastewater Reclamation Plants serve separate sewer areas only, and over the years the dry weather flow and the treated flow rates have been compared. The other Wastewater Reclamation Plants (WRP) serve combined sewer areas and an estimate of I/I was determined.
 - 15%-20% of the total treated flow is estimated to be excessive I/I.
 - The impact of excessive I/I flows is not only limited to collection and treatment, but includes fixed costs and wear and tear on our conveyance and treatment facilities.
 - At Egan the average dry weather flow is 24MGD. During the 2008 storm event it was pumping at 145MGD. A WRP that serves a separate sewer area must not experience over six times high daily wet weather flow.

- Hanover Park WRP is smaller than Egan, and during that same 2008 storm, there was a danger of flooding the entire plant.
 - The bigger WRPs that also serve combined sewer areas, can handle excessive flow rates due to availability of TARP facilities, which can store excessive I/I but that reduces TARP's capacity which is intended for combined flows.
- B. Mr. Abbas Bhikapurawala, Senior Civil Engineer, MWRD, gave a slide presentation regarding the MWRD's newly created web page (mwrdd.org> Business with US>I/I Control Programs) dedicated to I/I references and resources. He appealed to the participants for suggestions and to provide literature/web links for posting there for reference.
- C. Mr. Jerome Fogel, Senior Project Manager, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD), described the MMSD's Private Property I/I Program with a slide presentation and distributed several handouts for reference. (A copy of Mr. Fogel's presentation along with handouts and links to the MMSD's program can be found on the aforesaid webpage dedicated to the I/I.) It generated lots of interest as can be seen by the follow-up questions (see below) from the ATP members.
1. Mr. Sean Dorsey, Village of Mount Prospect, asked if there are any spending restrictions for the combined or separate sewer systems. Mr. Fogel stated that there are no restrictions on funds being spent. He indicated that target areas should be addressed and that most funds are being spent in the separate sewer areas.
 2. Mr. Al Berkner, Sewer System Evaluations, asked how the MMSD is managing public expectation with respect to a specific item (overhead plumbing or a backflow preventer) that will help them with their backup problems. Mr. Fogel stated specific solutions that benefit the sole homeowner and are not removing clear water from the system are not covered under the program. The strategy of mass participation in the program through public outreach is extremely important.
 3. Mr. Al Hollenbeck, RJN Group, asked if there is a requirement of foundation drain disconnection in conjunction with lateral rehabilitation. Mr. Fogel stated that there is no requirement to disconnect on the front-end if the lateral rehabilitation is removing clear water from the system.
 4. A question was asked if laterals are allowed to be lined even if sump pumps and/or foundation drains are connected to them. Mr. Fogel replied that ideally disconnection and lining should be done together. He further explained that most communities have baseline flow data when the public system was rehabilitated, and the [private] laterals are now being addressed. The communities will do flow metering once the laterals are completed and may need to disconnect the foundation drains depending on the metering results. The MMSD does not require the homeowner to address the laterals and the foundation drains at once because it is politically unpalatable and comes with a large price

tag. The communities would like to address the lateral only; however, that is not a sole solution to remove clear water from the system.

5. Mr. Hollenbeck asked what method is used for lateral lining and how far into the lateral the lining is being done. Mr. Fogel stated that there are different philosophies of lateral ownership; some municipalities will repair a lateral only in the right-of-way (ROW) while others will repair a lateral to the connection. This issue has raised internal discussions. Since the main objective is to remove clear water from the public system, the MMSD addresses the lateral from the house to the connection. The municipalities are looking at the lateral from the connection to the ROW, because they typically do not want to get involved with the homeowner. The MMSD will allow the municipality to partially rehabilitate the lateral only if they can show that it will be effective in removing clear water from the system. Mr. Fogel stated that their primary contractor implements lateral lining conforming to ASTM 2561.
6. Mr. Hollenbeck asked if there typically is a cleanout on the lateral. Mr. Fogel indicated that there typically is not a cleanout. He stated that this aspect is part of the public outreach and education. The best rehabilitation solution is to line the lateral from the connection to the house, but it is desirable for the municipality to install a cleanout so they do not have to enter the house. He cited that some homeowners did some self educating and wanted the lateral lining to be done all the way to the house, which resulted in the contractor lining it that way. He stated that the lining is going well for now, but individual homeowners should not be requesting the contractor to line the lateral completely because it can get out of control.
7. Mr. Gronski asked about the extent of the baseline flow metering MMSD has already done and if it is continuing to be done. Mr. Fogel stated that their flow metering strategy has been in place since 1977, and has currently undergone a major overhaul. He stated that the MMSD has about 85% coverage, of which they can pull flows from individual Villages. The MMSD has substantial baseline data, but it may not be valuable to the private sector because it is not targeted. However, the data indicates that flows are being reduced and clear water is being removed from the system. He stated that they have a significant number of portable flow meters; however, establishing baseline flow data is up to the individual communities. There is an effort by the MMSD to encourage the municipalities plan 2-3 years out, and have them compile baseline flow data of target areas pre-rehabilitation so that a comparison can be made post-rehabilitation.
8. Mr. Hollenbeck asked if there is a requirement for televising individual laterals pre-rehabilitation. Mr. Fogel indicated that yes there is a pre-rehabilitation televising requirement.
9. Mr. Hollenbeck asked if surface flooding is used to simulate an event to inspect for damaged laterals. Mr. Fogel indicated that surface flooding is not a requirement on an individual basis.

10. Mr. Hollenbeck asked if there is a reliance on active leaking during the pre-rehabilitation televising of laterals. Mr. Fogel indicated that this is done case-by-case and hasn't seen a lot of them. He further elaborated that if the lateral is visibly cracked with roots in it, then that lateral will most likely be approved under the program. He gave a specific example of an individual lateral application, which is not being approved right now in general; but it is in a target area and if that specific lateral looks like the rest in the target area, then it will most likely be approved.
11. Mr. Rafiq Basaria, MWRD, inquired about a recommended portable flow monitoring device. Mr. Fogel indicated that the MMSD has ISCO portable flow meters. He also stated that it is difficult to establish a baseline flow because it may be within the error range of the meter and outside the capabilities of measuring. Peak and wet weather flows can be measured. A weir can be installed in the manhole, but when there is a storm event peak flows can not be measured. The ideal monitor to capture baseline, peak and wet weather flows has yet to be found.
12. Mr. Ross Dring, Kimberly Heights Sanitary District, asked if the MMSD has any experience grouting the laterals. Mr. Fogel stated that active leaks should be grouted prior to lining. He also stated that a WEF paper detailing a sand pour project in Seattle due to challenging topography is forthcoming. He also mentioned that he has experience with packer injection, which is done at connections and that there is technology that exists to move it up the lateral.
13. Mr. Dring expressed concerns with visual inspection of the structural integrity of the lateral during the pre-rehabilitation dry weather televising and only root infestation can only be seen. Mr. Fogel concurred stating that majority of pre-rehabilitation inspection during periods of dry weather is non-conclusive. He stated that the municipalities have crews that do televising during storm events, specifically at night. The inspection crew will televise the main line and observe the flow from the lateral at the connection to determine if there is a clear water source. The flow is observed for a period of time to ensure that flows are not from a washing machine or shower. If clear water is seen, then the homeowner will receive a letter stating that they have a clear water source, and they have 60 days to remedy it. Mr. Fogel also indicated that they have spent a large amount of money televising laterals, which is not done anymore. Dye water injection, surface water flooding and stormwater flooding can be done instead of televising, which yield good results; however, it is also not affordable to do it across the entire municipality. Therefore, the strategy to implement, as done in Portland, Seattle, is to estimate how much clear water that can be removed from a target area by assuming how much can be removed from the lateral and by disconnecting foundation drains. Then a dissipation number is determined by comparing that flow with the number of homes in the target area. All the funds are spent on a project to achieve that dissipation number, and once it is achieved the program is concluded.

14. Mr. Hollenbeck stated that if connections are not addressed at the same time of spot repairs, water will migrate and infiltrate at the connection points. Mr. Fogel agreed and that concern is part of the learning process going forward. He stated that municipalities are lining everything right now to obtain results. Mr. Fogel cited an example of two communities. One community has completed the public sector work is now targeting laterals. The other community is starting to line their public sewer system. I/I reduction results from these two communities can be compared to determine the extent of migration.
15. Mr. Fred Vogt, City of Rolling Meadows, asked if the municipalities are collaborating or working independently. Mr. Fogel stated that ideally collaboration is what was envisioned; however, all the municipalities are working independently which can be frustrating. The MMSD has a library of information that it is available to all the communities.
16. Mr. Craig Brunner, Donohue, asked if any of the municipalities have been lining storm sewers. Mr. Fogel stated that some municipalities have lined their storm sewers, but what has been surprising is how it resulted in large amounts of clear water migrating to the laterals and into the public sewer system.
17. Mr. Gronski asked if the program is part of the consent decree that the MMSD is under. Mr. Fogel stated that work was previously completed to comply with the consent decree of which the MMSD is no longer under.
18. Ms. Durkin asked if the \$62 million to be spent over the next 10-years is divided between the communities based on the amount of taxes they pay as well as the number of connections they have. Mr. Fogel stated that the funds are distributed solely on the percentage contribution of their property tax.
19. Ms. Durkin asked if there are fairness issues raised by homeowners or municipalities with regard to property values being different. Mr. Fogel cited one municipality that voiced their concern about funds being more equitably distributed (this municipality was eligible for a relatively large percentage of available funds). After doing their rehabilitation and inspection work, their result of reducing clear water was very good. Currently, equitability concerns are no longer voiced by that municipality.
20. Mr. Aaron Fundich, Robinson Engineering, asked what the percentage of homes that qualifies for the program. Mr. Fogel indicated that it depends on the age of the home. He stated that there is large number of homes that were built before the 1940's. He cited a City of Milwaukee study that half of the laterals within the MMSD service area will be 40-years or older by 2025. About 70-80% of homes in the target areas qualify for the program.
21. Mr. Jim Goumas, Hancock Engineering, asked if the cost to treat excess clear water is the basis of funding the program into the future.

Mr. Fogel stated that the cost to treat excess clear water is a contentious issue because it is very costly. The dollar value associated with treating the excess flow would have to be considered and included in the funding system, which is a very difficult value to determine. The 2020 facilities plan indicated that the MMSD treatment facilities are adequate, so the question is where does that dollar value come from? He believes that the cost to run a treatment plant is underestimated and it is complicated to get a dollar value on all the components.

22. Mr. Gronski stated that risk of flooding a treatment plant and being out of commission for a period of time are future costs that are not even considered, but should be. Mr. Fogel expanded further, with the concept of the MMSD taking over the entire sewer system. Then a value would have to include costs associated with additional infrastructure, basement backups, personal property, legal costs, etc.

[Mr. Fogel answered some individual questions after the meeting as well.]

D. Mr. Robert Covey, Village Engineer, Village of Schaumburg, gave a slide presentation regarding the Village's Footing Drain Disconnection Cost-Share Program.

1. Mr. Basaria asked if the disconnection program is part of the overhead plumbing program. Mr. Covey stated that they are similar but two separate programs.
2. Mr. Basaria asked how many disconnections have been completed and the associated cost. Mr. Covey stated that five disconnections have been done under the program and the overhead sewer program has been popular. He further elaborated that the difference between the two programs is that homeowners have a choice to participate and time to budget for the overhead plumbing program, whereas the disconnection is a code requirement, so by default, homeowners apply for the program. The average cost of disconnection is between \$4,000 and \$5,000.
3. A question was asked that if the defect is in the main line sewer, is the homeowner required to televise the entire line or expose it. Mr. Covey stated that the Village will address any maintenance issues of sewers in the ROW. The Village is not going to investigate the lateral unless there is a reason to do it. Typically, the repair or replacement of the lateral is from the foundation to the sidewalk or the property line.
4. Mr. Hollenbeck remarked that it appears that cost associated with excavation and location is already included, compared to a stand alone foundation project those costs would not be included. Mr. Covey stated that with the overhead plumbing program the Village requires three or more estimates, to make sure the quotes are comparable to the others that have been completed. With the disconnection program, the Village has been more lenient with the requirements, because additional costs should not be incurred if the lateral is already exposed and excavated and the contractor is mobilized on the site. Those costs will be included in the program and the Village will work

with the homeowner and the contractor so they can be approved as quickly as possible.

5. Mr. Hollenbeck asked if battery backups are covered under the program. Mr. Covey stated that battery backups haven't been requested to be covered by homeowners yet and is unsure if they would be covered at this time. The Village is looking into covering them and it may be something that people should be encouraged to do.
6. Mr. Vogt asked if the programs are being implemented proactively for or reactively because of problems that have been encountered. Mr. Covey stated that the overhead plumbing program is reactive because the 2008 storm events caused many homes to have backups. The footing drain disconnection program is a proactive approach to remove clear water from the sanitary sewer.
7. Mr. Bhikhapurawala stated that as part of Villages SSES (sanitary sewer evaluation study) in the late 1980's or early 1990's, extensive work was done, including smoke testing that must have detected and documented illegal foundation drain connections. Mr. Covey stated that he has not seen the report and will look into it.
8. Mr. Hollenbeck stated that smoke testing isn't necessarily reliable to detect foundation drain connections.
9. Mr. Bhikhapurawala stated that the Village has several subdivisions, so chances are if one house was detected to have a foundation drain connection, then chances are that the others in that subdivision have it as well.
10. A member of the ATP Panel stated that majority of the SSES report was done by smoke testing, not by televising, so information in the report is limited. As far as he knows, they have only televised main lines, not the service laterals, unless there is a specific reason or by a request by the homeowner.
11. Mr. Goumas asked if the Village requires point-of-sale inspections. Mr. Covey stated that there is no such requirement.
12. Ms. Durkin asked if it is appropriate to assume that if one house in a subdivision has an illegal connection, then all the homes in the subdivision have illegal connections. Mr. Joseph Pisano, Village of Hillside, stated that certain subdivisions within his Village were built by the same builder and all the houses are identical, while other subdivisions may have been built by two builders and each house is different. Therefore, that assumption may not apply to all subdivisions. Mr. Hollenbeck stated that in the Chicago area where there is no foundation tile, it is not uncommon to find trench backfill with open joints on the service lateral.
13. Mr. Flogel asked if there has been any code change with respect to not allowing foundation drains to connect to the sanitary sewer. Ms.

Durkin stated a condition of the MWRD sewer permit prohibited such connections since 1950's. Mr. Covey stated that it may have been easier and/or cheaper for the developer to make that connection.

E. Ms. Maureen Durkin gave a slide presentation detailing historical (e.g., IEPA Grant, SRF), existing (i.e., SRF, GI funding, water/sewer charges) and potential funding sources (Local Sewer Improvement Fund, User Charge System) and opened the floor for discussion:

1. Mr. Vogt stated that Special Service Areas are administratively similar to Special Assessment Districts, and the former seems to be less cumbersome than the latter. He stated that he has used Special Service Areas on projects (for street repairs, wells, septic systems), to benefit homeowners which is administered on the property tax bill. He noted that the special assessment has to be included on a public referendum and voted on. Ms. Durkin asked if a cost-share program was implemented. Mr. Vogt stated that his City pays 50% and the remaining cost is distributed among the homeowners included in the project.
2. Mr. Al Hollenbeck stated that the IEPA does not approve SRF loan funding for sanitary sewer rehabilitation on private property.
3. Mr. Dring stated that he believes that a creation of a Local Sewer Improvement Fund is problematic because each community is at a different stage of rehabilitating their own systems. The issue of fairness is raised because creating a tax on everyone to pay for all projects, is more of a benefit to a community starting their program than one that may be completing or have completed their work. Ms. Durkin stated that with this type of fund, if it can be utilized with fewer restrictions, a community that can not establish a cost-share program like Schaumburg's to the address private sector could benefit, while other communities can use it for the public sector. Mr. Dring stated that given a choice he would not participate in that fund because his community is well into addressing I/I and have been making considerable strides over the years.
4. Mr. Fundich gave an example comparison of one community with low wet weather peak flows due to an implemented rehabilitation program and another with very high wet weather peak flows, and questioned why a proactive community should pay taxes to help a community that has not reinvested into their system. Ms. Durkin acknowledged that the tax is a political fairness question.
5. Mr. Pisano stated that the fairness issue has been addressed with a modifier in insurance plans. If there is a lower frequency of liability claims, the payment into the group insurance plan is less via a modifier. To compare, if his community has less clear water entering the system, a modifier should be applied to reduce the community's tax contribution.
6. Ms Durkin asked the ATP Panel Members if a user charge system would be more appropriate. Mr. Al Hollenbeck stated that considering

the numerous connections to the MWRD system, flow metering can be very challenging. Ms. Durkin concurred and stated that back-flow can occur in the MWRD Interceptors which results in unreliable analysis of flow monitoring data.

7. Ms. Durkin asked the ATP Panel Members if there has been any experience with flow monitoring a target area of a community. Mr. Al Hollenbeck stated that this type of approach was done under ICAP, where a sewer was monitored immediately upstream of the MWRD Interceptor. Ms. Durkin asked if flow monitoring of one or two selected areas can be utilized as representing the entire community. Mr. Hollenbeck stated that it depends on how those target areas compare to the entire community.
8. Mr. Hollenbeck stated that the enabling legislation prohibits the MWRD from funding public sector rehabilitation programs, and questioned how to address funding for private sector rehabilitation programs. The homeowners want proof that their lateral needs to be rehabilitated and since it is difficult and expensive to demonstrate that the laterals are leaking, it will lead to a difficult situation where the homeowner is required to fix the lateral without definitive proof. A homeowner funded program will require increased sewer/water rates and increased taxes, and to expect them to pay for it is difficult to push. This type of situation leads to a publicly funded program instead of a homeowner funded program. Ms. Durkin asked if there were funds available to help the homeowner pay for a portion, or all of the lateral rehabilitation, will it be more amenable than the homeowner being entirely responsible? Mr. Hollenbeck stated that the program should be simplistic to attract more homeowners and encourage them to comply with lateral rehabilitation. The higher the source of funding, in this case the MWRD, the fewer objections. If the homeowners or the municipalities are expected to fund a program or by raising sewer/water rates and/or taxes, the homeowners will object to the program.
9. Mr. Fundich stated that previously it was determined that footing drain disconnection, costing between \$7,000 and \$10,000 per home, was found not to be cost-effective to remove. That analysis, which may be different if done today, showed that it was less expensive to treat the flow from the footing drains, than it was to remove it within the MWRD service area. Ms. Durkin concurred that the directly connected footing drains were subject to the cost-effectiveness analysis and that many were found not cost-effective to remove.
10. Ms. Durkin summarized the opinions of the ATM Panel Members on the three options of funding sources. Funding by the MWRD to subsidize the private sector work would be worth perusing and may be productive. The Local Sewer Improvement Fund raises fairness concerns related to taxes. The User Charge System is most appealing with regard to fairness; however, the flow monitoring, analysis and allocation of wet weather flow to a community would be extremely challenging. [There are cases where a community's flow combines with that of another one before connection to the MWRD system.

There are also cases where multiple communities connect to an MWRD interceptor making mass balancing difficult.]

11. Mr. Fundich asked how the user charge flow monitoring would work. His concern is taking into account the variability of storms impacting areas differently over the large MWRD service area. Ms. Durkin stated that the variability of a storm is a good point to consider, but the charge would be based on the amount of flow. Mr. Fundich stated that when flows are subject to a user charge, the accuracy of measuring flows become an issue. Mr. David Tang, MWRD, stated that a rain gauge is not measured; it is the amount of flow that is being pumped to the MWRD. Several communities have lift stations and know what the dry and wet weather flows rates are. The user charge would be applied to the extraneous flow, which can be quantified because the dry and wet weather flows are known. Mr. Hollenbeck gave an example of a community that implements a user charge system, which use very accurate meters that are permanently installed.
12. Ms. Durkin stated that Minneapolis has a dedicated flow-monitoring staff to maintain flow meters and to take readings. Discussions with them indicated that they do not have as many challenges and they do have an appeal process.
13. Mr. Brunner gave an example of sanitary district, which implements a user charge system. The four communities within the sanitary district are arguing with the sanitary district about the flows and related charges. His concern is to compare that four community situation with the MWRD's 125 community service area if a user charge system is implemented.
14. Ms. Durkin asked if a magnetic flow meter will have a higher accuracy for measuring flows. Mr. Hollenbeck stated that cost and accuracy are not necessarily limitations with utilizing pump station magnetic meters. The limitation is that the total area being served by separate sewer systems that discharges directly into MWRD Interceptors or immediately upstream is a very small percentage of the total sewer in the separate sewer areas. Data for pump stations upstream of MWRD Interceptors has value, but probably on a more limited basis for assessing member community peak flow rates. Mr. Fundich stated that if the flow is based from lift station, the runtime may be the only indicator of flow which is an estimate. Therefore, the lift station should have a separate user charge from that from a gravity system.
15. Mr. Daniel Feltes, MWRD, asked if the IEPA has telemetry requirements for lift stations, and if they should be able to indicate flow rates. Mr. Rob Sulski, IEPA, stated that lift stations have a runtime requirement.
16. Ms. Durkin stated that there are some significant technical hurdles for a user charge program and that a tax based program has fairness concerns. She gave a related fairness example of homeowners that pay a tax to the MWRD but they do not receive service from the MWRD.

17. Ms. Durkin asked the ATP Panel Members if there are ideas that should be discarded or if the status quo is sufficient, because the MWRD is working under the assumption that it isn't. Mr. Vogt asked if the outcome of the ATP meetings is to develop recommendations of an I/I program. Ms. Durkin stated that the ultimate goal from the ATP meetings is to generate discussions with the representatives of municipalities, townships, sanitary districts, other satellite sewer system owners and to receive their input in developing an MWRD-wide I/I reduction program. A report detailing the recommendations for an I/I program will be presented to the MWRD Board, which will result in policy direction from them.
 18. Mr. Vogt recommended a pilot project that would implement the ideas discussed to determine the advantages and disadvantages, similar to what Stormwater Management is doing in the watersheds to determine the associated costs with the Watershed Management Ordinance.
 19. Mr. Hollenbeck stated that there is political discussion to get these programs running, and once they do, they typically do well. He said that it is a classic example of funds clashing with public interest, and those funds end up being directed to where the need is. Ms. Durkin cited TARP, indicating that the entire country paid for it, but it benefits one area. Mr. Vogt stated that the same concerns were raised with his City's stormwater management fee. There was less pushback the fee started very low and it was slowly raised over time, and in hindsight it is doing well. He stressed that programs have to start small to allow people to ease into it.
 20. Mr. Dring stated that his small sanitary district is involved with an SRF loan program. He thinks it is a good program because it allows any agency the opportunity to draw funds, at a reasonable rate, to do the work they should be doing on their own. He also stated that the MWRD may be able to start a supplemental funding program, because financing is the issue.
 21. Mr. Hollenbeck asked if the legislative authority allows the MWRD to fund the public and private sector. Ms. Durkin stated that the specifics of the authority have to be further researched.
 22. Mr. Dring stated that if the MWRD were to implement a loan program, there must be an emphasis that the loan must be paid back, just like the SRF loan program. Ms. Durkin asked if the homeowner contributes to repaying the loan. Mr. Dring indicated that they are encumbered through the local sewer fee.
- F. The next meeting of the ATP is scheduled at 1:00pm on Wednesday May 16th, 2012 at the LASMA Visitor Center. Focus of the meeting will be on Private Sector. Mr. Allen Hollenbeck, RJN Group, has volunteered to make a slide presentation on private sector I/I. The Village of Palatine will also be invited to make presentation on their funding program. If anyone has a program or speaker that would like to give a presentation, contact Ms. Maureen Durkin.