

1 Member Hoeft suggested that on page 14, line 22, “. . . would be to reconstruction the storm
2 sewer system along Koepke Road.” should be changed to “. . . would be to reconstruct the
3 storm sewer system along Koepke Road.”

4

5 Member Sturgis stated that she had some comments regarding the previous meeting’s minutes.

6

7 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 2, line 36, “He stated that development of the area
8 overtime likely disrupted this path . . .” should be changed to “He stated that development of
9 the area over time likely disrupted this path . . .”

10

11 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 3, line 23, “. . . they released inundation maps” should
12 be changed to “. . . they released inundation maps.”

13

14 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 8, line 14, “Member Sturgis suggested that they could
15 acquire some land from 1302 Waukegan Road . . .” should be changed to “Member Sturgis
16 suggested that they might consider acquiring some land from 1302 Waukegan Road . . .”

17

18 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 8, line 34, “He stated that they should but the 12 inch
19 pipe . . .” should be changed to “He stated that they should put the 12 inch pipe . . .”

20

21 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 9, line 4, “Levy stated that the flow shown in the model
22 was different to real life.” should be changed to “Levy stated that the flow shown in the model
23 was different than real life.”

24

25 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 10, line 20, “Member Sturgis asked how recently this
26 part of Western Avenue had been worked on.” should be changed to “Member Sturgis asked
27 how recently this part of Western Avenue street had been worked on.”

28

29 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 12, line 24, “. . . she remembered that flooding at 1709
30 Longvalley Drive being in the rear yard.” should be changed to “. . . she remembered that
31 flooding of the home at 1709 Longvalley Drive originating in the rear yard.”

32

33 Member Hetue made a motion, seconded by Member Reynolds to accept the minutes of the
34 April 24, 2023 meeting as amended. On a voice vote, the motion to approve the minutes as
35 presented passed, with no member abstaining.

36

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

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

39

40 No one from the Audience brought forth any topics.

41

42 **3) Old Business**

43 Chairman Burke stated that there was no old business.

44

1 **4) New Business**

2 Chairman Burke stated that new business would be a presentation from Engineering Resource
3 Associates (ERA) covering Addendum 3.

4

5 Bielak presented Memo 4a describing the Addendum 3 process so far.

6

7 Marty Michalisko introduced himself and his colleague Mike Maslowski.

8

9 Michalisko stated that since the last meeting, Maslowski had met with Village Staff out in the
10 field to gather data. He explained that this presentation would include recommendations, costs,
11 and a project prioritization table describing where the Village should begin in regard to the 8
12 projects. Michalisko stated that they would cover the project prioritization table and then
13 present the projects. He explained that they would present the projects in order of rank, with
14 the highest ranked project first.

15

16 Michalisko presented a map of the Village of Northbrook with the project locations highlighted.

17

18 Michalisko presented the project prioritization table. He stated that the table ranked the 8
19 project areas based off of 3 categories, the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR), Structures Benefited, and
20 Properties Benefited. He explained that table also included the Level of Service (LOS),
21 Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost (EOPCC), and Average Cost Per Structure.
22 Michalisko stated that the ranking for Projects 11 and 13B were combined since they shared a
23 proposed solution. He explained that the data for each project was shown separately, excluding
24 their costs. Michalisko stated that they could revise the table based off of feedback from the
25 Commission and the Audience.

26

27 Michalisko stated that the highest ranked project was Project 12 – Wescott Road, followed by
28 Project 10 – Sunset Lane, followed by Project 13A – Woodbine Lane, followed by Projects 11
29 and 13B – Jeffery Court and Marcee Lane/Villa Court, followed by Project 1 – Koepke Road,
30 followed by Project 33 – Longvalley Drive, and ending with Project 5 – Bordeaux Drive.

31

32 Chairman Burke asked if the ranking methodology was consistent with the past addendums.

33

34 Michalisko replied that it was consistent with the past addendums.

35

36 Member Sturgis suggested that there should be a column for Average Cost Per Property
37 Benefited.

38

39 Michalisko responded that they could add that to the table.

40

41 Member Sturgis suggested that Project 12 – Wescott Road should include Maple Avenue and
42 Oak Avenue in the title. She explained that doing so would help prevent confusion with the
43 Wescott Park project. Member Sturgis suggested that acronyms, such as BCR, LOS, and EOPCC,
44 should be written out and explained. Member Sturgis stated that in previous addendums, the

1 EOPCC was rounded to the nearest 1,000 dollars and the Average Cost Per Structure and the
2 Property Benefit was rounded to the nearest 100 dollars. She explained that they did not need
3 the current level of detail shown in the table at this stage.

4
5 Michalisko responded that he agreed with her statements.

6
7 Michalisko asked Maslowski to begin with Project 12 – Wescott Road, Maple Avenue, and Oak
8 Avenue.

9
10 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 12 – Wescott Road, Maple Avenue,
11 and Oak Avenue in its existing condition. He stated that the Properties Benefited value from the
12 project prioritization table was derived from the model, with any property affected by street or
13 yard flooding being counted. He explained that Structures Benefited was calculated from
14 properties affected by structure flooding according to the model. Maslowski stated that BCR
15 was also calculated from the model.

16
17 Michalisko stated that they were aiming for a 10 year LOS.

18
19 Bielak stated that the 10 year LOS was consistent with previous addendums.

20
21 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 12 in its proposed condition. He
22 stated that the proposed project included underground storage in the Village's right-of-way on
23 Wescott Road.

24
25 Michalisko stated that they avoided the intersection of Wescott Road and Oak Avenue, creating
26 two separate areas of underground storage.

27
28 Maslowski stated that the corridor was ideal for right-of-way storage due to the lack of utilities.

29
30 Maslowski presented costs, permitting, and statistics for Project 12. He stated that the EOPCC
31 was \$2,008,541, with Phase I and Phase II engineering costs being \$200,900. He explained that
32 the permitting entities involved would be Northbrook and Metropolitan Water Reclamation
33 District of Greater Chicago (MWRD). Maslowski stated that there would be a 10 year LOS, with
34 10 structures and 14 properties being benefited. He explained that the Average Cost Per
35 Structure Benefited was \$200,854. Maslowski stated that the BCR was 0.37. He explained that
36 60 feet of 18 inch storm sewer pipe and 1 acre-foot of underground storage was required.

37
38 Michalisko stated that the final report would include the exhibits so the Commission could
39 compare the existing and proposing conditions. He explained that the statistics would also be
40 included in the report.

41
42 Member Hoeft asked if the underground storage was gravity drained.

43
44 Maslowski replied that it was gravity drained.

1 Chairman Burke asked why they needed a MWRD permit.
2
3

4 Michalisko replied that since it was all local work, they probably did not need to coordinate
5 with MWRD.
6

7 Chairman Burke asked which properties in the exhibit were counted.
8

9 Michalisko replied that properties in the benefited area were counted if they had yard flooding
10 or structure flooding.
11

12 Member Reynolds suggested that ERA highlight the benefited properties on the exhibit.
13

14 Member Sturgis asked whether detention areas could be enlarged if they used pumps.
15

16 Michalisko replied that they could, but using pumps would be expensive.
17

18 Maslowski stated that gravity drains were more reliable over time.
19

20 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 10 – Sunset Lane in its existing
21 condition.
22

23 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 10 in its proposed condition. He
24 stated that they took feedback from the previous meeting regarding downstream impacts. He
25 explained that they found no downstream impacts. Maslowski stated that the proposed project
26 included conveyance improvements. He explained that no storage was required.
27

28 Maslowski presented costs, permitting, and statistics for Project 10. He stated that the EOPCC
29 was \$724,809, with Phase I and Phase II engineering costs being \$72,500. He explained that the
30 permitting entities involved would be Northbrook and MWRD. Maslowski stated that there
31 would be a 10 year LOS, with 4 structures and 12 properties being benefited. He explained that
32 the Average Cost Per Structure Benefited was \$181,202. Maslowski stated that the BCR was
33 0.87. He explained that 1,190 feet of 12 to 30 inch storm sewer pipe was required.
34

35 Chairman Burke asked what their plan was for the road.
36

37 Maslowski replied that the plan was to do patching.
38

39 Bielak stated that road work had been done on Sunset Lane within the past 5 years.
40

41 Michalisko stated that they assumed the pipe would go in the pavement.
42

43 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 13A – Woodbine Lane in its existing
44 condition.

1
2 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 13A in its proposed condition. He
3 stated that the proposed project included underground detention on Westmoor School's
4 property. He explained that storm sewers on Adelaide Drive, Shannon Road, and Cherry Lane
5 would be rerouted to the proposed detention. He elaborated that 4 acre-feet of storage was
6 required.

7
8 Maslowski stated that a 10 year LOS meant that in a 10 year storm event, the level of ponding
9 in the street was 6 inches or less.

10
11 Maslowski presented costs, permitting, and statistics for Project 13A. He stated that the EOPCC
12 was \$3,057,008, with Phase I and Phase II engineering costs being \$305,700. He explained that
13 the permitting entities involved would be Northbrook and MWRD. Maslowski stated that there
14 would be a 10 year LOS, with 4 structures and 16 properties being benefited. He explained that
15 the Average Cost Per Structure Benefited was \$764,252. Maslowski stated that the BCR was
16 0.16. He explained that 830 feet of 12 to 48 inch storm sewer pipe and 4 acre-feet of
17 underground storage was required. Maslowski stated that coordination with the school would
18 be required.

19
20 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 13B – Marcee Lane/Villa Court and a
21 10 year inundation map of Project 11 – Jeffery Lane in its existing condition.

22
23 Michalisko stated that these projects were combined due to their proximity and shared
24 solution.

25
26 Maslowski stated that there was rear yard flooding on Jeffery Court West due to water coming
27 from Chapel Court, structural flooding on Jeffery Court South due to water traveling from
28 Jeffery Court North, and structural flooding on Woodhill Drive due to a relief valve connected to
29 Jeffery Court South.

30
31 Maslowski stated that there was side yard and structure flooding on Marcee Lane due to the
32 area being depressed and lack of capacity in the current system.

33
34 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 13B and Project 11 in its proposed
35 condition. He stated that the proposed project included conveyance improvements, leading to
36 an underground detention facility on the property of Meadowbrook School. He explained that
37 the storage was needed for both projects. He elaborated that the school would not be
38 receptive to the project if it did not alleviate its flooding issues at the same time. Maslowski
39 stated that a 12 inch storm sewer would have to go to the rear yards of Jeffery Court West. He
40 explained that the relief valve would be connected to the storm sewer system on Portsmouth
41 Court. Maslowski stated that a swale would be cut between the houses on Marcee Lane to the
42 school.

43

1 Maslowski presented costs, permitting, and statistics for Project 13B and Project 11. He stated
2 that the EOPCC was \$4,011,454, with Phase I and Phase II engineering costs being \$401,100. He
3 explained that the permitting entities involved would be Northbrook, MWRD, and Illinois
4 Department of Transportation (IDOT). He elaborated that IDOT would need to be involved if
5 they crossed Waukegan Road. Maslowski stated that there would be a 10 year LOS, with 6
6 structures and 10 properties being benefited. He explained that the Average Cost Per Structure
7 Benefited was \$668,576. Maslowski stated that the BCR was 0.16. He explained that 1,940 feet
8 of 12 to 24 inch storm sewer pipe and 4.75 acre-feet of underground storage was required.
9 Maslowski stated that coordination with the school would be required.

10
11 Chairman Burke asked how much benefit the improvements provided to Meadowbrook School.
12
13 Maslowski replied that it provided a 0.2 feet reduction in flooding during a 100 year storm
14 event.

15
16 Member Reynolds asked if the storage alleviated the school's flooding on the west side.
17
18 Michalisko responded that there was a bowl on the west side of the school. He stated that the
19 school would have to get the water from the bowl to the storage area. He explained that they
20 could use a pump. Michalisko stated that during design the Village could work with the school
21 on expanding the scope of the project.

22
23 Chairman Burke asked if the proposed detention would be lower than the bowl.
24
25 Michalisko replied that it would not be lower than the bowl.

26
27 Member Reynolds asked if it would help if the storage was oriented east to west, rather than
28 north to south.

29
30 Michalisko responded that was something they could look at in final design.

31
32 Jubie Ryan asked who owned the land northeast of Meadowbrook School.

33
34 Chairman Burke replied that the school owned the land. He stated that the elevation there was
35 higher than the proposed location for the underground storage.

36
37 Maslowski stated that the area was rather steep, which made it not ideal for storage.
38
39 Michalisko stated that since it was 4 to 5 feet higher than the surrounding area, they would
40 have to do more excavation before installing the storage. He explained that the extra
41 excavation added cost. Michalisko stated that it would be good to go to the school with
42 multiple options.

43

1 Phil Barras asked if they had any alternative plans in case the school did not want to have
2 underground storage on their property.

3
4 Michalisko replied that they had some alternative proposals.
5
6 Maslowski stated that for Marcee Lane, one of the alternatives would be to increase the pipe
7 size down Chapel Court and have underground storage in the right-of-way on Church Street. He
8 explained that having the two projects share underground storage at Meadowbrook School
9 made it more cost effective.

10
11 Barras asked how the pipe would get to his back yard. He explained that the model showed it
12 going to the east of the house, but there was a protected oak tree located on the east side. He
13 suggested that they could possibly have the pipe go through 1133 Jeffery Court West.

14
15 Michalisko stated that they would have to do a survey of the potential corridors to determine
16 the optimal route.

17
18 Barras asked whether they could do improvements in the rear yards of Chapel Court.

19
20 Bielak replied that Village Staff and ERA performed a walkthrough of the whole corridor on
21 Chapel Court. He stated that the grades did not work for putting a structure up there. He
22 explained that to get any improvements done, they would have to get easements. He
23 elaborated that even if there was a possible improvement, the residents on Chapel Court were
24 unlikely to provide easements since they were not experiencing any issues.

25
26 Bielak stated that this would be a good project to pursue grant funding.

27
28 Barras stated that he appreciated Village Staff doing the walkthrough.

29
30 Chairman Burke asked what was the existing size of the pipe under Waukegan Road.

31
32 Michalisko replied that it was currently 18 inches.

33
34 Chairman Burke asked if 27 inches was enough to prevent surcharging west of Waukegan Road.
35 He explained that he did not want to just move the problem there.

36
37 Maslowski replied that there were no impacts according to the model.

38
39 Member Sturgis suggested that the project prioritization table should elaborate on the
40 differences between structure and property flooding.

41
42 Michalisko responded that they could add that.

43

1 Member Hetue suggested that Project 13B and Project 11 be combined completely in the
2 project prioritization table. He explained that it was confusing to have them separated when
3 they shared a solution.

4
5 Michalisko responded that they could change the table to combine them.
6

7 Member Hetue suggested that for ranking the 3 categories, they should follow golf rules for
8 ties. He explained that under those rules, if there were 2 projects in second place, they would
9 both rank as second with the next project ranking fourth, not third.

10
11 Michalisko responded that they could change how they treated ties in the table.
12

13 Chairman Burke asked whether there were any downstream impacts for Portsmouth Court.
14

15 Michalisko replied that there were no impacts. He explained that the water still reached the
16 same place as it did currently.

17
18 Ryan asked if having the relief valve be open constantly would help with the flooding.
19

20 Bielak replied that after the improvements, the system would be always open and acting like a
21 normal storm sewer. He stated that this project should help.
22

23 Michalisko stated that it could still get overwhelmed in larger storm events.
24

25 Ryan stated that the current pipe was along the fence line. He asked if they would need
26 easements.
27

28 Bielak replied that they would have to get an easement. He stated that getting an easement
29 when it was on the edge of the property would be easier than if it was in the middle of the
30 property.

31
32 Barras asked if the drain could come down the side of 1134 Jeffery Court West.
33

34 Chairman Burke replied that the proposed conditions exhibit was conceptual. He stated that
35 cost difference of moving a drain was inconsequential compared to the total cost of the project.
36 He explained that details like drain locations would be worked out during the final design.
37

38 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 1 – Koepke Road in its existing
39 condition. He stated that they had tweaked the model since the last meeting.
40

41 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 1 in its proposed condition. He stated
42 that the proposed project included conveyance improvements for 525 feet of pipe. He
43 explained that the project could be combined with a roadway project as the street was not in
44 great condition.

1
2 Bielak stated that there was a roadway project planned for Koepke Road in 3 years. He
3 explained that the Village would prefer to do conveyance improvements all the way to
4 Pfingsten Road. He elaborated, any improvements would be nullified by the current system
5 downstream as it was in such poor condition.

6
7 Maslowski stated that the cost would have to be recalculated.

8
9 Chairman Burke asked if they could include the cost savings for doing a roadway project at the
10 same time.

11
12 Bielak replied that he wanted to get an estimate without combining it just in case project
13 schedules changed.

14
15 Member Sturgis asked if the Village could send a notice to the residents of Koepke Road,
16 encouraging them to consider a special assessment for full scale street improvements.

17
18 Bielak replied that he had talked to residents previously and they had not been interested.

19
20 Member Sturgis stated that in this situation, the cost for residents would be reduced due to the
21 work the Village would be doing at the same time.

22
23 Bielak stated that he would work towards a solution to explain what was happening on Koepke
24 and to see if those residents would consider a special assessment.

25
26 Maslowski presented costs, permitting, and statistics for Project 1. He explained that these
27 values did not reflect the Village's current plan to go all the way to Pfingsten Road. Maslowski
28 stated that the EOPCC was \$431,675, with Phase I and Phase II engineering costs being \$43,200.
29 He explained that the permitting entities involved would be Northbrook and MWRD. Maslowski
30 stated that there would be a 10 year LOS, with 1 structure and 2 properties being benefited. He
31 explained that the Average Cost Per Structure Benefited was \$431,674. Maslowski stated that
32 the BCR was 0.40. He explained that 525 feet of 12 to 18 inch storm sewer pipe was required.

33
34 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 33 – Longvalley Drive in its existing
35 condition. He stated that they had performed a site visit with Northbrook Staff. He explained
36 that they had updated the model to show the rear yard flooding.

37
38 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 33 in its proposed condition. He
39 stated that the proposed project included a conveyance improvement that would help with the
40 street flooding. He explained that no storage was needed.

41
42 Chairman Burke asked if they could extend a pipe to the rear yard of 1709 Longvalley Drive to
43 alleviate their flooding.

44

1 Maslowski replied that a 12" pipe would provide a 10 year LOS even in existing conditions. He
2 explained that the rear yard flooding was not caused by the street flooding and could be
3 considered a private drainage issue.

4
5 Bielak stated that after the walkthrough, Village Staff discussed the flooding with the resident.
6 He explained that they needed to get conveyance from the back yard to the front yard.

7
8 Member Sturgis asked if the yard was graded properly around the foundation.

9
10 Bielak replied that it was not graded properly. He explained that if they established a proper
11 swale, it could solve the issue.

12
13 Member Sturgis asked if they needed to do anything in the street if a swale could solve the
14 resident's issue.

15
16 Michalisko replied that they modelled a solution to help with the street flooding. He explained
17 that according to residents, the street became impassable during rain events.

18
19 Member Sturgis asked how long the street was impassable.

20
21 Michalisko replied that it was not impassable for a long time. He stated that this project should
22 be a low priority for the Village.

23
24 Member Sturgis asked if there was a way to conduct an evaluation of whether properties had
25 their downspouts connected directly to the storm sewer. She explained that it was a problem in
26 this neighborhood.

27
28 Maynard replied that it was a problem all over the Village. He stated that previously the Village
29 allowed properties to directly connect. He asked whether they could retroactively force people
30 to disconnect.

31
32 Member Hoeft replied that the Village retroactively forced properties to disconnect from the
33 sanitary system around where he lived.

34
35 Maynard stated that the time and cost required to fight each resident would be significant.

36
37 Michalisko asked whether the Commission wanted an estimate for connecting a 12 inch pipe
38 from the back yard to the street for 1709 Longvalley Drive.

39
40 Chairman Burke replied that they would. He stated that 1709 Longvalley Drive was in a similar
41 situation to Jeffery Court. He explained that the resident was getting other properties draining
42 to them that they could not control. He elaborated that they should do the pipe and not the
43 swale.

44

1 Michalisko stated that they would get an estimate for that solution.
2

3 Member Reynolds asked if the pipe would become Village owned.
4

5 Bielak replied that it would.
6

7 Member Reynolds asked if the Village had done stubs on private property elsewhere.
8

9 Bielak replied that they have done it when it served a benefit to the neighborhood and the
10 resident was collecting water from multiple other properties.
11

12 Maslowski presented costs, permitting, and statistics for Project 33. He stated that the EOPCC
13 was \$994,615, with Phase I and Phase II engineering costs being \$99,500. He explained that the
14 permitting entities involved would be Northbrook and MWRD. Maslowski stated that there
15 would be a 10 year LOS, with 1 structure and 5 properties being benefited. He explained that
16 the Average Cost Per Structure Benefited was \$994,615. Maslowski stated that the BCR was
17 0.10. He explained that 1,405 feet of 18 to 30 inch storm sewer pipe was required.
18

19 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 5 – Bordeaux Drive in its existing
20 condition. He stated that Northbrook Staff had surveyed the area. He explained that the model
21 showed no properties with structure flooding. Maslowski stated that 3936 Bordeaux Drive had
22 reported structure flooding in the past. He explained that since then the Village had done storm
23 sewer improvements and the resident had built up their window wells.
24

25 Maslowski presented a 10 year inundation map of Project 5 in its proposed condition. He stated
26 that the proposed conveyance improvements would help with the street flooding.
27

28 Maslowski presented costs, permitting, and statistics for Project 5. He stated that the EOPCC
29 was \$199,465 with Phase I and Phase II engineering costs being \$19,900. He explained that the
30 permitting entities involved would be Northbrook and MWRD. Maslowski stated that there was
31 an existing 10 year LOS, with 0 structures and 3 properties being benefited by the
32 improvement. He explained that the Average Cost Per Structure Benefited could not be
33 calculated as no structures were benefited. Maslowski stated that the BCR was 0.00. He
34 explained that 160 feet of 30 inch storm sewer pipe was required.
35

36 Bielak stated that the improvements in 2019 have significantly helped the resident. He
37 explained that a project was not as critical now.
38

39 Michalisko presented the project prioritization table. He stated that the last 3 projects provided
40 much less benefit than the first 4 projects.
41

42 Chairman Burke stated that the third and fourth projects required coordination with the District
43 28.
44

1 Bielak stated that the next steps would be to have the final draft ready for next meeting. He
2 explained that next meeting would be a working meeting.
3

4 Member Sturgis asked what the next steps would be after the next meeting.
5

6 Chairman Burke replied that if the Commission recommended the report, then it would be sent
7 to the Board of Trustees.
8

9 Member Sturgis stated that she was worried that the Board would see the high costs in the
10 addendum and reject it. She explained that she did not want a repeat of the Grainger Detention
11 Project.
12

13 Bielak stated that the Board was not committing to any of the projects by accepting Addendum
14 3. He explained that they were just accepting the report and he saw no reason for the Board to
15 decline the Commission's recommendation.
16

17 5) Hear from Commissioners concerning new topics

18 Member Sturgis asked if the Commission could add a recommendation to Addendum 3 to
19 switch the Stormwater Utility Fee from a potable water usage basis to an impervious coverage
20 basis. She stated that the change would promote fairness.
21

22 Bielak stated that the Commission could make funding stream recommendations, but they
23 should be careful to not tell the Board how to tax or fee. He explained that it was possible to
24 add Stormwater Utility Fee suggestions to Addendum 3.
25

26 6) Next Meeting Date: June 12, 2023

27 The next meeting is scheduled for June 12, 2023 at 6:00 P.M. in the Terrace Room at Village
28 Hall.
29

30 7) Adjourn

31 There being no further business, Member Hetue made a motion, seconded by Member Hoeft to
32 adjourn the meeting. On a voice vote, the motion was unanimously carried and the meeting
33 adjourned at 7:47 P.M.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Respectfully submitted,
44 Michael Weller