

1
2 Member Reynolds made a motion, seconded by Member Hetue to accept the minutes of the
3 February 15, 2023 meeting as amended. On a voice vote, the motion to approve the minutes as
4 presented passed, with no member abstaining.
5

6 **2) Hear from the Audience on Topics not on the Agenda**

7 Chairman Burke stated that they would hear from the Audience on topics not on the agenda.
8

9 Phil Barras asked where the minutes from the previous meetings were located. He explained
10 that he looked on the website but could not find them.
11

12 Member Sturgis stated that the minutes should be on the website.
13

14 Beladi replied he would investigate the issue. He stated that in the interim, Barras could reach
15 out to Jack Bielak for the minutes.
16

17 **3) Old Business**

18 Chairman Burke stated that there was no old business.
19

20 **4) New Business**

21 Chairman Burke stated that new business would be a presentation from Engineering Resource
22 Associates covering Addendum 3.
23

24 Marty Michalisko introduced himself and his colleague Mike Maslowski. Michalisko stated that
25 ERA had finished Phase 2 of Addendum 3, which was the existing conditions analysis of the 8
26 project areas. He explained that they were now in Phase 3, which was the proposed conditions
27 analysis. He stated that he would be presenting the existing conditions of the 8 areas, while
28 Maslowski would be presenting the proposed alternatives. He explained that after each area
29 was presented, they would ask for feedback from the Commission and the Audience.
30

31 Michalisko presented a map of the Village with the 8 project areas called out.
32

33 Michalisko stated that the presentation would begin with Project 13A – 1000 Woodbine Lane.
34 He presented a MWRD 100 year inundation map of the area surrounding Project 13A. He
35 explained that looking at the map, it was likely that there was a historical overland flow path
36 that went through the area. He stated that development of the area over time likely disrupted
37 this path, which has led to the current flooding issues.
38

39 Michalisko presented the same 100 year inundation map, but now it was zoomed into Project
40 13A. He stated that the storm sewers from Shannon Road and Crabtree Lane combined into a
41 single storm sewer on Woodbine Lane which then travelled east to Western Avenue. He
42 explained that the location was a digressional area. He stated that when the system was
43 inundated, the sewers surcharged and flooded the area. He explained that when the flooding

1 got high enough, the overland flow path travelled between the houses to Western Avenue.
2 Michalisko stated that there were 55 acres directly tributary to the area.
3

4 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that they
5 were able to improve their models from the MWRD maps using information provided by Village
6 Staff. He explained that the 10 year map showed flooding with some overland flow to Western
7 Avenue, and the 100 year map showed significant flooding with significant overland flow to
8 Western Avenue. He stated that the models closely mimicked what residents had mentioned.
9

10 Chairman Burke asked if the MWRD models included localized storm sewers.
11

12 Michalisko replied that the MWRD models only included storm sewer pipes that were 24 inches
13 or larger.
14

15 Chairman Burke asked if they calculated the capacity of the system with no inundation.
16

17 Michalisko stated that they had not run any models below 10 year events.
18

19 Barras asked what MWRD stood for.
20

21 Michalisko replied that MWRD stood for Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater
22 Chicago. He explained that they were in charge of water management in Cook County. He
23 stated that in 2016 they released inundation maps. He explained that due to the massive area
24 being mapped, only pipes 24 inch or larger were used in the model.
25

26 Member Sturgis asked if the more detailed models were updated to use Bulletin 75.
27

28 Michalisko replied that they used Bulletin 75.
29

30 Michalisko stated that they would move on to the proposed alternatives.
31

32 Maslowski presented Alternative 1 for Location 13A. He stated that Alternative 1 would reroute
33 the Adelaide Drive storm sewer south to a new detention facility on the school district
34 property. He explained that the Adelaide Drive sewer reroute would divert about 8.2 acres of
35 the tributary area from the Woodbine Lane storm sewer system to the new detention facility.
36 Maslowski stated that the storm sewer on Shannon Road west of the intersection with Adelaide
37 Drive would be rerouted to the new detention facility as well. He explained that the Shannon
38 Road reroute would divert about 8.9 acres of the tributary area from the Woodbine Lane storm
39 sewer system to the new detention facility. Maslowski stated that Cherry Lane storm sewer
40 would also be rerouted into the detention facility to help relieve the storm sewer system
41 downstream. He explained that 4 acre-feet of storage would be required to provide a 10 year
42 level of service. He elaborated that 1,150 feet of storm sewer pipe would also be required.
43 Maslowski stated that this option would require coordination with Westmoor School.
44

1 Member Reynolds asked how they calculated the 4 acre-feet of storage.

2
3 Michalisko replied that they iterated the model until they got a 10 year level of service. He
4 stated that the benefit of Alternative 1 was that if you increased the storage above 4 acre-feet,
5 you could potentially help other problem areas nearby.

6
7 Michalisko stated that they assumed underground would be only viable option as park districts
8 and schools did not like losing usable land.

9
10 Chairman Burke asked Michalisko to define a 10 year level of service.

11
12 Michalisko responded that a 10 year level of service meant a half foot or less of street flooding
13 during a 10 year rain event.

14
15 Maslowski presented Alternative 2 for Location 13A. He stated that this alternative assumed
16 that Westmoor School did not want to have storage. He explained that the next space available
17 for underground storage would be Greenbriar School. Maslowski stated that 2,880 feet of
18 storm sewer improvements would be required between Woodbine Lane and Greenbriar School.
19 He explained that 7.2 acre-feet of storage would be required to provide a 10 year level of
20 service. Maslowski stated that this option would require coordination with the Greenbriar
21 School.

22
23 Michalisko stated that this alternative would also provide a benefit for the areas between
24 Greenbriar School and Woodbine Lane. He explained that the 10 year and 100 year inundation
25 maps of the area showed overland flooding between Greenbriar School and Woodbine Lane.

26
27 Maslowski presented Alternative 3 for Location 13A. He stated that this put the underground
28 storage in the Village's right-of-way on Western Avenue. He explained that 8 acre-feet of
29 storage would be required to provide a 10 year level of service. He elaborated that 384 feet of
30 storm sewer improvements would also be required.

31
32 Michalisko stated that this alternative would be trickier. He explained that according to their
33 atlases, Western Avenue appeared to have all of its utilities installed under the west parkway.

34
35 Chairman Burke asked whether there appeared to be flooding issues downstream of Woodbine
36 Drive according to the models.

37
38 Michalisko replied that once you get over the 10 year events, there was a significant overland
39 flow path through the area.

40
41 Beladi stated that in 2019, the Village did a MSMP project on Blackthorn Lane. He explained
42 that the project should have alleviated some flooding issues in the corridor.

43
44 Chairman Burke asked if there were any comments.

1 Member Reynolds stated that if they could not acquire the land needed for underground
2 storage west of Westmoor School, there was land to the east owned by the church.
3

4 Michalisko stated that moving from west of the school to the land east would not change
5 Alternative 1 drastically.
6

7 Beladi stated that he believed it would be easier to work with the school district than the
8 church. He explained that staff already had a positive relationship with the school district.
9

10 Member Sturgis asked if they had calculated the number of properties benefited for each
11 alternative.
12

13 Michalisko replied that they did not have that calculated at this stage.
14

15 Member Sturgis stated that she was nervous about the cost of having large underground
16 detention. She explained that Westcott Park was the Village's most expensive stormwater
17 project ever. She asked how much prices had gone up since then.
18

19 Michalisko replied that prices for underground storage had gone up quite a bit. He stated that
20 he estimated \$300,000 to \$400,000 per acre-foot of underground storage. He explained that
21 they could calculate a value for cost per property benefited.
22

23 Member Sturgis stated that she remembered the school district not being keen on
24 underground storage when staff talked to them before regarding Marcee Lane. She asked if
25 staff or ERA had reached out to the school district.
26

27 Michalisko replied that they had not reached out. He stated that it would be good to contact
28 the school district sooner rather than later.
29

30 Chairman Burke stated he was worried about the scope of the project being too large for
31 Alternatives 2 and 3. He explained that Alternative 1 looked like the best option.
32

33 Michalisko stated that they ordered the alternatives so Alternative 1 was the one they thought
34 was the best.
35

36 Chairman Burke stated that he thought that the school district would be accepting of
37 underground storage. He explained that what they did not want was to take on more water
38 from Marcee Lane without also having detention built.
39

40 Beladi stated that he was in communication with the school district about Marcee Lane and
41 that Chairman Burke was correct. He explained that the school district would be receptive to
42 the Village building projects on their property if it benefitted them.
43

1 Michalisko stated that the next two areas, Project 13B – Marcee Lane/Villa Court and Project 11
2 – Jeffery Lane, would be covered together due to their close proximity. He presented a MWRD
3 100 year inundation map of the area surrounding Project 13B and Project 11. He explained that
4 looking at the map, you could see flooding at Project 13B, but not at Project 11. He stated that
5 they would touch on why that was in a bit.

6
7 Michalisko presented the same 100 year inundation map, but now it was zoomed into Project
8 13B. He stated that it was a small area that was depressed. He explained that there were 4.8
9 acres directly tributary to the area.

10
11 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that once
12 the depression at Marcee Lane filled up, it flowed between the houses to Meadowbrook
13 School. He explained that the easiest solution would be to cut a swale to Meadowbrook School.
14 He stated that due to the existing flooding issues at Meadowbrook School, the school district
15 did not want that solution.

16
17 Michalisko presented a MWRD 100 year inundation map zoomed into Project 11. He stated that
18 Jeffery Court West did not have a ponding issue, rather the swale running to Waukegan Road
19 was not working as intended. He explained that over time, the overland route had been
20 disturbed by development. Michalisko stated that there were 2 acres directly tributary to
21 Jeffery Court West and 17.5 acres directly tributary to Jeffery Lane.

22
23 Jubie Ryan stated that the map did not show the relief valve between Jeffery and Woodhill.

24
25 Michalisko responded that the new models took that pipe into account.

26
27 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that the
28 surcharging on Woodhill Drive was due to the undersized pipe and elevation difference. He
29 stated that the model showed the overland flow issues by Jeffery Court West.

30
31 Beladi asked if there were any questions before they moved to the alternatives.

32
33 Barras stated that he was concerned that Jeffery Court West did not have any blue in the
34 model.

35
36 Maslowski responded that the MWRD model was not as detailed as the new models they
37 created, which was why it was not shown in the MWRD model.

38
39 Michalisko stated that they would move on to the proposed alternatives.

40
41 Maslowski presented Alternative 1 for Location 13B. He stated that Alternative 1 included
42 upsizing 723 feet of pipe and constructing underground storage in the Village right-of-way on
43 Church Street. He explained that 0.5 acre-feet of storage would be required to provide a 10

1 year level of service. Maslowski stated that the storm sewer would surcharge down Chapel
2 Court towards Church Street where it would be captured.

3
4 Maslowski presented Alternative 2 for Location 13B. He stated that Alternative 2 included
5 upsizing 1,078 feet of pipe and constructing underground storage in the Village's right-of-way
6 on Church Street. He explained that 2 acre-feet of storage would be required to provide a 10
7 year level of service. Maslowski stated this alternative would not have the system surcharge
8 down Chapel Court towards Church Street.

9
10 Maslowski presented Alternative 3 for Location 13B and Location 11. He stated that 1,550 feet
11 of storm sewer improvements would be required on Jeffery Lane, Jeffery Court West, Jeffery
12 Court North, Jeffery Court South, and Portsmouth Court. He explained that the water would be
13 taken to Waukegan Road and then flow overland behind the houses on Marcee Lane to
14 underground detention at Meadowbrook School. He elaborated that 4.75 acre-feet of storage
15 would be required to provide a 10 year level of service. Maslowski stated that this option would
16 require coordination with the Meadowbrook School and would help with the school's flooding.

17
18 Maslowski presented Alternative 4 for Location 13B and Location 11. He stated that it was the
19 same as Alternative 3, but included grading and swales for conveyance through private
20 property instead of backyard inlets.

21
22 Michalisko stated that Location 11 dealt with a lot of private property. He asked if the Village
23 had a Cost-Share Program.

24
25 Chairman Burke replied that the Village did have a Cost-Share Program. He explained that this
26 was added to the list due to the amount of properties affected. He stated that if they restored
27 the swale, the issue would reappear in a decade or two.

28
29 Michalisko asked if the Village could do a walkthrough with ERA at Jeffery Court West.

30
31 Chairman Burke asked where the storm sewer went after Waukegan Road.

32
33 Michalisko replied that it went to a backyard swale and pipe. He explained that the system
34 surcharged and flowed to Meadowbrook School.

35
36 Beladi stated that there was both a swale and pipe in the backyards.

37
38 Chairman Burke asked if they would be replacing the pipe.

39
40 Michalisko replied that Alternative 3 and 4 did not have the pipe west of Waukegan Road being
41 replaced.

42
43 Member Sturgis asked if they could use the empty land northeast of Meadowbrook School.

1 Maslowski replied that the area was rather steep which made it not ideal for storage.
2
3 Michalisko stated that it was 4 to 5 feet higher than the surrounding area so they would have to
4 do more excavation before installing storage. He asked if the school used that space often.
5

6 Chairman Burke replied that the school did not use it often. He asked if the 4.75 acre-feet
7 would benefit the school.
8

9 Maslowski replied that it would help the school. He stated that if they decided to go down this
10 route, they could quantify the benefit for the school. He explained that Alternative 3 would be
11 good without the storage. He elaborated that the water flowed here anyway so they would not
12 increase the flooding.
13

14 Member Sturgis suggested that they might consider acquiring some land from 1302 Waukegan
15 Road, which was south of the plot of land at the northeast corner of the school. She stated that
16 the property had recently been bought.
17

18 Michalisko stated that the area would probably not be large enough to contain all the storage
19 necessary. He explained that they could reach out to the property if the Commission chose to
20 pursue Alternative 3 or 4.
21

22 Barras stated that in previous meetings it was discussed that the water was coming from
23 Hillside Road. He explained that he did not see any mention of Hillside Road here.
24

25 Maslowski stated that Hillside Road was at the edge of the sub-basin and the water came down
26 from there.
27

28 Michalisko stated that they could do improvements in the rear yards closer to Hillside Road to
29 catch the water. He explained that the residents would probably not agree to have the work
30 done however, since they did not have any issues.
31

32 Barras stated that none of the people behind him on Chapel Court had any problems. He
33 explained that it was unlikely to get help from them for this project. He stated that they should
34 put the 12 inch pipe in the backyards of Jeffery Court North.
35

36 Steve Levy stated that the water was coming from multiple different directions. He explained
37 that they would need inlets in multiple locations.
38

39 Michalisko stated that it was coming from different directions due to the surrounding area
40 being steep. He explained that getting inlets at a few key locations could drastically improve the
41 situation.
42

43 Chairman Burke stated that when the Commission looked into this before, there was reports of
44 water coming from the Chapel Court storm sewer. He explained that when the system was

1 overburdened, the water overflowed from the road to the backyards and then to Jeffery Court
2 West.

3
4 Levy stated that the flow shown in the model was different than real life. He explained that the
5 water shot straight at his house due to all the buried downspouts from Chapel Court
6 discharging by his fence.

7
8 Michalisko stated that they could shoot catch basins into the backyards to help with the
9 problem. He explained that constructing them would cause major disruptions. Michalisko
10 stated that Alternatives 3 and 4 set up the infrastructure for catch basins to be connected from
11 the backyards. He explained that the cost usually was not the limiting factor for these type of
12 projects, rather it was getting permission to construct in private property.

13
14 Barras stated that they should put a catch basin in the backyard of the property on Chapel
15 Court that had the waterfall of water.

16
17 Beladi stated that any construction on private property would require easement acquisition. He
18 explained that it would be hard to get properties on board when they were not experiencing
19 any problems.

20
21 Michalisko stated that the next area would be Project 12 – Westcott, Maple, and Oak. He
22 presented a MWRD 100 year inundation map of the area surrounding Project 12. He stated that
23 the trunklines all converged around the Grainger property. He explained that the entire area
24 was lined with residential and had little greenspace. He elaborated that the lack of greenspace
25 made solving the issue difficult.

26
27 Michalisko presented the same 100 year inundation map, but now it was zoomed into Project
28 12. He stated that there were a number of houses heavily affected in the area. He explained
29 that they did not want to push water downstream and create further problems. Michalisko
30 stated that there were 17.2 acres directly tributary to the area.

31
32 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that the
33 model showed a lot of flooding in the right-of-way, which was better than structure flooding.
34 He explained that they had to be careful not to push more water into right-of-way and cause
35 structure flooding downstream.

36
37 Michalisko stated that they would move on to the proposed alternatives.

38
39 Maslowski presented Alternative 1 for Location 12. He stated that Alternative 1 included
40 minimal storm sewer improvements which would direct stormwater into underground cisterns
41 located in the Village's right-of-way on Westcott Road. He explained that 0.98 acre-feet of
42 storage would be required to provide a 10 year level of service.

43

1 Michalisko stated that the issue was localized. He explained that the Grainger property would
2 have been very useful for solving this issue.

3
4 Maslowski presented Alternative 2 for Location 12. He stated that Alternative 2 included 998
5 feet of storm sewer improvements which would direct stormwater into underground cisterns
6 located in the Village's right-of-way on Western Avenue. He explained that 2.2 acre-feet of
7 storage would be required to provide a 10 year level of service.

8
9 Michalisko stated that due to the lack of open space, underground storage in the Village's right-
10 of-way was the only solution. He explained that these solutions would not help properties
11 downstream.

12
13 Member Sturgis stated that Addendum 3 was the third time they had looked at this area. She
14 explained that she was surprised with the amount of storage needed. She elaborated that they
15 had been told that they would have to buy several lots to get enough storage.

16
17 Michalisko responded that the lots were very small and that you would probably need 8 lots to
18 get the same amount of storage. He stated that these solutions were very local.

19
20 Member Sturgis asked how recently this part of Western Avenue street had been worked on.

21
22 Beladi replied that it was worked on recently and there was also a water main project done by
23 Maple Avenue. He explained that they might be able to get utility information from those plans.
24 Beladi stated that they had looked at more alternatives, but these were the only feasible ones.
25 He explained that one idea was to put detention in Shermer Road, however there were too
26 many utilities.

27
28 Michalisko stated that local underground storage was the only way you could do it, unless a
29 property similar to Grainger became available. He explained that the entire system was backed
30 up.

31
32 Member Sturgis asked if they would have these problems if the pipe going to the river was
33 larger.

34
35 Michalisko stated that it would help with the flooding, however it would mean much more
36 water going into the river. He explained that the increased flow into the river would affect
37 floodplain properties downstream.

38
39 Member Sturgis asked if oversized pipe would create storage.

40
41 Michalisko replied that it would create more conveyance to the river. He explained that if you
42 had restrictors then you could possibly equate it to storage.

43

1 Michalisko stated that the next area would be Project 10 – Sunset Lane. He presented a MWRD
2 100 year inundation map of the area surrounding Project 10. He stated that a recent project
3 was helping with flooding on the east portion of Sunset Lane. He explained that now they
4 would have to help the west portion. Michalisko stated that there were 16.1 acres directly
5 tributary to the area.

6
7 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that the
8 models showed that the water travelled overland into backyards when the road was full.
9

10 Michalisko stated that they would move on to the proposed alternatives.
11

12 Maslowski presented Alternative 1 for Location 10. He stated that Alternative 1 included 1,114
13 feet of storm sewer improvements which would direct stormwater into the storm system on
14 Sanders. He explained that 0 acre-feet of storage would be required to provide a 10 year level
15 of service.
16

17 Maslowski presented Alternative 2 for Location 10. He stated that Alternative 2 included 829
18 feet of storm sewer improvements which would tap onto the previous improvement. He
19 explained that you would need a backflow preventer installed where it tapped onto the
20 previous improvement. He elaborated that 0 acre-feet of storage would be required to provide
21 a 10 year level of service.
22

23 Chairman Burke asked if the storm sewer on Commercial Avenue had capacity.
24

25 Maslowski stated that in the 100 year model there was a small impact. He explained that he
26 had not looked at the 10 year model to see the impacts on Commercial Avenue.
27

28 Beladi stated that both systems would eventually reach the storm sewers on Sanders Road and
29 shed north.
30

31 Member Sturgis asked if there was any consideration for when the smaller properties on Sunset
32 Lane were redeveloped.
33

34 Michalisko replied that from the standpoint of runoff, they were making sure they followed
35 Bulletin 75. He stated that they had not considered the change in impervious when a lot was
36 redeveloped. He asked if the Village had detention requirements.
37

38 Chairman Burke replied that the Village did have detention requirements.
39

40 Michalisko replied that with proper detention, the runoff should not change dramatically.
41

42 Member Sturgis stated that on Western Avenue and Oak Avenue, the redevelopment without a
43 unified stormwater plan was worsening the existing issues.
44

1 Michalisko stated that issues at Western Avenue and Oak Avenue were a product of past design
2 standards not requiring adequate detention or overland paths of travel. He explained that in an
3 ideal world you would not rely solely on pipe but instead overland flow as well.

4
5 Chairman Burke stated that there were 2 good alternatives here.
6

7 Michalisko stated that for the next 3 locations, they were still developing modeled alternatives.
8 He explained that the solutions for these locations would be less complex.
9

10 Michalisko stated that the next area would be Project 33 – Longvalley Drive. He presented a
11 MWRD 100 year inundation map of the area surrounding Project 33. He stated that the area
12 was east of Northfield Township. He explained that Northfield Township was planning on doing
13 a stormwater project west of Longvalley Drive.
14

15 Michalisko presented the same 100 year inundation map, but now it was zoomed into Project
16 33. He stated that the flooding was localized. Michalisko explained that there were 29.3 acres
17 directly tributary to the area.
18

19 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that it did
20 not look like there was much flooding outside of the right-of-way. He explained that the
21 Northfield Township project might help with capacity issues in the pipes. Michalisko stated that
22 he did not feel that this area was as bad as the previous locations.
23

24 Member Sturgis stated that she remembered that flooding of the home at 1709 Longvalley
25 Drive originating in the rear yard.
26

27 Maslowski stated that the model did not show flooding in the rear yard. He explained that he
28 visited the site and the rear yard was a plateau that was much higher than the street. He
29 elaborated that it looked like a local drainage problem that could be solved with a swale being
30 cut from the back yard to the front yard.
31

32 Member Sturgis stated that the resident had window well flooding from the rear yard.
33

34 Michalisko stated that the street flooding was not affecting the rear yard flooding. He explained
35 that solving the street flooding would not help the resident's window wells.
36

37 Chairman Burke asked if they had photos from the residents on Longvalley Drive.
38

39 Maslowski replied that they had a video of window wells flooding.
40

41 Member Reynolds stated that he remembered the rear yard and street flooding being separate
42 issues based off what the residents said in past meetings.
43

1 Chairman Burke stated that something did not seem right. He explained that being next to the
2 unincorporated area could mean they were not getting the full picture.

3
4 Maslowski stated that the resident told him that all the water came into the back yard from
5 adjacent properties. He explained that the neighbor had installed a swale in the side yard.

6
7 Michalisko asked if a swale would work.

8
9 Maslowski replied that they would have to get survey data to make sure the elevations worked.
10 He stated that the models did take into account data from the unincorporated area. He
11 explained that he thought it was a local drainage problem.

12
13 Michalisko asked if the Village could do a walkthrough with ERA at 1709 Longvalley Drive. He
14 stated that this seemed like a local drainage problem.

15
16 Member Sturgis stated that there were houses with downspouts connected directly to the
17 storm sewer. She explained that this was not allowed by the Village and could be contributing
18 to the flooding issues.

19
20 Michalisko stated that they would do some field investigations at 1709 Longvalley Drive and
21 then get back to the Commission next meeting.

22
23 Michalisko stated that the next area would be Project 5 – Bordeaux Drive. He presented a
24 MWRD 100 year inundation map of the area surrounding Project 5. He stated that the area was
25 south of Project 33, but it was in a different system.

26
27 Michalisko presented the same 100 year inundation map, but now it was zoomed into Project
28 5. He stated that there flooding in the intersection and that there were some houses that
29 reported flooding. Michalisko explained that there were 17.7 acres directly tributary to the
30 area.

31
32 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that the
33 flooding was being caused by a bowl in the intersection. He explained that the top of the bowl
34 was south of the intersection and was slightly higher than the driveway. Michalisko stated that
35 there already appeared to be a 10 year level of service. He explained that any conveyance
36 improvements would require storage to prevent additional surcharging at Sanders Road.

37 Michalisko stated that recent improvements included additional inlets and a raised window
38 well. He explained that the Village could potentially lower the roadway profile so the bowl
39 spilled over sooner. He elaborated that lowering the road could cause issues downstream.

40 Michalisko stated that doing a capital improvement project when there was already a 10 year
41 level of service was not worth it.

42
43 Maslowski presented a 25 year inundation map showing that the property had at least a 25
44 year level of service. He stated that the required storage for a 100 year level of service would

1 be 2 acre-feet. He explained that it did not make sense to spend that much money with the
2 existing level of service.

3
4 Beladi stated that this issue was brought up in 2019 and the window wells and inlet
5 improvements were done after that.

6
7 Chairman Burke asked for ERA to find the rain event data coinciding with the 2019 flooding
8 pictures at Project 5.

9
10 Beladi stated that he would be able to find that data.

11
12 Michalisko stated that the last area would be Project 1 – Koepke Road. He presented a MWRD
13 100 year inundation map of the area surrounding Project 1. He stated that there were some
14 detention improvements done south of the area. He explained that there were 3 acres directly
15 tributary to the area.

16
17 Michalisko presented the same 100 year inundation map, but now it was zoomed into Project
18 1.

19
20 Michalisko presented 10 year and 100 year inundation maps of the area. He stated that 2980
21 Koepke Road was very flat and that the storm sewer connecting the front and back yards could
22 be causing some issues. He explained that the only solution would be to reconstruct the storm
23 sewer system along Koepke Road.

24
25 Maslowski presented the proposed solution for Location 1. He stated that the current storm
26 sewer system was in very bad condition with no standardization. He explained that a 15 inch
27 RCP pipe flowing east to Pfingsten Road would be a potential conveyance solution.

28
29 Beladi stated that the storm sewers had been televised in the past. He explained that the entire
30 corridor was in bad condition.

31
32 Michalisko stated that the flooding was not deep. He explained that a backflow preventer in the
33 storm sewer system at 2980 Koepke Road could help.

34
35 Member Sturgis stated that they had a similar project on Greenacre Drive where a special
36 assessment was done to get a fully improved street. She explained that the current street was
37 substandard and that they should see if they could get the residents of Koepke Road onboard
38 with a fully improved street. She elaborated that the Village had a 66 foot right-of-way, but the
39 lots on the south side were small compared to those on the north side.

40
41 Michalisko stated that whether there was a street improvement done or not, they suggested
42 doing conveyance improvements on Koepke Road.

43
44 Beladi stated that Koepke Road was scheduled to be resurfaced in 2026.

1
2 Member Sturgis stated that the drainage was so inconsistent that even if they cleaned all the
3 pipes, it would only be a matter of time until the system became clogged again.

4
5 Michalisko stated that they had covered all of the areas. He explained that by the next meeting
6 they would have a draft report. He asked if there were any questions.

7
8 Member Sturgis asked if they could get copies of the presentation.

9
10 Beladi replied that they would be able to send it over.

11
12 Chairman Burke asked for ERA to get a defined level of service for next meeting.

13
14 Michalisko stated that usually they had the level of service being 6 inches of ponding or less.

15
16 Michalisko thanked the Commission and residents for their time and gave out their emails if
17 anyone wanted to contact them.

18
19 **5) Hear from Commissioners concerning new topics**

20 None.

21
22 **6) Next Meeting Date: May 25, 2023**

23 The next meeting is scheduled for May 25, 2023 at 6:00 P.M. in the Terrace Room at Village
24 Hall.

25
26 **7) Adjourn**

27 There being no further business, Member Sturgis made a motion, seconded by Member Hetue
28 to adjourn the meeting. On a voice vote, the motion was unanimously carried and the meeting
29 adjourned at 8:16 P.M.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Respectfully submitted,

44 Michael Weller