

**MINUTES OF THE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
VILLAGE OF NORTHFIELD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2017**

The Committee of the Whole meeting was called to order by Village President Fred Gougler on Tuesday, February 21, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. Village Clerk Stacy Sigman called the roll as follows:

Committee Members Present:

President Fred Gougler
Trustee Brian Kozminski
Trustee Thomas Roszak
Trustee Allan Kaplan
Trustee Joan Frazier
Trustee Jane Goldenberg

Absent:

Trustee John Gregorio

Others Present:

Village Attorney Everette M. Hill, Jr., Village Manager Stacy Sigman, Finance Director Steve Noble, Assistant to the Village Manager Melissa DeFeo, Community Development Director Steve Gutierrez, Public Works Director Mike Nystrand, Village Engineer Pat Glenn, Aaron Green and the slated Trustees Greg Lungmus, John Goodwin and Tom Terrill.

Approval of the January 17, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Trustee Goldenberg made a motion, seconded by Trustee Roszak to approve the January 17, 2017 meeting minutes.

Middlefork Bridge Fee Waiver Request

President Gougler said the Board has been briefed on this matter during the last few weeks. Community Development Director Steve Gutierrez indicated the Board has been given some chronologies and dealings with regard to the Middlefork bridge. He said he will highlight some of the history.

In the summer of 2016, the Middlefork homeowners advised Village staff that they were considering replacing the Middlefork bridge which provides the only means of access to that neighborhood across the river. On December 13, 2016, the police department received a request for permission for an oversized load to bring the bridge into town. They advised the building department's Village engineer. There wasn't a permit submission for the replacement of the bridge. The building advised the project engineer and the homeowners that no permit had been applied for nor granted. The project engineer represented by stating the existing bridge was in a potentially dangerous and hazardous condition and could collapse. Based on the concern expressed by the homeowner's structural engineer, the Village engaged Wiss Janey as a structural engineering consultant to assess the condition of the existing bridge and ensure that the

bridge was safe. A couple of days later, Wiss Janey opined that the bridge was actually safe for existing traffic and didn't need to be repaired or replaced.

Director Gutierrez explained that the fee for this assessment, and then some follow up analysis on the proposed bridge totaled \$8,000. In addition, a peer review will be needed for the replacement bridge and that is estimated to be an additional \$6,000, depending upon the information provided such as the quality of plans. Those fees are normally paid by the people directing the project to cover the cost of the review. The homeowners have requested the Village waive the Wiss Janey fees. Their email has been forwarded to the Board.

President Gougler questioned the status of the bridge now. Director Gutierrez indicated their engineer submitted plans and after Wiss Janey reviewed those plans, they concluded that the bridge as designed is inadequate. Staff is now working with their project engineer on what is needed in a revised set of plans. The existing bridge is safe but is deteriorated. Permits have not been issued yet for a new bridge. Village Manager Stacy Sigman said we are waiting for the revised plans from their engineer as to how they are going to meet the load standards.

Attorney Buzz Hill advised that the Board has the ability to waive the fee.

Aaron Green, 2120 Middlefork, said he sent the email to Director Gutierrez. He said he has lived here only 1-1/2 years. To his family, Northfield feels like the small town that they grew up in. They wanted that feeling in the suburbs. Since the bridge is the only way in and out from their homes, the number one priority for the homeowners is the safety of the bridge. There are construction projects in their neighborhood so they really care about the safety of the bridge. Phil Ryan has been leading the group on the bridge project. Mr. Green said at the first meeting it was brought up that they needed to have an additional review done by structural engineers that weren't theirs. The Committee worked hard on doing their due diligence on making sure they obtained a certified structural engineer who understood how bridges were put in and maintained so it could be repaired in a manner of like and kind to the bridge before. There could be a lot of discussions on repair versus replacement versus reconstruction. The homeowners are all about repair. What is most important to them is that the people floating the bills for this are taking the financial load of this bridge on their own. It's not easy for them to throw that sum of money out. At the meeting, they then heard about fees that the homeowners would have to incur in addition to what they understood originally. So they were to pay for another structural engineer that was brought on by the Village to review work of their structural engineer. He understands the point of having it reviewed, but he doesn't understand that if the engineer that the Village has is not capable of doing that review so the Village has to bring in another structural engineer then that should be at the cost of the Village and not the people who have already done their due diligence to find a structural engineer for this project. Safety is their number one concern and cost is a concern also. So adding another \$16,000 across 20 homeowners may not seem like a lot to the Board, but they have already paid a lot. This adds a financial burden on the homeowners. They want the safest bridge with the least amount of time as possible and done in the most cost effective way. They had already hired a licensed and certified structural engineer and it doesn't seem fair for them to pay the Village's hired

engineer. From their perspective, review is okay, they shouldn't have to pay for review on work that they had already found a certified, licensed structural engineer to do.

President Gougler asked Director Gutierrez for clarification on bringing the Village's engineer in based on what was represented by their engineer that the bridge was not safe. Director Gutierrez said that the only additional work was in terms of assessing the condition of the existing bridge. The Village would have hired a structural engineer to do the peer review in any event. The assessment of the existing bridge was \$8,000. President Gougler asked if the Village would have done that assessment had it not been advised that the current condition of the bridge was unsafe. Director Gutierrez answered "no."

Trustee Goldenberg asked when these peer reviews are done by structural engineers. She asked is it the Village's practice to always do a peer review. Director Gutierrez answered "yes." She then asked who usually pays for it. Director Gutierrez indicated the applicant or whoever is building the project. VM Sigman added if you are grading your property or building, a civil engineer will be hired by the owner and it gets submitted as part of the permit and then the Village's civil engineer reviews it and the cost is part of the permit and the hourly cost to our engineer is applied back. This case is a little unusual because we don't get a lot of structural reviews. When we do, they are always done by an outside consultant. Trustee Goldenberg wondered what the legal history of the bridge is and is it owned by the association. Director Gutierrez said it is currently on a private lane. Trustee Goldenberg felt it is highly unusual for a bridge to be private. VM Sigman said she believes it is the only private bridge in town. It is part of a private road on either side of it and the bridge itself is private. The only example VM Sigman could think of would be in Fox Meadow where there is a new bridge which is controlled by their association. Trustee Goldenberg then asked when the bridge was originally built. Attorney Hill indicated the bridge was in the county when it was built. Trustee Goldenberg then asked what the Village's legal standing is then. Attorney Hill said it is similar to any other portion of a private road. If the Village annexes it, it stays private unless it's a township road, then we are required to take it over. Trustee Goldenberg then asked when road construction comes in, does the Village have to review, even though there isn't a safety issue. VM Sigman indicated it would still have to be reviewed by an engineer. If it's just a roadway, it is done by a civil engineer and the Village has an in-house civic engineer. Homeowners are responsible for the cost of those, but the hourly rate is lower. The Village does not have a structural engineer on staff. There are a number of things that are outsourced such as mechanicals and fire suppression systems. They get contracted out and then charged back to the petitioner.

Trustee Roszak felt there are two issues. One is the assessment of the existing bridge and the Village taking on Wiss Janey to assess the structural integrity of the bridge. The other is the peer review. Every Village does this because there isn't the expertise in house. The peer review is normal and the permittee always pays for that. The assessment of the existing bridge is tricky. How does the Village deal with the private lanes in forcing an association to pay for it? Do they have to give notice? Attorney Hill said that when the Village received the statement from the homeowner's structural engineer that the existing bridge was unsafe, it was his advice that the Village could

have some exposure to risk. If the Village knew that the bridge was unsafe and we sent our fire-rescue people over or even a private entity over it and there was a problem, the Village would be exposed to liability. Trustee Roszak then asked if the Village has the right to pass that reporting cost on to that entity. Attorney Hill said the Village does.

Trustee Frazier asked under what circumstance does the Village pick up expenses on private roads. VM Sigman said to her knowledge, the Village has never picked up expenses on private roads. She said the Village does not plow them or maintain them. If a private road wants to join our roadway project, we have often times facilitated special service areas, repaved the roads, added them to the Village's contract but all of that is kept separate so the engineering fees are paid by the association and any costs of the actual construction is paid as well. They are typically kept in a separate account. Trustee Frazier said that based on law or ordinances, would the fact that a bridge is involved change our calculation. VM Sigman indicated "no."

Trustee Kaplan asked why a lane would want to remain private and not be part of Northfield to get the plowing and so forth without cost to the homeowner. VM Sigman said for the same reason many homeowners would prefer not to have it be a private road and have to maintain it, the Village has had a longstanding concern about the ability to support the cost of those since there isn't a source of revenue that covers the reconstruction of our roads. We do not want to take them over. There is a chart she will pass around and one-third of all the roads in Northfield are private. It's not uncommon. There are also benefits for staying on a private road and there is a policy in place that if somebody doesn't want to keep a private road and they want to dedicate it to the Village, the Village policy says they have to reconstruct the road to like new condition and it has to be in compliance with our subdivision standards which requires dedication of right of way, reconstruction of pavement, sidewalks and other things that add to the cost. In addition, the dedication of the right of way affects the underlying zoning. Some may end up under the minimum square footage. There may be setback issues or FAR issues. One of the benefits of keeping a private lane is the residents have control and they can decide what it looks like and they have the benefit of the land where it sits to be included in their property. In the 20 years she has been here, she has explained the process to a number of different private roads and no one has actually petitioned to make it public. There was actually somebody (Martin Lane) who re-constructed a road completely in compliance with the Village's subdivision standards for the road, but opted to keep it private.

Someone in the audience said they thought that Norfolk was accepted by the Village. He said that when they talked with the Village to take over Middlefork, they were told they would need to spend millions of dollars on curbs and gutters and so it was not doable financially. VM Sigman indicated it is a Village street, but that happened before she started with the Village so she is unaware of what standards were in place then. If it was a township road when they annexed in, then the Village automatically takes them. All of the Longmeadow properties who have annexed to the Village have remained private. Rolling Ridge has remained a private road after annexations.

President Gougler then polled the Board as to waiving the costs. Trustee Frazier said "no". Trustee Kozminski indicated nobody wants to pay a fee and he said it is

customary to reimburse, especially for the peer review, but this is the only bridge in town and it should be built safely. He is persuaded by the fact that it's a bridge and extraordinary circumstances and would be willing to grant a waiver. Trustee Goldenberg asked what the typical review cost. VM Sigman said that the Village bills on an hourly basis and the time varies. Some projects may be able to be reviewed in 3 hours and other times he could have 40 hours, depending upon the complexity. Trustee Goldenberg said she agrees with Joan and Brian. She said we don't typically pay for costs associated with new roads, but a bridge is different and the safety issues are more problematic. She said she would like a general policy on the bridge. She is open to granting a waiver, but the bridge should be looked at long term. Trustee Roszak again said there are two different issues. He agrees also with Joan and Brian. He would say no to the peer review because that's normal, but yes to the bridge assessment. Trustee Roszak wants to be careful that they are not throwing it all into one bucket. President Gougler indicated he is talking about just waiving the assessment of the existing bridge. Trustee Roszak feels the Village should pay for the bridge assessment.

Trustee Kaplan said he saw the chronology of the matter, and said if the proper permits had been secured and IDOT and everyone else had approved it, what expense would the Village have incurred then? \$8,000 if they had done it right to begin with? Director Gutierrez said we would not have had to do the \$8,000 assessment and would only have done a peer review. We only did the assessment because their structural engineer indicated that the bridge was unsafe. That is what triggered the \$8,000 fee. VM Sigman said that had they just come in for permits and submitted structural drawings of the replacement bridge, we would not have sent the engineer out to do an assessment of the existing structure. We would have simply just done a structural review on the proposed bridge. Trustee Kaplan said that is what the Village should be paying for and the rest seems like a screw up from their engineer's end. VM Sigman said that Trustee Kaplan sounds like he is the opposite of Trustee Roszak in that he would have the Village pay for the permit review, but not the assessment of the structure of the existing bridge. Trustee Kaplan thinks anything that was extra due to the fact that their engineer had made a mistake and as it turns out the design is not correct and they didn't go through the permit process, all the extra costs he doesn't think we should be bearing.

President Gougler said that there appears to be three votes to waive the assessment fee and two against, so the \$8,000 fee is waived. Trustee Goldenberg thinks it would be a good idea to have certain procedures to go through to avoid this. President Gougler clarified that this matter will be at the next Board meeting for ratification. So it is not being acted on now.

Infrastructure Update

President Gougler thanked VM Sigman for her lengthy memo. VM Sigman began by saying as they began to finalize the budget and closing out the fiscal year, staff thought it would be helpful to update the Board on what was done on the infrastructure projects and what is planned for next year's budget. Overall, everything is very positive. Implementation-wise the Village is on track in every category or ahead and is either

under budget or right on in all categories. VM Sigman said she will highlight the different sections and provide insight into the strategy as to how this was being rolled out instead of reading the whole memo. She will then hand the discussion over to Pat Glenn who will provide more detail on the West Central design so that the Board can think a bit about whether the Phase I work for that is something we want to try to include in this program.

VM Sigman indicated that the infrastructure program was intended to be an \$8.5 million program with \$7.5 paid from bond proceeds and \$1 million in reserves. The plan was to implement this over 7-10 years based on when projects were ready. The plan has 4 categories – with a general allotment of funds in each - roads \$5 million, storm \$2 million, life safety \$1 million and streetscape \$1/2 million.

On roads, last year we started the year not anticipating doing any roads. Thanks to some really strong market conditions, the work was expedited to take advantage of a really good market. What was estimated at \$958,000 in work was done for \$461,622. Last year, we tried to pre-negotiate a contract to do more roadwork at the same rates, but that wasn't something the contractors were interested in. They did allow us to expand the contract to include things like Maple Row and other small additions.

However, as we look at this year, we believed the reason the market was so good last year was the State was in such a mess that they stopped doing all new roadwork. Particularly the bigger roadway contractors were sitting there with not a lot to do, so they were throwing very aggressive numbers at municipal projects that they typically wouldn't bid on. That same set of circumstances still appears to be present this year. The State isn't any closer to a budget. Our plan then for this year is to bid with a larger package that includes a base bid of \$1.3 million in work with an additional \$627,000 in alternate/add on work. Depending on how competitive the prices are, the Board could then decide to do it all or \$1.9 million or to do something less. The hope is that like last year, we will be able to get that \$1.9 million in work done for much less. Once we see how the numbers come in, we can decide how much work we want to actually award. If we do it and the numbers come in fabulously, it is anticipated to do another bond issue to cover it. When the State puts bids out again, prices are likely to go way up.

Storm Sewer like Roads - we are actually ahead of schedule. In the past year, we have been able to make tremendous progress. We have completed four neighborhood projects; 2 major studies (Winnetka trunk main and West Central); created a backflow prevention grant program, and have new topographical mapping ready to be flown this spring. As we look to next year, we plan to undertake about \$225,000 in work to repair damaged/blocked storm sewers in the Sunset Drive/Valley View area, in the ComEd right of way by Edens Lane and at Lagoon and Mt Pleasant. In FY18/19, work is planned valued at about \$125,000 for the second phase of work around Sunset/Valley View drive. If all of that work is done, it is anticipated to cost us about \$500,000. That leaves about \$1.5 million that could go toward either the Winnetka Trunk Main or the West Central area. We recognize that those two projects combined will cost over \$11 million. We have a total of \$2 million to divide among everything, so without outside funding, SSA or grant, these projects will not be able to be completed.

VM Sigman went on to say that Pat will go into more details on the West Central project, but if the Board were so inclined, the Phase I work for West Central is estimated at about \$1.1 million. We could potentially proceed with that work and then utilize the balance to apply or support grants for the other \$10 million in work.

Another suggestion VM Sigman made in her memo was to pledge \$1 million in reserves for the West Central project. It will make it easier to follow and be more transparent if it is all applied to one area, and with things like the backflow prevention grant that has to be paid for in from that source, the storm sewer work seems to make the most sense. If the Phase I was done for West Central, it would go towards furthering the Winnetka Road truck main and try to get grants for the balance of the West Central. She said she hopes to get MWRDGC and the Cook County Highway Department to pay 100% of the Winnetka Road truck main. The Village will have to do the heavy lifting on the design side and technical support and hope that MWRDGC will pay 70% and that Cook County will pay 30%.

VM Sigman then discussed life safety. She said it is a bit more of a hodge podge of projects. The number one project is the 911 center. That work is underway now and will continue into next fiscal year when the changeover will actually take place. The deadline is July 1st. There are a lot of things from video loggers and recorders and connections and kiosks and different equipment that are going into that number. In addition, staff is working on the bids/pricing for our emergency warning sirens, the replacement of the generators, various building issues at FR/PW, and the Board room AV update and electronic packets. She indicated that at this point we do not have final numbers in most areas. But overall the preliminary estimates all seem to be in line with what was contemplated during the referendum development process. We believe we will be able to complete all of the work contemplated within the \$1 million allocation.

Streetscape was discussed next by VM Sigman. Initially, this work was planned a bit later in the roll out process. Funding had been earmarked for the general purpose, but specific projects had not been agreed on. In the fall, the Board reviewed the broad range of project ideas and then came back and prioritized them. In addition, the Board asked staff to expedite these projects whenever possible. Based on that direction, next year's budget contemplates us moving forward with gateway signage, PACE bus shelters, painting of traffic lights/guard rails, running electricity to the Willow Road medians for holiday lighting, and additional funds for parkway plantings and site furniture. Everything is VERY, VERY preliminary at this point, but it is estimated these elements will cost about \$228,000. She said from the beginning there was a bigger wish list than a pot of money.

VM Sigman concluded with the bond Issue. As mentioned in her memo, \$2.2 million was issued in bonds last year and there is a current balance of about \$1.6 million. That is enough to keep most of the planned projects moving forward next year. But if we are up to doing all of the roadway work we hope to, we will need to issue the next tranche. Last year the Board adopted an appropriation ordinance that allows us to front funds, when needed, and then reimburse ourselves with bond proceeds. The bond process is relatively short and we would be able to do that within about 60 to 90 days from when we know how much we want to issue. She said the other good news is that the bond

market remains fairly strong and although the rates may be a bit higher than last summer, they appear to still be historically low. As of today, the interest rate from Ehler's was about 1.84% and the 15 year rate is about 2.25%.

She then turned the discussion over to Pat to review the West Central and Winnetka Road status and then answer any questions.

Pat Glenn, civil engineer with Gewalt-Hamilton Associates, said his firm has provided engineering services to the Village of Northfield since the 1990's. Their role with the Village is capital projects engineer and the Village has Greg Kramer as the Village's engineer who reviews plans and permits. They are outside consultants for the larger projects. Last year's roadwork design and construction was done by them along with some water main projects. Currently, they are helping with the bond issue and to help the Village formulate and execute the projects.

Mr. Glenn continued by saying the roadwork is the biggest part of the bond issue. With the favorable market conditions they scrambled to put together a road project to take advantage of that. They determined which streets they could get into knowing they didn't have to come back and do utility work. The West Central area was an area they knew they had to do some sort of storm water. Last year, the work hadn't been done to figure out the cost and what work needs to be done. Also, they didn't know if the Board would like to move ahead in the short term, in which case they would hold off on paving the streets. Or if the Board says we need to defer that storm sewer improvement, we could then get in and do the roadwork. He said they have had the opportunity to examine this area, but they haven't sent the surveyors out or gotten near construction level detail. They are doing the modeling and putting numbers to it, such as if there was a significant storm water improvement in this area, what it would look like and conceptually what it would cost. This is a new project to the Board. It doesn't exist in the overall plan. He intends on incorporating it into the overall plan. The overall plan has quite a few projects in that plan that the Village currently doesn't have the resources to execute it. So this will fit in with that work.

Trustee Frazier questioned the boundaries of West Central. Mr. Glenn said generally all the streets west of Wagner, south of Willow, Jeffrey on the west and Drury on the south. VM Sigman added that when Mr. Glenn talks about incorporating the project in our overall plan, a comprehensive storm water plan was done a number of years ago that outlines projects, but by putting it in our plan keeps it more accessible to secure grants and other outside funding later on. It was important that it be in there to leverage that for future funding.

Mr. Glenn passed out hard copies of the presentation. He said the memo explains a little more and there is a memo that has a link to the full report. The colors indicate that green is higher and purple is lower. The neighborhood in many places is lower than Willow and Wagner Roads. The course of drainage is toward Middlefork, so it goes west to east and what happens in this neighborhood is as water is trying to get east, Wagner and Willow are higher so the only way to get the storm water out is through storm sewers. They have observed water standing up against Wagner Road that can't get over the road. He said the topography is compounded by an enormous area that drains through this area – almost 90 acres in area itself and what is upstream of it. This

is the fundamental drainage issue all down the middle of Northfield where we have a drainage area and a river all the way on one side. So all these bid areas have to work their way through the neighborhoods to get to the river on the far side.

Mr. Glenn indicated that there is some storm sewer in the neighborhood. There was a lot of pipe put in the ground over a long period of time to address specific problems using the tools at hand. But it isn't sufficient. The area was platted in the early 1930's and at that time, there was virtually no engineering oversight. If you owned a piece of property and subdivided it, the authorities signed off and you built it. This area doesn't have a lot of modern storm water amenities, not only designed storm sewers but also easements so that the Village can get in and do work and recognition that certain overland areas need to be kept free of development so that the water can flow between the properties. The only outlet for the water is storm sewers. He pointed out the two black lines are what was basically the only way for the water to get out of the subdivision. There is a storm sewer on Wagner Road that ties into the Willow Road system and then from the end of Graemere up and toward Middlefork School is a 42" diameter storm sewer that the Village built back in the 1990's. That storm sewer is completely separate from the Willow Road storm sewer. It is hard pipe across the road and there are two 9' diameter manholes where that pipe intersects the Willow Road storm sewer and remains completely separate. The state now has come through and put in really big storm sewers on Willow to handle a lot more capacity to consider as an outlet for the neighborhood. The Village's 42" storm sewer remains as it was.

Mr. Glenn said it now leads them to consider what they can build to utilize the maximum amount of capacity out of the neighborhood. There are two systems in that central area, one system is all the way on the west and north side that runs up Jeffrey Street and through the unimproved Willow Road right of way and ties into the Willow Road system and another system ties into the Village's system. By looking at the capacity of those two systems and how they need to be divided so as best they can they don't overwhelm one or the other. As big as the pipes are, they have limitations. The other consideration, which is the normal approach for storm water, is if you have limited downstream capacity you build detention to store the water someplace until the downstream storm sewer catch up. We have the unimproved right of way so it is included in this modeling of what the impact or benefit would be of having some detention. It wouldn't flood neighboring properties. From an engineering and storm water perspective, the unimproved right of way has a benefit.

Trustee Frazier asked where the end of Thackeray and Ingram drains now. Mr. Glenn answered that Thackeray goes straight north and up into the Village system and Ingram outlets into the same ditch which makes it into the Village storm sewer. There isn't a direct connection of these local storm sewers into the IDOT system. It drains into the unimproved Willow Road right of way and ultimately into the Village's 42" storm sewer. Mr. Goodwin asked if the pond by his home would get bigger. Mr. Glenn said it would be excavated out and day to day the water would change. In a very large storm, it would fill up. Mr. Glenn said they would propose to take more dirt out so you could get a bigger volume, but not bringing it out any further or higher. Mr. Goodwin asked if the area would be fenced for safety reasons. Mr. Glenn indicated there are two schools of thought on that. The logical thing would be to put a fence around it but he was told if

you put a fence around it and someone is on the other side of the fence where they shouldn't belong, you can't get to them as quickly.

Mr. Glenn anticipates a lot of discussion on this unimproved right of way. Trustee Goldenberg asked how deep it would be. Mr. Glenn answered 3 or 4 feet. President Gougler indicated the property directly north of this is under development. He asked if there is any way if some of this flood relief could be incorporated into the design of what is being considered for that 7 acre parcel to the north. Mr. Glenn said they will definitely be coordinated. He said you can't see it in the picture, but there is whole separate 96 acre area just north of this area which is what flows through that subdivision and goes directly into the IDOT system. When there is a big rain, they are acting together. When in the design stage, they will look at it as two separate areas. He said as they see that development evolve, if there are ways to either tie into phases of this work or easements which may be needed, they will be looking at it at the same time. Mr. Terrill asked if there is a sea wall around the water. Mr. Glenn said it is just a natural open area. Mr. Glenn said they looked at it and didn't think they would need any retaining walls which would start to get expensive. Mr. Goodwin indicated that 99% of the time there isn't any water in there.

Mr. Glenn said they put an amount of \$3.8 million on the project. Remembering that there is roadwork that is waiting on making decisions here, they tried to see if there is a piece they could start with. What they thought would be the first logical step is to make a clean, standalone project of the Jeffrey Street portion for a couple of reasons. It gets over the hurdle of a portion needing a permit from IDOT. He said we don't have that permission now and before the other part of the project gets put in the ground, they would like to know that this is built and working so as to not overtax the Village sewer. This also picks up a lot of offsite flow that comes into the neighborhood. It's good hydraulics and good optics too. He said at least a lot of that tributary flow can be picked up. This was figured at \$1.1 million.

President Gougler questioned if it could be built in a way that they could accommodate a detention pond. Mr. Glenn said he is envisioning the detention as part of the second phase. This is very conceptual. Trustee Kozminski added that Drury Lane and Birchwood slopes west toward the river so you are picking that up and alleviating the burden on the West Central neighborhood. Mr. Goodwin said by putting that trunk on Jeffrey, they get a lot of the water on Ingram and it keeps moving east especially down the easement. Mr. Glenn said they will put the pipe under the road so then they can do the roadway. This is similar to the Churchill project where they pulverized the whole road, put the pipe in and came back and put in the new road.

Mr. Glenn then gave visuals through the desktop. Approximations they can generate with the GIS data and models. He proceeded to show a 10 year event on the screen. He said this neighborhood is susceptible with intense, brief storms. They determined that it's the one hour duration event that is critical for the area. The 10 year event would drop 2.1" in one hour. When you talk about the 10 year storm, you immediately talk about the 100 year storm. The 10 year is a major event. A 100 year storm has not been seen in this neighborhood. The 100 year event would be over 3.5" in an hour. He then showed what it would look like with the Jeffrey pipe in. When they can implement the full project, it eliminates all flooding for a 10 year event. To physically increase the

42" line is impossible because it is hard pipe through the Willow Road storm sewer. Mr. Terrill asked what the life expectancy is of Phase 3. Mr. Glenn said about 80-100 years, but it will still need maintenance.

Trustee Roszak said the \$2.2 million is for phase 1 of our overall and the \$1.1 million for this phase 1 and asked if it's in the \$2.2 million. VM Sigman explained that in the initial \$2.2 million bond issuance, \$400,000 of that was for storm water. Right now, she said we have about \$500,000 in other storm water work planned to be done. Bonds have been issued for about \$400,000 of the \$2 million total. So about \$1.5 million left from the overall \$8.5 million project. Trustee Roszak then asked how the \$1.1 million would be paid. VM Sigman said we could do a combination of two things. We would take about \$775,000 from reserves and the balance of \$250,000 would be included in the next tranche of bond issues when we do the roadwork this summer if the rates are good. VM Sigman's suggestion was that between the Winnetka Road trunk and all of West Central is \$11 million worth of projects and our focus now should be to try and get that \$7 million because the Winnetka trunk main is important. She said we can't solve the rest of the flooding until we get that second spine in. Staff is fighting to try and get MWRD and Cook County to fund that. We hope to get the 70/30 split and get them to pay 100% for us and the Village just paying the support design. After we did the phase 1 at West Central, we would continue to explore other grant opportunities to pay for the balance. Cook County has already agreed that they will pay any matching funds that MWRD would want.

Trustee Kozminski thought the presentation was great and thanked staff for their work on it. His question is when will we know when to get them both done. He doesn't want to commit to one and then not be able to do the other. VM Sigman explained that even if phase 1 for West Central is done, that doesn't help us do the trunk. We either get grants on the trunk or we don't do anything at all. At least with West Central we have something we can do which is in our control. Timing wise, Pat was down with MWRDGC within the last month talking about the project. She said she is regularly talking to Cook County. Last time Pat and Mike were down there, they specifically said how do we get in line for the funding and they said there was going to be another call for projects coming out. She indicated we are ready to go with that. The grant application is getting ready to go and we're hoping to plug and play. Unfortunately, that doesn't mean we'll get it. Hopefully by the end of 2017, MWRDGC should be announcing who has the grants.

President Gougler said that when we made the concessions with Willow, we wanted something back for the Village. If the developers want to take out the median on Willow Road to enhance the value of their property, he thinks they should be offering something to the community. There is an opportunity to leverage that development for a public benefit. He can see phase 1 being something that might be negotiable if we're smart as we look at this development. It doesn't impact them directly, but that project won't work without the median being compromised. If we are to concede that, the developer needs to give something of public value back. Since we don't have the funding for the whole project, we could at least get the \$1 million for phase 1.

Mr. Goodwin said they will need a pipe into something, whether it's the new phase 1 60" or go out straight to Willow Road somehow. There is a swale through the middle of that area that goes down into something. Mr. Glenn said as they further the design development of that project, they can work between them, the state and the developer. We could say for the outlet for your site, build the pipe in the unimproved right of way. It doesn't make sense to build two parallel pipes.

Trustee Goldenberg asked what the status is with the storm water study projects. VM Sigman said the Winnetka Road trunk main is a big one and we are in the process of that. Several projects were done by the state and we got them to fund them. Many projects that are in there are things that we recognized from the beginning, but we don't have the wherewithal to do. They will have to be done on a larger regional basis – dredging the river, berming and other things on the east side of town. A lot of the smaller projects have been done.

Trustee Frazier asked Mr. Glenn if we should be worried because Winnetka is spending millions of dollars to funnel their storm water west of the Forest Preserves. Mr. Glenn said worried probably not, but we should be paying attention. We have a good relationship with them.

Trustee Kaplan said the water is already backing up. It's an annual event, not a 10 year event. The ballfield behind the school is always completely flooded. He asked if you put all this piping in, where is the water going to go. Mr. Glenn said for this neighborhood it's a one hour event, very short and very intense events that blow up this neighborhood long before the river, with several square miles of drainage area, has a chance to catch up and so the notion here is with the local conveyance, we can get this area drained before the river then comes up rather than having the situation where the river is up and this neighborhoods' water is finally getting there and adding to that peak. When the river is up and Willow Park is flooded, there isn't anything we can do upstream that is going to alleviate that. Trustee Kaplan said everyone is getting flooded with the backup so all you're doing here is getting the water there faster to save this little neighborhood and then all that is going to do is put more water in the system that's not going into people's basements and it's going to back up further and flood other parts of Northfield due to the river being up already. He said it seems like we're fixing one problem and then there are other holes in the dyke over here because we fixed this. He is concerned that money is being spent where there may be other issues caused by the fix. Mr. Glenn said if the Board should decide to proceed with phase I or some portion of this project, it's a fair question and one we should have a good answer for. This notion of why we should get the water out of this neighborhood into the river and gone early doesn't impact ultimately what the crest of the river is. The river is going up to its level because of what is going on way upstream of us, not from what is happening here. VM Sigman added that none of the West Central work is programmed into the budget for next year. Staff wanted to outline the options for the Board so they can begin to think of what the best options are and when to proceed.

Other Business

No other business.

Adjournment

Village President Gougler asked for a motion to adjourn. Trustee Kozminski made a motion, seconded by Trustee Goldenberg to adjourn the meeting. By voice vote all agreed and the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.