

**MINUTES  
of the  
REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
VILLAGE OF NORTHFIELD  
Monday, December 1, 2008 - 7:00 p.m.**

The Board of Trustees of the Village of Northfield met in the Council Chambers of the Village Hall for the Regular Board meeting on Monday, December 1, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by President John Birkinbine. The Village Clerk called the roll.

PRESENT:	President Trustees	John Birkinbine, Jr. John Chapin, Jr. Frank Charhut Joan Frazier Terry Gottlieb Ted Greene Fred Teichert
----------	-----------------------	--

**Discussion and review of Stormwater Report by Consulting Engineer Patrick Glenn of Gewalt Hamilton.**

Manager Sigman stated that the Village contracted with the engineering firm of Gewalt Hamilton to do a comprehensive review of the Village's watershed and stormwater situation. Engineer Patrick Glenn is here to provide a review of the findings of that report. Upon completion of that review, the report will be finalized and brought to the Board in January. Manager Sigman noted that those with questions and anyone who wants to be heard by the Board should sign up at the table in the back of the room.

Mr. Glenn reported that since spring 2008, they have been working to develop a village-wide stormwater management plan. Because of the major rain storm in September, additional information was provided and the plan is not quite complete. However, he noted he is providing this interim report tonight summarizing the findings so far. He stated he would provide some background information, observations with regard to the rainfall and flooding they saw in September, projects that are included in the stormwater management plan at this stage and, where they intend to go as the plan is finalized. He added that some of the information may be repetitive from the prior two public meetings that were held.

Mr. Glenn commented that they started with two surveys to the community. In spring a survey was sent to all residential and business addresses to collect information on known flooding issues and documentation of those issues in order to develop a sense of what the community sees as the stormwater issues that need to be resolved. By the July community meeting, 370 survey responses were received. As a result of the September flooding, it was appropriate to resend the survey. A second survey was mailed in October 2008 to residential homes only and that mailing generated an additional 200 surveys. Prior to the September storm, the surveys generally focused on smaller, more nuisance oriented drainage issues. That changed in the second survey. Mr.

Glenn related that it is understandable people are not enthusiastic about tagging their property as having flooding issues. Consequently, the surveys received are most likely not indigitive of all the flooding problems that exist in the community.

In reviewing the survey responses, there were 14 locations that reported flooding on the first floor of the building; 300 reports of basement flooding including causes such as the sump pump could not keep up, power failure or sewer backups or basement flooding through window wells or under doors. Yard flooding was reported throughout the Village. Nearly everyone who responded had some type of yard flooding. Of the total 570 returned surveys, there were 70 to 75 that reported no flooding at all.

Mr. Glenn reported on what was observed and measured from the September rain event. The state water survey maintains a rain gauge at the Winnetka Park District's facility north of Willow Road and east of Forestway. It registers rainfall every 10 minutes except for the September storm when the bucket on the gauge filled up relatively early in the storm and just quit reporting data. The state took that gauge and compared it with others to determine a formula to extrapolate the additional rain. The best estimate is that about 8.2 inches of rain fell over the three-day period. Because the gauge is so close to Northfield, Gewalt Hamilton's engineers felt it was very reliable.

On the day after the storm, Mr. Glenn reported they went out and took a lot of photographs as did the Public Works Department and information was received from a number of residents. When they surveyed the high water marks in various locations, the flooding elevations were between the 10 year and 100 year elevations that FEMA predicts. In general what was observed is that along the Middlefork River Branch in the center of town, elevations were generally closer to or exceeded the FEMA 100 year elevations, whereas along the Skokie River on the east side of town, elevations were significantly lower than the 100 year elevations and in some locations by as much as two feet lower. They observed river flooding along the rivers as well as overland flow that was not necessarily adjacent to the river. In the center of town (Bosworth area) they saw a lot of overland flow. Stormwater flowed in a straight line between where it was at and the river, flooding from block to block going over land and into resident's window wells. He noted that he also reviewed observations from the Public Works Department on the Saturday following the storms, when the Middlefork Branch was at it highest and most likely reached the 100 year elevations.

Many people had questions about the modifications the Forest Preserve District performed on the Willow Road Dam. The Forest Preserve District explained that to make the flow of water more normal and not block up the three circular pipes with tree branches and debris, they eliminated those three pipes and installed a notch that is about 7-1/2 feet wide to allow the debris to flow through and not be a maintenance issue. All dams in the state are regulated by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and they reviewed the improvements to the Skokie Lagoon dam and issued the permit for the work that was done. Part of the permit submittal that

was sent to IDNR included a hydraulic model that included the dam as it previously existed and as it was modified. The Village was able to obtain a copy of that model from the Forest Preserve District and had another consulting engineer that specializes in this type of modeling apply the actual September rain amount to the model to determine what the effect of this particular rain event was on the modifications. The rain amount was run through the model of the dam as it was and as it was modified to see what the water elevations would be down stream from the dam. The model results show that with the modifications, it appears that downstream water elevations were increased by two to three tenths of a foot which is about 3 to 4 inches. The model indicates that had the dam not been modified, the peak downstream water elevations might have been 3 to 4 inches lower than they were. The model also shows that for much higher flows, the modification becomes irrelevant. The rain event the Village got could be considered a 100 year event. However, for this particular watershed, this 100 year rain event did not produce the 100 year flood. The watershed of the Skokie River is more sensitive to a different type of storm probably one of longer duration and higher volume. FEMA predicts flood elevations two to three feet higher than what was observed on the Skokie River after the September storm. Mr. Glenn reported that if the water were at the 100 year flood level, it would be almost two feet above the spillway of the dam and when it reaches that level on the dam the flow through the three notches becomes irrelevant because so much water is coming over the top of the dam. He noted that they contacted the IDNR to find out if there was a permit requirement for the District to inspect flows less than 100 year events. They responded "no." He stated they are simply concerned with the safety and integrity of the dam itself. The downstream water elevations are not part of what the IDNR reviews during a dam permit process.

Mr. Glenn then went on to discuss what improvements are being proposed in the report to alleviate some of the stormwater issues of the Village. He noted they separated the private drainage issues from the larger public drainage issues and established a scale of the severity in terms of damage for the issues. The proposed improvements can be broken down into two categories: 1) conveyance improvements – focusing on getting the water from where it is and back to the river without causing damages, and 2) protection projects – putting in improvements that are meant to keep flood waters away from properties.

He noted the conveyance improvements are mostly storm sewer improvements:

1. A trunk line storm sewer on Willow Road with a number of branch sewers on adjacent streets east of Wagner Road to increase the storm water capacities and lessen the frequency which the storm sewer is overwhelmed. The project is estimated at \$2.3 to \$2.8 million project.
2. Another storm sewer project is proposed along Winnetka Road. The storm sewers to the west are not sufficient to carry the entire flow on Winnetka Road and currently the

water goes down Winnetka Road and flows off to adjacent properties on its way to the Branch of the Middlefork River. The idea is to put in a large enough trunk line sewer to carry those flows and reduce the frequency by overflow damages. This project is estimated at between \$2.5 and \$3.1 million.

3. Two other storm sewer projects that are proposed along Sunset Ridge Road, both pick up large drainage areas west of Sunset Ridge and convey the water to the river without using the overland flow paths in the community. The cost of the northerly section of sewer is estimated at between \$1.4 and \$1.8 million and the southerly section is estimated at between \$1.7 and \$2.1 million.
4. Also as a conveyance project, Gewalt Hamilton is proposing a channel improvement along the entire Middlefork River. The river is largely eroded with steep banks and dense overgrowth that inhibits the amount of conveyance or flow of water. They modeled the river and found that by clearing out the undergrowth adjacent to the river and laying back the banks with a less steep slope, the conveyance of the river would be increased and would have the effect of lowering the 100 year elevations along the river between six inches and one foot. The cost of this project is estimated to be between \$5.1 and \$5.5 million to do the Middlefork Branch in its entirety from Winnetka Road north to the Village limits. He noted that there are benefits that would be realized whether the entire river was done or just portions.
5. In looking at the Skokie River, they determined it would not benefit from a similar project. The river has very little vertical fall between the dam and the Edens Expressway and the flow is sluggish. The elevations are largely controlled by the downstream confluence with the Middlefork which happens just south and west of the Edens and that is what drives the elevation of the Skokie River during floods. To alleviate flooding east of the expressway, Gewalt Hamilton is proposing flood barriers (levees or dykes) in two locations to prevent flood water from the river from reaching developed properties. In each location it would require a pumping station on the dry side of the levee. It is being suggested to cut these areas off from the river so a pumping station is needed on the protected side to bring storm water back into the river. The two locations are the Willow/Lagoon neighborhood where the levee would be 4 to 5 feet high and as proposed it encompasses protection for all the properties east of the Edens north of Winnetka Avenue. This project is estimated as being between a \$3.3 and \$3.6 million. A second barrier could be put south of Winnetka Road and east of the river which would protect the homes west of Hibbard and south of Winnetka Road. It is estimated at between \$2.9 and \$3.2 million.
6. In an effort to address some of the sewer back up issues which is more of a regional issue, the Village could help by doing some investigations to make sure storm water is not getting into the local sanitary sewers which would increase the frequency and

severity of these sewer back ups. Some work can be done to make sure storm water is not contributing to those back ups. Mr. Glenn noted that in the Lagoon and Meadowview areas, the storm sewers were observed to be flowing backwards during the September flood. Regardless of the larger prevention projects, the Village could still undertake the backflow prevention of these storm sewers to at least prevent the river from flowing back through the storm sewers. This project would cost about \$100,000.

7. Mr. Glenn also noted that while preparing the stormwater report, engineers mapped and located all the storm sewers, and they noted structures where catch basins and manholes need repair or maintenance due to debris.

Projects that were not included in the report are small scale issues on private property and proposals for particular structural work by elevating or relocation. Mr. Glenn addressed a question posed by a resident at the October town meeting about whether a large tunnel could be dug with a pipe that goes from the Botanic Garden to Lake Michigan to take the water and dump it in Lake Michigan. In investigating that, they found that a similar proposal was put forth for the Des Plaines River in the 1990's but got hung up when the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) said that it is fine to take flood waters to Lake Michigan but since it is a source of drinking water, if you take it there, you have to store it and treat it before dumping it in the lake. And, if we could store flood water, we would not need to get it to Lake Michigan.

To finish the stormwater plan, Gewalt Hamilton needs to quantify what the benefits are for the various projects. It is easy to put together costs for the projects, but the Village can't make decisions or put forth proposals for outside funding until the benefits can be quantified from implementing the projects. Mr. Glenn noted they also want to do more research on what outside funding sources may be available through federal and state agencies to help the Village pay for some of the improvements. Gewalt Hamilton will include whether the Village would want to consider establishing a stormwater utility to try and move forward with some of the improvements. He also noted that they would want to help develop some "green" solutions that the Village might encourage residents to implement on their own properties that will provide a stormwater benefit for everyone.

Questions were then invited from the Board members.

Trustee Charhut asked if all of the sewers were done that are shown on the map, wouldn't that be sending more water to the river faster? What makes us think that the river will be able to carry all the water out?

Mr. Glenn noted that we need to remember that we are not taking water from someplace else that is not a tributary to the creek today. What is happening today is that with these large rain events, the stormwater overflows the storm sewers and simply flows overland to the river. It is getting there whether we get it through a pipe or through someone's yard. The storm sewer projects are intended to get the water from the source to the river without the intervening damages to someone's property. There is no meaningful storage that is being eliminated.

Trustee Charhut asked whether timing was an issue.

Mr. Glenn responded that timing is always an issue with hydraulics. It is likely that those nearest to the river where the storm sewer are, you could beat the timing of the largest flood. He noted that the watershed of the Middlefork River at Willow Road is about 30 square miles. If there were improved storm sewers that got the local drainage to the river faster, it takes about 12 hour or 24 hours for the whole watershed to come down and flood the river, the local water could be gotten to the river and gone before the crest of the later floodwater comes along. There can be an advantage of moving local water to the river faster.

Trustee Gottlieb inquired about the potential sources of funding to mitigate the cost to the Village; what is a reasonable time frame after applying for grants?

Mr. Glenn noted that at this particular time in the economy it is difficult to have any real expectation especially at the State level. However, projects that are ready to go and meet the criteria historically have been funded within a reasonable one to two year time frame. He noted that the Willow Park had some federal monies and those grants were available within 12 to 18 months from application. That was several years ago and it is a different economic time.

Manager Sigman also noted that some of the projects would also involve other agencies such as the Cook County Forest Preserve and agencies that control the land. Permits would be needed from them to do the work which also adds to the timing.

Trustee Frazier asked that if the Village meets the grants, whether the money is available to do projects.

Mr. Glenn responded that currently the most likely project to receive outside funding is the channel improvements of the Middlefork River. Other projects are less likely because it is less likely to show a benefit for the expenditure and they are largely outside the maps flood plains. The protection projects on the east side of the Edens have some difficulty from FEMA because they tend to focus on eliminating the improvement from the hazard rather than taking the hazard from the improvement. FEMA generally pushes to see buildings elevated, relocated or moved versus the types of civil works that go into preventing damages.

Trustee Frazier also noted that Mr. Glenn had mentioned areas where new construction has occurred and inquired whether he had isolated particular neighborhoods where this has impacted flooding.

Mr. Glenn responded "no". He noted that in the interim report they prepared, they addressed the issues and concerns of residents about the effects of new construction on their property. He noted there was no discernable location. It was randomly spread throughout the Village where projects were going on and neighboring residents questioned their impact.

Trustee Chapin asked whether it is the Army Corps of Engineers' responsibility to dredge the Middlefork River.

Mr. Glenn responded that he did not think the Corps has the responsibility of maintaining the Middlefork River. Historically the Corps was willing and did some maintenance along streams like that

but that role to a large extent has been taken over by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation Dept. (MWRD). They will do small clearing of branches and brush. The Corps does not have a responsibility to maintain natural drainage courses on private property. He did not feel the Corps would take direct responsibility for the river improvement.

Trustee Charhut read a passage in the report that noted that “by improving the bank drainage of the Middlefork, this project would result in lowering the base 100 year flood elevation of the Middlefork between 6 inches and one foot throughout the Village. The frequency and severity of damage to property would be reduced. Property owners could receive reduced flood insurance premiums following revision of the regulatory flood elevations.

Mr. Glenn noted that the project would provide some direct benefits and it is the one that has the highest likelihood of receiving outside funding. He added, it is important to remember that that river runs almost entirely through private property and easements would be required from property owners along the river and there could be resistance from some owners.

Trustee Teichert asked if all our problems were fixed, wouldn't there be problems downstream?

Mr. Glenn responded that what is being proposed is an excavation project and it is almost impossible to flood a neighbor by digging a hole. What would be done to increase the ability of the Middlefork to carry the flood flows at a lower elevation. It is just carrying the water through the village more efficiently at a lower elevation by a channel within the Village.

Trustee Teichert asked whether it would be viable to dig a big detention area in the Forest Preserve if they would allow it.

Mr. Glenn responded “yes.” If the Village was able to acquire the rights to property to construct a reservoir, it would provide a benefit for those downstream.

Manager Sigman noted that she knows of at least three communities that have been working for some years on just such a request and they have not been successful in getting the Forest Preserve to make this type of grant.

President Birkinbine asked what they would do in the area around Robinhood Lane where the water has been imperiling the parking and driveway.

Mr. Glenn noted that the plan would not work in this area since the river is almost taking their parking lot already. In this area, the project includes armoring the bank on Robinhood Lane to stabilize the bank. The erosion of this area is included in the project.

Residents were then called on for their questions.

Chuck Hirsch of 350 Latrobe, on the east side of town, noted that the reservoirs mentioned for the Forest Preserve area have a slim chance to none of being accepted. He noted however, the huge reservoir north of Willow Road that functions in this capacity. He asked whether the Forest Preserve could be asked to dredge the Skokie Lagoons to make them deeper, have the elevation lowered to accommodate more water so that the existing Lagoons could act as a water retention.

Mr. Glenn said the short answer is yes if the Forest Preserve District is inclined to rework the Lagoons and reconfigure the control structures. The Lagoons could be used differently to provide

more of a stormwater benefit to downstream properties. Historically, the District sees the Lagoons as a recreational area and has not been inclined to use the Lagoons to their full storm water capacity.

Mr. Glenn noted that is why they did not propose that in their plan.

Manager Sigman clarified her earlier comment that the District has said no to large detention basins used on their property. She noted that she is not aware of anyone who has requested a flood barrier and we feel this might be more acceptable to the Forest Preserve District.

Resident Tom Schwartz of 61 Meadowview Drive asked if permits are required to put the backflow devices in the sewers and if so do you think it would be difficult to get them.

Mr. Glenn responded that the backflow devices would require permits from either or both the Forest Preserve District and the Illinois Department of Transportation, neither of which would be a significant hurdle.

Resident Roberto Levi from 9 Winfield Drive asked if the ecosystem has been taken into consideration in the proposed projects. He noted that affecting the ecosystem would affect the fauna and flora and thus the residents. However, he felt that increasing the depth of the Lagoons would not affect the ecosystem and may have a benefit

Mr. Glenn responded that neither he nor the other Gewalt Hamilton engineers involved in this study have preformed any environmental analyses. All of the projects along the rivers would require permits from the Army Corps of Engineers and we would expect them to review any projects. At this stage, no environmental study has been done. He noted that he did not feel any of the projects would be rejected on environmental concerns but that is not to say there are no endangered species in the Middlefork River that could hinder the project.

Resident Joanne Burnstein of 91 Meadowview noted that Mr. Glenn had mentioned that to get pumping stations in the area it would require the support of FEMA and that they would not be likely to give it. She asked if he was referring to financial support or would they also be unlikely to approve such a project?

Mr. Glenn responded that his comments were mainly referring to financial support. He added that FEMA would not object to or disallow any flood control projects.

Resident Roseanne Barrett of 286 Ingram wanted to know more about the sheet metal used to stabilize the bank and whether it would look like the channelization projects of 3-5 decades ago which were ultimately ecologically disastrous.

Mr. Glenn responded "no." He added that in the particular location at Robinhood, they are stuck with the geography that is there. They have no room to move the bank out and flatten it out. A good example of what is being proposed along the Middlefork can actually be seen at Willow Park where the banks had a very steep drop off and there was a lot of buckthorn and undergrowth. The bank was excavated out which gave the bank a less severe slope and planted it with native plantings which is included in the cost estimated. These plantings also improve the project in the eyes of the EPA which might have grant monies available for restoration of stream banks. Ms. Barrett then asked if they could identify certain projects that individuals or groups might pitch in and work on to help such

as eagle scouts that have helped develop nature trails along the Des Plaines Trail so residents are not waiting forever for money or raising their own taxes.

Mr. Glenn noted that “yes” these types of projects could be identified. He said that some of the larger civil projects don’t lend themselves to volunteer groups but the smaller projects that can be handled at the downspout do. Projects such as the rain gardens where a small excavation on a single property are done lend themselves to volunteerism and are on a scale that volunteers can handle.

Resident Dave McGregor of 221 Latrobe, asked whether the Middlefork River project was identified as having the best cost benefit.

Mr. Glenn responded that they are not there yet and have not quantified the benefits in order to start drawing those conclusions. The Middlefork work is where the improvement would net a direct and immediate benefit and lends itself to some outside funding.

Resident McGregor asked how that project will benefit residents East of the Edens Expressway that live close to the Skokie River.

Mr. Glenn noted that there is no direct benefit to a homeowner who is not affected by the problems that are alleviated by any of these projects.

Resident McGregor asked if the Middlefork project was done, would it harm residents on the east side.

Mr. Glenn responded that work on the Middlefork would have no impact on flooding to residents East of the Edens.

Phyllis Amublay of 346 Lagoon Drive, (east of the Edens), noted that with lesser rainfalls, she and her neighbors have had flooding problems with their garages and back yards, etc. and wondered if any of the proposed projects would address that. She asked if the backflow project would help.

Mr. Glenn responded that in the projects planned there is no direct solution for her particular problem. In other areas where storm sewers are proposed, they may create an outlet for some future private storm sewer that could alleviate problems in those areas. East of the Edens we don’t have a storm sewer project proposed that would create a new lower or larger outlet for another storm sewer that would directly address the particular problem in your backyards. He noted that she is not alone with her problem and that from the results of the surveys, that issue was flagged village-wide. He further noted that many parts of the village were designed decades ago before there was any real review of engineering developments so backyards are problematic because the sub-divisions weren’t built the way they are today with all types of rear yard storm sewers and easements. The projects proposed would not directly address that situation.

Mary Malin of 602 Woodland Lane North, asked about the channeling of Middlefork and if it would be deeper or wider.

Mr. Glenn reported that it would actually be wider rather than deeper. He noted that there is not a lot to be gained by going deeper at that flow level. Where you pick up flood flows is at the higher elevation so if you can open the channel up, you can carry the larger volumes of water. It is more involved in widening the channel and taking the near vertical banks holding the toe and pulling the top

of the bank back. He noted that there is a supposition that they would have 30 feet on either side of the river to work in throughout its length. Mr. Glenn reported they assumed they would have easements but each individual yard would have its own width.

Resident Malin asked whether the cottonwood trees on the banks would be taken down.

Mr. Glenn responded "not necessarily." The larger trees could be left as they did at Willow Park. He noted it is largely a function of whether the particular vegetation is constricting the channel. He further noted that he would not want to mislead anyone; it would look significantly different looking out their backyard window. It would be more cleared out. Being able to get water through the channel does not lend itself to a lot of vegetation. They would propose that native type of plantings be used rather than the woody types of species that have established themselves.

Resident Paul Wagner of 257 Latrobe, stated that he failed to see how spending any money was going to solve resident's problems. If the outlet for stormwater is the river, and if everyone is putting water in the river and the elevation of that water is higher than the elevation of the flood, how is that water going to run uphill? He noted you can do something on your own but you are not going to be able to move the water by gravity in the bowl we live in. He stated that our problem is that we live in a bowl and the only way to get rid of the water is to pump it or store it and let it out later when the river comes down. The Skokie Lagoon is a joke. When they built it and put the dam there, that was a retention basin. If you use it for that, it works but if you cut an 8 foot wide hole in it you are not using it for that. What should be done is stop the water from flowing out of the dam when a storm comes and hold it as a retention basin should.

Jane Goldenberg of 61 Meadowview, noted that with regard to the Willow Road dam, since your study shows there is an additional 3 to 4 inches coming downstream as a result of the notch being put in, maybe it did not create that much of a difference in this storm but there will be other storms where 3 to 4 inches would make all the difference in someone's house flooding. It seems that a fundamental mistake has been made and I don't think they intended to create a much worse situation in Northfield but what is our recourse as a Village. Could Cook County do something to reduce the water flow in the future. Is that something we are looking at?

Mr. Glenn noted that outside of the permit requirements for maintaining and modifying the dam he questioned whether there were other requirements the District is obligated to abide by maintaining or modifying the dam. He noted that this would be a legal question and outside his purview.

Ms. Goldenberg further noted that having two pumping stations to protect her neighborhood does not seem to be a viable solution. What about pumping out the street during the storm.

Mr. Glenn reported that they are exploring this with Public Works in order to come up with some temporary solutions during flooding. He noted it was a good suggestion at a previous meeting when a resident asked why we don't treat flooding like snowstorms. We know it is coming. We could be ready to go in certain areas. He noted that they are trying to work on incorporating this into the actions taken during big storms at specific locations.

Resident Paul Katz of 81 East Canterbury Lane, noted that his street was impacted by the September storm and his next door neighbor was canoeing up and down the street. What would be the impact on our Village if any of the villages to the north of us performed any of these projects on the river that you proposed we do and then do we become obliged to do the same thing.

Mr. Glenn restated the question as if the communities immediately upstream of us where to perform exactly what we are proposing and noted the impact on Northfield would be minimal if at all. We are simply proposing to convey the water with the Middlefork and storm sewer projects that is already getting to the river by using pipes rather than overland flow or with the river we are conveying the same amount of water but at a lower elevation so the downstream impacts would be negligible whether we were the upstream folks or the downstream folks.

Scott McCallum of 2098 Old Willow Road, and 270 Thackeray, asked for more information on installing the backflow devices, what it entails, etc.

Mr. Glenn reported that the installation of the backflow prevention devices requires putting in a new manhole at the end of the stormsewer where it enters into the river that has a valve on the end that snaps shut. It is a structural improvement at each of the storm sewer outfalls where they meet the river. The other side of that is they only have a benefit under a limited set of circumstances where the river is high but the local drainage is low. In the case of the September storm, there would have been a direct benefit. Under most circumstances, usually the local drainage comes up before the river does so you want to try and get that out. The backflow prevention device would simply reduce the amount of water that is getting to your property from the river. The approximate cost for storm sewers identified along Willow Road, east from Lagoon to the river and in the Meadowview area was under \$100,000. There may be additional sewers that could also benefit.

Mr. McCallum remarked that it sounds like a bargain compared to some of the other costs to protect against the annual 100 year floods.

Tim Ringer of 321 Latrobe, asked if the water in the Skokie River had measured the amount expected for a 100 year event, would it have overtopped the levees on the Skokie dam.

Mr. Glenn noted that it would if it had met the requirements set by FEMA for a 100 year event. He noted that the existing levee for the Skokie River is not an engineered levee and is not reliable which is why they would propose to build a new levee away from the river.

Mr. Ringer also asked if we have thought about working with other communities. He asked because he received a letter from survey crews to come on his property because Lake County is doing a study of the Skokie River basin in conjunction with IDNR. Is there an ability to partner with other communities or agencies for a more regional solution to help get more funding?

Manager Sigman responded "absolutely". We have already had conversations with Glenview, Northbrook and Winnetka on what we are doing and that is how I know what they have been trying to do with the Forest preserve. I think that we will have the most success getting funding if there are multiple jurisdictions behind it. We will explore all of those avenues.

Bobbie Moore of 345 Sunset Drive, commented that Meadowbrook and Sunset Drive both have bridges and that it was at those points that flooding occurred during the September storm. When you talk about widening the Middlefork River, is the cost of the bridges part of that? What are your plans for those bridges?

Mr. Glenn responded that the project as proposed does not include replacement of the bridges along the river. We did give some consideration to that specific area to removing one of the bridges because a bridge itself causes a constriction. Are two crossings needed that close together? If they want to put in a wider bridge, how wide would it need to be? As plans are developed these questions would be resolved. The bridges have a limited reach of impact and it becomes difficult to justify the cost of a bridge replacement in terms of benefits to the few properties impacted by those crossings.

Katie Sweeney of 201 E. Frontage Road, noted they came to the meeting in October and since that time they had an overhead sewer system installed in their home. She noted their problems were two-fold; they flooded in their yard but had flooded seven times since they bought the house in 1993. Included in their cost was a permit fee that was to be paid to the Village. While this is a huge benefit and she is looking forward to the next rainfall, it is also a benefit to the Village and she asked the Board to consider that if residents are going to be installing these types of systems, to give them a pass on the permit fees. While it is a minimal amount, the residents are trying to help themselves and at the same time are benefiting the Village. She noted that neighboring Villages are offering a rebate to residents who do this kind of improvement to their home. The Village of Glencoe has offered this since 2003, Highland Park is now offering it to their residents where the Public Works will do the work or offer a refund of 20%, Arlington Heights also does it. She asked if the Board could look into offering such a savings to its residents.

Resident Graham Jackson of 26 Meadowood Lane, asked for an idea of what the engineering firm will do to prepare a cost benefit analysis.

Mr. Glenn reported that they use programs developed by the Army Corps of Engineers and FEMA. The programs look at the square footage of the home, the damage elevation, value of the property and formulas have been developed that assign a numerical value to the damages based on the depth of flooding. When you compare the current anticipated 10 year, 50, year or 100 year elevations with the proposed elevations you reduce the depth of flooding for all the properties and therefore generate a benefit in reduced damages. It is trickier with storm sewer projects. There is not existing information for expectations for flood levels for a particular event so he noted they will have to be more creative in determining the benefits for those projects. Benefits are calculated in terms of damages avoided by constructing the improvements.

A resident who has lived in community for 30 years noted there has been no improvement along Winnetka Road. He asked if safety and benefits can be considered when trying to obtain grants for projects.

Mr. Glenn noted that those things are taken into consideration when the government reviews requests for grants for these types of projects and they are beneficial. He also noted that what each of

the proposed projects do is reduce either or both the frequency or severity of the flooding.

A resident from 346 Lagoon wanted clarification on the Skokie River not reaching the 100 year elevation mark with the September flooding and said it is not the same as saying the Skokie River did not overflow its banks. She noted it was her understanding that it did and that is what caused the flooding in the area east of the Edens.

Mr. Glenn responded that in general they observed that farther west of the river the local storm sewers were overtaxed and could not get the water from the west side of the area to the river east and similarly in the Meadowview area the sewers could not get water from the west end east to the river. On Monday when the river was up at its highest point, a lot of the storm sewers were flowing backwards and bringing water back into the neighborhoods. However, along the Skokie River between Willow and Winnetka Roads, the bank of the channel runs at an elevation of about 624 and the elevations of water they observed Monday morning were at 623, a foot lower than the overbank at the river. Consequently their theory about the water in those neighborhoods was a) it was supplied by the storm sewers flowing back into the neighborhoods and, b) it was a result of the local rainfall that could not get out through the storm sewers because they were flowing back in. The actual banks of the channel of the Skokie River in that area are higher than the flooding observed.

The resident then commented that with that storm perhaps the backflow prevention devices might have helped us.

Mr. Glenn responded "certainly". They modestly decrease the amount of storm water you can get through your storm sewer and in most cases they provide a direct benefit.

A resident from 225 Wagner Road asked if Gewalt Hamilton's stormwater report was available. Manager Sigman reported that a full copy would be available on the Village website.

President Birkinbine thanked everyone for their participation and noted it will be the priority of this Board and successive Boards to determine what solutions can be tackled and how they can be funded.

There was a comment from an attendee noting that in these types of big events, the Police and Public Works Departments have worked together helping residents and deserve our gratitude.

President Birkinbine agreed and thanked her for her comments.

### **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:**

Trustee Teichert made a motion, seconded by Trustee Frazier, to approve Consent Agenda items 1 and 2.

1. Approve the Minutes of the October 21, 2008 Village Board meeting.
2. Approve the Bills and Disbursements from 10/11/08 to 11/14/08 in the amount of \$363,517.48.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES: Chapin      NAYS: 0      ABSTAIN: 0      ABSENT: 0

Charhut  
Frazier  
Gottlieb  
Greene  
Teichert

**CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE 2008 TAX LEVY AND  
CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY CLERK TO REDUCE THE 2008  
TAX LEVY IF NECESSARY PURSUANT TO THE PROPERTY TAX EXTENSION LIMITATION  
LAWS**

Trustee Chapin made a motion, seconded by Trustee Teichert to approve an ordinance adopting the 2008 Tax Levy and the resolution directing the County Clerk to reduce the 2008 Tax Levy if necessary pursuant to the Property Tax Extension Limitation Laws.

Finance Director Noble noted that the ordinance before the Board recommends a 2008 Tax Levy of \$3,374,500 which is 4.9% greater than the 2007 tax levy. Of the 4.9% levy, 4.1% is attributable to inflation of property taxes and the remaining amount is what is estimated to be attributable to new properties. The typical Northfield resident will see about a 4.1% increase in the Village's portion of the property taxes.

Director Noble then noted that the resolution to reduce the 2008 Tax Levy is in the event that the estimate of what we believe is new property is overstated, the Village will get an amount less than 4.9% increase. The Resolution directs the County to reduce the Village's corporate levy by whatever amount is necessary.

It was noted that the vote must be done separately on the ordinance and resolution upon which Trustee Chapin withdrew his motion and restated it as a motion to approve an ordinance adopting the 2008 Tax Levy (3A), which was seconded by Trustee Frazier.

Following discussion and upon the following roll call vote, the amended motion was approved.

AYES:	Chapin	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Charhut			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

**CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY CLERK TO REDUCE THE 2008  
TAX LEVY IF NECESSARY PURSUANT TO THE PROPERTY TAX EXTENSION LIMITATION  
LAWS**

Trustee Chapin made a motion, seconded by Trustee Teichert to approve a resolution directing the County Clerk to reduce the 2008 Tax Levy if necessary pursuant to the Property Tax Extension Limitation Laws.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES: Charhut                      NAYS: 0                      ABSTAIN: 0                      ABSENT: 0  
           Chapin  
           Gottlieb  
           Greene  
           Frazier  
           Teichert

**CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION ABATING PROPERTY TAXES FOR THE 2007 GENERAL OBLIGATION (ALTERNATE REVENUE) BOND**

Trustee Gottlieb made a motion, seconded by Trustee Charhut to approve a resolution to abate 2008 Property Taxes for the 2007 General Obligation (Alternate Revenue) bonds.

Director Noble noted that this will be an annual event for the remaining 18 years of the bond issue. Last year when the bonds were issued to do the water system improvements the Village also gave it a General Obligation pledge which gave us the lowest possible interest rate we could get on the bonds. As part of the bonding process, we adopted a bond ordinance that established a 20-year tax levy over the life of the bonds. However, the Village's intention is to pay for the bonds from its water system revenues so every year we will need to go through this process and abate the tax levy already filed a year ago.

Trustee Charhut asked since the Village already legally pledged the taxes to secure the bonds, does the Village have to have the money before we can do this and whether the Village has the money.

Director Noble responded that the Village does have the money.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES: Charhut                      NAYS: 0                      ABSTAIN: 0                      ABSENT: 0  
           Chapin  
           Gottlieb  
           Greene  
           Frazier  
           Teichert

**CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE VILLAGE CODE, APPENDIX D, FEES AND BONDS, TO REFLECT CHANGES IN VARIOUS SECTIONS EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2009**

Trustee Chapin made a motion, seconded by Trustee Gottlieb to approve an ordinance amending the Village Code, Appendix D, Fees and Bonds, to reflect increases effective January 1, 2009.

Director Noble noted that this ordinance reflects the Board's approval at its October 2008 meeting of various fee and fine increases.

Trustee Teichert asked if the Board were to entertain a rebate for flood-related construction when would that be discussed or put into effect.

Manager Sigman noted that the Board would need to discuss this and bring it back as an ordinance change. This could be done at any time.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES:	Charhut	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Chapin			
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

**CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE VILLAGE CODE, APPENDIX D, FEES AND BONDS, TO REFLECT CHANGES TO ARTICLE I, WATER AND SEWER RATES, EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 2009**

Trustee Gottlieb made a motion, seconded by Trustee Teichert to approve an ordinance amending the Village Code, Appendix D, Fees and Bonds, to reflect changes to water and sewer rates, effective May 1, 2009.

Director Noble noted that this action came out of the Capital Improvement Committee work reviewing the water and sewer system including capital needs, rate structure and cash flows over the next ten years. The changes were based on many meetings of the Committee which determined a rate increase would be necessary to help fund some of the capital projects coming up over the next several years.

Trustee Chapin asked if this increase is a one time event or could be expected again in succeeding years.

Director Noble indicated that the cash flow models put together indicate there would be several increases over the coming years.

Trustee Chapin noted that this is a 7% increase and asked whether each year the increase would be 7%?

Director Noble responded yes but that it could be analyzed and open for discussion each year depending on the projects being contemplated and, whether we were ahead or behind on projects. There is nothing in this current ordinance that would lock us into specific annual increases over the next several years.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES:	Charhut	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Chapin			
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

**CONSIDERATION OF THE TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE CHARTER**

Trustee Frazier made a motion, seconded by Trustee Charhut to approve a Charter for the Traffic and Transportation Committee.

Manager Sigman noted that this item was tabled from the October 21 meeting in order to give the Village Attorney additional time to rework some of the language in the originally proposed Charter. Attorney Hill made the changes and shared them with the Traffic and Transportation Committee.

Trustee Charhut stated that the Attorney did a very good job in clarifying a document that raised many questions.

Trustee Frazier also agreed that the Charter now more accurately sets forth the duties of the T&T Committee.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES:	Charhut	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Chapin			
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

**CONSIDERATION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH COOK COUNTY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE COOK COUNTY MOBILE VIDEO AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK PROJECT (PROJECT GOLD SHIELD)**

Trustee Gottlieb made a motion, seconded by Trustee Chapin to approve an agreement with Cook County to participate in the Cook County Mobile Video and Data Communications Network Project (Project Gold Shield).

Chief Lustig related how the various agencies and police departments depend on each other for assistance. The County has been experimenting with a new response program called Project Gold Shield. While the program has been around for a few years, now that the bugs have been ironed out, Northfield's Department is ready to enter into the program.

Manager Sigman noted that under this system, the Village will get two cameras, one set camera that will monitor one of our public facilities. The Village Hall is already monitored and now the public works fire-rescue building is now being considered or our water reservoir site. The camera feed would only go into the 911 center so any activity could be monitored from that location. The other camera would be a mobile unit that would be put in the command van that could be dispatched to a specific site or location when an incident occurs. One example is that it could have helped with one of the storms by putting the camera in an areas where flooding was occurring. These would only be used for official police and emergency business and would not be monitored other than that. The Police would have the ability to go to this particular computer and look at the images but it is not something we would monitor 24-7.

Trustee Frazier asked about the stationery camera and whether another community could see that feed.

Chief Lustig responded saying only if their department allows access.

Manager Sigman gave an example noting that the public works and fire-rescue facility was considered a possible location if the village ever needed an emergency distribution of pharmaceuticals. It was one of the locations regionally that was thought could be a distribution center where other municipalities could send their teams to pick them up. For this type of activity, the Village could give permission or access to the feed to see how the distribution was working. On a normal basis, the monitoring of one of our facilities would only be done by Northfield unless there was some disaster happening here and we needed additional back up. After 24 hours the feed recorded is automatically disposed of.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES:	Charhut	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Chapin			
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

**CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE VILLAGE TO ENTER INTO A COOK COUNTY NETWORK AGREEMENT TO PERMIT JOHNSON CONTROLS, INC. TO PROVIDE SERVICES NECESSARY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT GOLD SHIELD PROGRAM**

Trustee Chapin made a motion, seconded by Trustee Charhut to approve a resolution authorizing the Village of Northfield to enter into a Cook County Network Agreement to permit Johnson Controls, Inc. to provide services necessary for participation in the Project Gold Shield Program. Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES:	Charhut	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Chapin			
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

Trustee Charhut extended kudos to Deputy Chief Claude Casaletto for his work on getting the grant money for this project.

**Board Updates**

*Traffic and Transportation Committee*

Manager Sigman noted that the minutes of the meeting are attached. She commented that at this time it does not look like the State is in a position to move ahead with the Phase I and Phase II work on Willow Road for several more months. They have not come to an agreement on the engineering consultants they plan to use. After the Bureau of Local Roads determines their selection, it still needs to go to Springfield for their approval.

The Traffic and Transportation Committee is beginning to gather names of engineering firms that may be able to assist the Village with this effort and we will be researching what firms may be appropriate to handle this type of work.

#### *Six Month Budget Review*

Trustee Charhut noted he read the six month budget review and questioned whether the Village has any investment strategy other than what we are currently doing now in light of how the stock market is performing.

Director Noble reported that there are two different investment strategies that he operates under. One is for the Village and the other is for the Police Pension Fund. He noted they are very similar except that the Police Pension Fund allows, and State statues permit, investments of 45% in equities. The Police Pension Fund has been fully invested in equities for many years and is feeling the downturn like everyone else. On the Village side, we are not permitted to invest in equities, but obviously the downturn also affects the bond market to a certain extent and interest rates are still historically low. The Village has a ladder of investments in fixed income securities over the next 15-16 months. The laddered approach has kind of protected the Village which still has some investments earning 5% and higher. The more current CD's with local banks are around 3% - not great rates but they are not on the negative side.

Trustee Charhut asked if there is a minimum percent for the Police Pension Fund that must be funded and is our percent below that amount at this time?

Director Noble noted that this could require a whole other meeting. If the Pension Fund continues to take the hits it has over the last few months and if it does not rebound by the end of the fiscal year which is when we have our next actuarial analysis of the fund, the assets of the fund will be a lot lower then what they were a year ago which means the Village has to provide more money to fund it. That would come out of next year's 2009 tax levy. This year the Police Pension Fund tax levy increased about 9% even though we were limited to 4.1% so 9% of that went to the Police Pension Fund. He noted he did not want to even guess what the increase would be next year if the market stays the way it is.

Director Noble also noted a new report that the Village was required to provide which shows our rate of return assumptions. Our actuary assumes we will get 7-1/4% return each year. He said he did not know what will happen if that turns into a negative 20% or whatever it will turn out to be. He further discussed the impact if the rate of return expected is changed to 5%. Director Noble noted that it might be appropriate to change it but if it is changed the impact is great on the tax levy. He noted that the difference between 5% and 7-1/2% compounded over 20 years turns out to be a huge number. He related that we are in a catch 22 – we keep the higher levy assumption and get beat up when we don't achieve that or we lower it and have to levy a higher dollar amount.

Manager Sigman also added that as a tax cap community, we can't pass those costs on to the residents; it has to come out of the other operating costs.

Director Noble estimated the Village's opportunity is going to come when the legislature decides to have a new amortization period to fund the unfunded liability. At that point, they will probably give us another 30-40 years to get to 100% funding. That would be the time to get a little more realistic with our assumptions. He stated that he felt the assumptions on the rate of return are too high given the last ten years and the rate of return probably on how much salaries go up every year is too low.

Manager Sigman stated that on a positive note is there where the Village is for six months is in line with where we should be with everything. The only budget item that is out of line is due to the cost of salt and costs from the September storm. She noted that the number we are concerned about moving forward is sales tax because the numbers reflected in the report the Board has are from several months ago. She noted the September, October, November numbers will not be available for several more months. The Village has outreached to several businesses in the community and she noted they expect a substantial downturn. On a positive note, the RedFlex numbers are higher than anticipated and village staff still feels they will end up this year with a balanced budget. She noted that they are more worried moving into the next year.

### **ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION**

Trustee Charhut made a motion, seconded by Trustee Teichert to adjourn to closed session at 8:00 p.m. to discuss personnel and litigation issues. Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES:	Charhut	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Chapin			
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

### **RETURN TO OPEN SESSION**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, Trustee Chapin made a motion, seconded by Trustee Greene to adjourn the meeting at 9:58 p.m.

Upon the following roll call vote, the motion was approved.

AYES:	Charhut	NAYS: 0	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 0
	Chapin			
	Gottlieb			
	Greene			
	Frazier			
	Teichert			

