

1 Member Sturgis suggested that on page 9, line 15, "Michalisko replied that there was no
2 impacts" should be changed to "Michalisko replied that there were no impacts"

3
4 Member Reynolds made a motion, seconded by Member Sturgis to accept the minutes of the
5 May 25, 2023 meeting as amended. On a voice vote, the motion to approve the minutes as
6 presented passed, with no member abstaining.

7
8 **2) Hear from the Audience on Topics not on the Agenda**

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

10
11 No one from the Audience brought forth any topics.

12
13 **3) Old Business**

14 Chairman Burke stated that there was no old business.

15
16 **4) New Business**

17 Bielak stated that new business would be a discussion of the Master Stormwater Management
18 Plan (MSMP) Addendum 3 Draft Report from Engineering Resource Associates (ERA).

19
20 Bielak presented Memo 4a describing the Addendum 3 process so far.

21
22 Bielak stated that ERA had a brief presentation to proceed the discussion.

23
24 Marty Michalisko introduced himself and his colleague Mike Maslowski.

25
26 Michalisko presented the goals of today's meeting. He stated that ERA wanted to collect
27 feedback from the Stormwater Management Commission and to have a discussion on big
28 picture items.

29
30 Maslowski presented the Project Prioritization Table. He stated that ERA had modified the table
31 based off of feedback from the previous meeting.

32
33 Bielak stated that the idea of the meeting would be to have the Commission give ERA high level
34 comments. He explained that inline grammatical comments should be emailed to him. He
35 elaborated that he would send over the minor comments to ERA.

36
37 Bielak asked Chairman Burke how he wanted to proceed with feedback.

38
39 Chairman Burke stated that they could begin with Staff comments, followed by individual
40 Commissioners.

41
42 Bielak stated that at the beginning of the report there should be a section stating that this
43 document was an extension of Addendum 1 and Addendum 2.

1 Bielak stated that he wanted the projects in the report to be assigned MSMP numbers,
2 continuing from the last MSMP project, MSMP 31. He explained that the report needed to
3 explain that there were originally eight projects, but two locations were combined due to a
4 shared solution.

5
6 Bielak stated that previous addenda included an acronym page, and that one should be added
7 to Addendum 3. He explained that including an acronym page in the report would be helpful for
8 readers.

9
10 Bielak stated that the disclaimer on page 5 should be moved to the beginning of the report. He
11 explained that he wanted to make sure the disclaimer was clear to readers.

12
13 Bielak stated that each project should have a cover page that included the pictures submitted
14 by residents. He explained that it would help break up the document and show why these
15 projects were selected.

16
17 Bielak stated that for the non-prioritized areas, the report should explain that they were
18 documented, reviewed, and could be considered for future plans.

19
20 Bielak stated the Commission had previously discussed the stormwater utility fee. He explained
21 that the report should explain that the Village would need to evaluate how projects were going
22 to be paid for. Bielak stated that this could be included in the section on funding opportunities.

23
24 Bielak stated that Appendix E - Private Property Improvements needed to list where the design
25 parameters came from. He explained that he did not want to include parameters that conflicted
26 with the Village's existing standards.

27
28 Bielak stated that ERA could drop the decimals for the last three columns in the Project
29 Prioritization Table.

30
31 Chairman Burke asked Member Reynolds to share any comments.

32
33 Member Reynolds stated that in the previous meeting, the Commission had asked for the
34 exhibits to highlight impacted properties. He explained that this would help people see how the
35 projects improved their situation.

36
37 Member Reynolds stated that the exhibit numbering was confusing.

38
39 Bielak stated that the report did not have a consistent method of describing the projects. He
40 explained that the report flipped between project location and project number. Bielak stated
41 that they needed to decide on a single way of describing the projects. He explained that
42 assigning the projects MSMP numbers would resolve this issue.

43
44 Chairman Burke asked Member Hetue to share any comments.

1 Member Hetue stated that he did not have any comments.

2

3 Chairman Burke asked Member Sturgis to share any comments.

4

5 Member Sturgis stated that the Project Prioritization Table did not include phase one and two
6 engineering costs in the Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Costs (EOPCC) calculation.
7 She explained that this also affected the Average Cost Per Structure and Average Cost Per
8 Property calculations as well. Member Sturgis stated that the phase one and two engineering
9 costs needed to be included in the calculations.

10

11 Member Sturgis stated that Villa Court should be dropped from the Marcee Lane, Villa Court,
12 and Jeffery Courts project. She explained that Woodhill Drive should be included in the title
13 instead.

14

15 Chairman Burke stated that they could drop Villa Court and add Woodhill Drive. He explained
16 that the project would then be called the Marcee Lane, Woodhill Drive, and Jeffery Courts
17 project.

18

19 Member Sturgis stated that the report should explain the change between Bulletin 70 and
20 Bulletin 75. She explained that the change to Bulletin 75 affected the calculations.

21

22 Bielak stated that they could include a table comparing the two Bulletins. He explained that he
23 did not want to get too technical.

24

25 Member Sturgis stated that the report needed to include a chart of rainfall data.

26

27 Bielak stated that he could get information on the major storms from 2015 to the present.

28

29 Bielak stated that Staff would be pulling data from all the previous MSMP projects to calculate
30 how much the Village has invested in stormwater management.

31

32 Member Sturgis stated that there was a list on the website of MSMP projects. She explained
33 that the website was out of date.

34

35 Member Sturgis stated that the Bordeaux Drive project was missing from Appendix C - Benefit-
36 Cost Analysis. She asked why they were recommending a project that has no benefit.

37

38 Bielak responded that prior to the improvements in 2019, there was structure flooding. He
39 stated that currently there was a 10 year level of service. He explained that the Commission
40 would need to consider if the Bordeaux Drive project should be recommended in Addendum 3.

41

42 Member Sturgis stated that the report included a 100 year storm exhibit for each project. She
43 asked if they should include it if they were only designing for a 10 year level of service.

1 Member Sturgis stated that the report should explain what a 10 or 100 year storm was.
2
3 Chairman Burke stated that they should acknowledge the fact that these improvements would
4 not prevent issues during a 100 year storm.
5
6 Member Rago stated that they should not hold back the information from residents.
7
8 Bielak stated that having the 100 year storm exhibits would help staff. He explained that he did
9 not want residents to incorrectly believe that they were safe from all storms after the projects
10 were completed.
11
12 Member Sturgis stated that they should include a disclaimer at the beginning of the report that
13 explained how the projects were only designed to provide a 10 year level of service.
14
15 Chairman Burke stated that the report should explain that the Bordeaux Drive project area had
16 already been improved.
17
18 Bielak stated that the report should explain that based on the private improvements and local
19 drainage improvements already made, this project area should not be included as a MSMP
20 project because it already has a 10 year level of service. He explained that they should still
21 include the information from the Bordeaux Drive project in the report.
22
23 Member Sturgis stated that she saw the Longvalley Drive project as being similar to the
24 Bordeaux Drive project. She explained that the report should include that private property
25 improvements needed to be done for the Longvalley Drive project.
26
27 Bielak stated that there were still structural concerns with the Longvalley Drive project during
28 10 year storms and the water was coming from the backyards. He explained that the Bordeaux
29 Drive project already had an existing 25 year level of service.
30
31 Chairman Burke stated that Longvalley Drive was also impassable during significant rain events.
32
33 Chairman Burke asked Member Rago to share any comments.
34
35 Member Rago stated that on page 13, the Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) was incorrect and did not
36 match the other tables in the report.
37
38 Member Rago stated that for the Marcee Lane, Villa Court, and Jeffery Courts project, there
39 should only be a single existing exhibit instead of two. He explained that the existing and
40 proposed exhibits should be face each other in the report so it was not necessary to constantly
41 flip between pages.
42
43 Member Rago stated that the analysis and graphics in the report were excellent. He explained
44 that the report was much better than previous addenda.

1 Chairman Burke asked Member Rosner to share any comments.
2
3 Member Rosner stated that he did not have any comments.
4
5 Chairman Burke asked Member Hoeft to share any comments.
6
7 Member Hoeft stated that on page 9, the report stated that Cherry Lane interception was
8 necessary for this design. He explained the drawing did not make it clear why it was necessary.
9
10 Member Hoeft stated that on page 11, the report stated that storage volume was not needed
11 to prevent downstream impacts. He explained that the report should explain what downstream
12 meant.
13
14 Chairman Burke stated downstream would be anything past the end of the project.
15
16 Member Hoeft stated that he understood that, but the report should include what was
17 downstream of the project. He explained that for the Sunset Lane project, downstream should
18 be described as Sanders Road.
19
20 Member Hoeft stated that the sections on the Woodbine Lane project and the Marcee Lane,
21 Villa Court, and Jeffery Courts project should include more detail on how the projects would
22 benefit School District 28.
23
24 Chairman Burke stated that Member Sturgis had additional comments.
25
26 Member Sturgis stated that on page 24, the report stated that the Village had worked with the
27 School District before on Wescott Park. She explained that the park was owned by the Park
28 District.
29
30 Bielak stated that it should be changed to say that the Village had previously worked with local
31 agencies.
32
33 Member Sturgis stated that new developments at Northbrook Court and Green Acres could
34 mean an increase in students for School District 28. She explained that the District might want
35 to save space for future expansion, rather than building underground storage.
36
37 Chairman Burke stated that he had some comments.
38
39 Chairman Burke stated that the year should be included after Addendum 1 and Addendum 2 on
40 page 3.
41
42 Chairman Burke asked if ERA followed previous addenda when quantifying benefit.
43
44 Michalisko replied that they had followed the previous addenda.

1 Bielak stated that ERA should include that they stayed consistent with previous addenda.
2
3 Chairman Burke stated that ERA should say sufficient capacity instead of did not have capacity.
4 He explained that there was still some capacity, just not enough.
5
6 Chairman Burke stated that overall it was a good report.
7
8 Member Reynolds asked about the purpose of the exhibits in Appendix A3 - TS&L.
9
10 Maslowski replied that those exhibits were more detailed and oriented to readers with an
11 engineering background. He stated that the exhibits also included both existing and proposed
12 conditions.
13
14 Bielak stated that the next step would be for Commissioners to send over inline comments. He
15 explained that Staff would send over the notes to ERA.
16
17 Bielak commended ERA for producing the report under such an aggressive schedule.
18
19 Michalisko thanked Staff for quickly responding to his team whenever they needed data.
20
21 Bielak stated that he would work with ERA on getting the Final Report completed. He explained
22 that he would then send the report to Commissioners for comments and feedback before
23 having a final meeting.
24
25 Bielak stated that the Koepke Road project would be included in the Capital Improvement Plan
26 (CIP) due to the existing roadway project. He explained that the rest of the projects would be
27 evaluated during the CIP process next year.
28
29 Bielak stated that for the Koepke Road project, Staff would be reviewing data to see which
30 areas of the system were failing. He explained that they would modify the limits of the pipe
31 installation based off that.
32
33 Member Rago asked if the Koepke Road project would be constructed out of sequence.
34
35 Bielak replied that it would be done out of sequence as there would be cost saving associated
36 with doing a roadway project concurrently with the stormwater project.
37
38 Member Sturgis asked if Staff would be discussing a standard road improvement with residents
39 on Koepke Road.
40
41 Bielak responded that he would work towards reaching out to the residents on Koepke Road
42 and that he would explain to them the situation.
43
44 Member Sturgis asked if the improvement included sidewalk.

1 Bielak responded that for now Staff was only considering curb and gutter. He stated that it
2 would depend on how many residents were interested.

3
4 Bielak stated that they would be able to get the notes and minutes over to ERA within the next
5 two weeks. He asked when ERA would be able to get the Final Report finished.

6
7 Michalisko replied that they would be able to get it finished for a July meeting.

8
9 Bielak stated that they could have a special meeting to approve the Final Report in July or
10 August.

11
12 Member Sturgis asked when Addendum 3 would be brought before the Board of Trustees.

13
14 Bielak replied that it would probably be before the CIP budgeting meetings in October.

15
16 Member Sturgis asked if there was any anticipated funding that could be opened up for shovel
17 ready projects.

18
19 Bielak replied that they could start looking at grant funding opportunities. He stated that it
20 would be good to have a project designed and ready to be built.

21
22 Chairman Burke stated that there was no point going for grants until they had funding in place.

23
24 Member Rago asked if Staff had a timeframe for completing the projects.

25
26 Member Sturgis replied that the timeframe would be funding dependent.

27
28 Bielak stated that it was difficult to predict a time frame. He explained that they would need to
29 figure out how the projects would be funded.

30
31 **5) Hear from Commissioners Concerning New Topics**

32 None

33
34 **6) Next Meeting Date: To Be Determined**

35 Bielak to schedule meeting for approval of the MSMP Addendum 3 Final Report in late July or
36 early August.

37
38 **7) Adjourn**

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

42
43 Respectfully submitted,
44 Michael Weller