

West Branch DuPage River Flood Control Improvements

Public Meeting Response Document



Prepared by:
DuPage County Stormwater Management Division,
Engineering Resources Associates, Inc.,
Knight Engineers and Architects, Inc. and
HR Green, Inc.

February 2, 2012

The following are comments and questions recorded for the West Branch DuPage River Corridor Improvements during group meetings with residents of Warrenville identified by project location: Emerald Green, Iroquois Court and Forestview Drive; and also recorded at a public meeting held on November 15, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. at the Warrenville City Council Chambers. Copies of the comments that were written, emailed or recorded by a court reporter are attached as appendices and separated by project location, but names and addresses have been redacted to safeguard the identities of residents with differing opinions.

Emerald Green Comments

EG Resident #1 Comment:

I am against having a wall built behind my condo. The big selling point to me when I bought my condo was being able to see the river and the pond from my living room, but the minute I saw the big oak tree right off of my patio, I knew I had to have that unit. Unfortunately, with this plan the big old oak tree would have to go. Isn't Warrenville all about trees? Please do not spoil our property.

EG Resident #1 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted. Unfortunately, the construction of the project would require the removal of several mature trees.

EG Resident #2 Comment:

Please do not put a wall behind my condo. We are totally against it. Also, we do not want our trees taken down.

EG Resident #2 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted. Unfortunately, the construction of the project would require the removal of several mature trees.

EG Resident #3 Comment:

The proposed concrete wall would be a few feet in front of my large glass doors. I am a retired person and am home most of the time. I enjoy looking out at the beautiful scenery across the pond at all times of the year. If you must install a barrier so close to the building, could it be of a more decorative material, and have landscaping that would disguise it. At least, please do not cut down the beautiful old trees on our side of the pond. They protect our building and provide much needed shade.

Our property values will really go down if that wall is built as proposed.

The sump pump station will probably be noisy, and it's very close to the building. Is it necessary to have it there?

EG Resident #3 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted. Unfortunately, the construction of the project would require the removal of several mature trees. A decorative treatment could be utilized to make the wall more aesthetically pleasing. The location of the pump station is purely diagrammatic at the present time; more detailed studies will be required prior to determining its final location. The pump station would be designed with submersible pumps to minimize the noise during operation.

EG Resident #4 Comment:

I am a resident of Emerald Green in Warrentonville (address redacted) and my condo unit overlooks the pond and river. I was unable to attend the 10/19 meeting, but am concerned about the proposed wall as it will abut my unit. I am in favor of doing something to assist in flood prevention, but do not want to look out my window at some eyesore. We have many beautiful, old trees in our area that provide shade and habitat. Removing those trees will impact energy use, not to mention the privacy aspects.

If this wall must be built, how close will it be to the building? What materials will be used? Please utilize some material that will enhance the area – brick, stone, stamped concrete – as well as provide plantings.

I appreciate your work in helping with flood issues, but hope you keep in mind that this area is our home – not just public access.

EG Resident #4 Response:

The wall will be approximately 10 ft. to 15 ft. from the back of the building. The wall will be constructed out of concrete; a decorative treatment could be utilized to make the wall more aesthetically pleasing.

EG Resident #5 Comment:

I am opposed to this project. The removal of the trees would destroy the natural beauty of the landscape. Moreover, the wall would be a real eyesore. The reason I brought this property was the lovely view from my doors and windows and balcony.

EG Resident #5 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted.

EG Resident #6 Comment:

As the proposal now stands, I think it is overkill for a flood that may not occur for 85 more years. The wall behind my house will affect my property value. There will also be the additional cost to me for flood insurance.

Not necessary in Emerald Green.

EG Resident #6 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted.

EG Resident #7 Comment:

That building is sitting right adjacent to the river, and through the years the bank for that river has been eroding. And I have a homeowner that lives there that says I have pictures showing how much it's eroding, so when I was here in October and they were doing this, the lady said, well, fill out the comment sheet and let us know so we can go in and secure that bank, river bank.

EG Resident #7 Response:

The construction of the flood control wall will not have an impact on controlling erosion of the existing river bank. As part of the flood control project there may be an opportunity to incorporate streambank stabilization improvements into the project as well.

EG Resident #8 Comment:

My name is [redacted]. I live at Emerald Green. My first question is if they do put a berm in behind Emerald Green, would that automatically classify us as a flood zone? The second question I have is that since - I've been in Warrenville over 20 years now, and I can't remember it ever flooding except 2008. Could the river cleanup have anything to do with that?

EG Resident #8 Response:

The construction of a wall would not automatically place a building in a flood zone that is not currently in one now. If a building is within the limits of the floodplain now, the construction of a flood control wall would not remove it from the limits of the floodplain. The river cleanup efforts should not have caused an increase in high water elevations in the river due as a result of storm events.

EG Resident #9 (letter signed by multiple residents) Comment:

We, the undersigned residents of [redacted address], have reviewed the Stormwater Management Division's initial proposals and request that the agency consider the following concerns in the design of the flood wall, which is currently proposed to be erected immediately behind our homes.

We oppose the construction of a concrete wall.

We oppose the removal of trees.

If a wall is deemed necessary, then we request that at least two alternatives to the present design be developed which reroutes the wall away from our buildings, which allows the retaining of all trees, which reduces the dimensions of the wall, and/or which alters the

wall's construction materials to something more aesthetically pleasing, such as natural stone, brick or timber.

EG Resident #9 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted.

Iroquois Court Comments

IC Resident #1 Comment #1:

We have many concerns about the impact of the proposed berm on our property. We have excellent drainage for our septic and sump water removal. Our lot is a wedge shape at the end of a cul-de-sac; and our home sits high on the property with about 250 feet of riverfront in our backyard. We had basement seepage in 2008 and 2010 to about 1-2 inches of water, causing minimal damage, but requiring treatment to remove dampness and to prevent mold.

We recently went through major changes to our property as a result of the river restoration for thorium clean-up. This dramatically changed the plantings and trees in our yard close to the river edge. The bulk of the tree losses were for access to the machinery to remove the contaminated soil. The river bank plantings are just now recovering and growing back. Your proposed berm would affect the larger more mature trees further back from the river.

The Stormwater Management proposal deals with the water from the river overflowing its banks (over-cap flooding). Flooding has caused our house to become land-locked, it is not the cause of our basement water problems! The rise in the water table causes our sumps to run, removing water to the back of our property toward the river (seepage from groundwater). The sumps had not kept up with the rise in the water table, or in the case of the July, 2010 high water, with a loss of electricity, the sumps could not run.

We have made a number of improvements to our property: We upgraded both sump pumps to a higher power rating, increased the diameter of the exit pipes, installed a natural gas generator for back up power, installed flooring which can get wet and not need to be replaced, and have installed battery/back-up sumps. For each flood instance we have addressed the problems and come up with solutions for our own home.

We have the following concerns about the proposed berm:

1. The berm will result in a loss of about 1/3 of our property, or access to that property.
2. The current proposed berm goes across part of our septic field and patio along with red and sugar maple that shade it.
3. The berm will result in a large number of large mature trees to be destroyed, both for the berm and for the installation of the berm. It would completely change the nature of our backyard.
4. We think we will have increased water problems because the berm will prevent stormwater from flowing downhill away from our house that our

sump pumps have removed. We could actually have increase flooding because of the berm and an inability to get water far enough away from our basement to prevent flooding.

5. It is not clear who will own the land, maintain the berm, manage the plantings and keep any back-flow drains in good condition. In particular, all berms that we know are covered with grass. Who will mow it? With the heavy surrounding trees, will the berm just become a big messy dirt pile? By choice, we have very little grass. We have natural plants that have taken many years to establish.
6. Access to our backyard is very limited. Building a berm will require access and damage to significantly more area than for just the berm.

The bottom line: the berm dramatically changes the aesthetics of our backyard and the resale value of our home. We have lived in this house since 1980 and have witnessed many annual and other high water conditions on the river. Our house has never suffered from flooding; only water seepage. We enjoy our backyard. We have built a stone patio in the same place where the berm would be located. Our lot is heavily wooded and there would be a significant amount of destruction to the trees and plants. Our plantings are wild flowers and native shrubs and trees. We have very little grassy area, by choice.

IC Resident #1 Comment #2:

On the whole, I was very happy with what you came up with. You appeared to address the issues we had outlined in our letter to you, i.e. did not put wall through our yard. Also, happy to see you plan to store and pump water from street.

Personally, I think having lower wall near house is better than high wall at property edge or water maybe more in general, but that is my personal taste, others can differ. I think that until people see view from ground level this will not be clear.

IC Resident #1 Response 1 & 2:

Your concerns are noted. The existing elevation of your house is over two feet above the 100 year flood elevation; therefore, the construction of a flood control wall in the back of your property is not currently proposed.

IC Resident #2 Comment:

1. Septic field appears to be mapped incorrectly on maps.
2. We are concerned regarding location of wall – it appears to be much higher than the existing lower deck. How would the wall be integrated into existing lower deck and patio?

IC Resident #2 Response:

We will verify the location of the existing septic field shown on our exhibits against the County's records and revise the limits, if required. Your concern is valid; measures for

integrating the flood control measures into your existing deck and lower patio would need to be evaluated in the next phase of the design process.

IC Resident #3 Comment:

[We] have talked about the discussed flood wall and we have no interest in having this on our property. Our house is not in the floodplain or floodway so we do not see much of a risk of river water coming into the house via surface water flooding. Our issue is water coming into the basement via the sump and this wall would do nothing to stop this so we see zero benefit to the wall.

We cannot imagine a scenario that would cause us to change our minds but we are always open to comments and suggestions from you and our neighbors.

IC Resident #3 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted.

IC Resident #4 Comment #1: Thanks for taking the time and explaining the tentative proposal to hopefully solve the flooding problems in our neighborhood. I must admit, I was shocked and overwhelmed when I saw the position of the concrete wall vs. what we were told would be a berm in a totally different location on my property. I'm completely against the current proposal if in the end that's the final placement of the wall, it would be a NO go. We would lose our yards, the septic tank and field would be cut off by the wall, my home would look like it had a moat around it and for resale, who would work with that. However, if the wall was to be positioned at the back of my lot along the current fence line, I could work with that. In that way, I'd still have a backyard, the septic field would not be cut off, I'd be able to maintain the property with my riding tractor and I'm sure in time the concrete wall would be emotionally acceptable. If in the future you would want to meet at the property to discuss this further, please let me know.

IC Resident #4 Response #1:

Your opposition to the current proposal is noted. Reconfiguring the position of the floodwall at the back of your lot along the fence line could potentially be an option. Currently your back property line/fence line is outside of the regulatory floodway and does not conflict with your septic field. A floodwall in this location on your lot would be much taller than the floodwall in its original location.

IC Resident #4 Comment #2:

I have more questions concerning the proposed drawing that was passed out and sort of glossed over last Tuesday night. We were on information overload with the aerial photo showing the concrete wall not to mention the Topo of our area that was very confusing to look at and comprehend for us non-engineers in the audience.

Please explain the Estimated Ditch you show on the map that winds around Iroquois Ct South, West and North. If you try and put this into scale it looks like a 10-20 ft culvert that's either in the street or more worrying, in our front yards? What's up with that?

Also, you briefly discussed a pumping station. We in the audience probably associated this with an underground big sump pump. I found it on the drawing and if my calculations are correct, it'll be the size of a 1 car garage on Iroquois Ct West. Is that correct? If my concerns above are correct, then we need to have a lot more discussion because it won't fly.

IC Resident #4 Response #2:

The flow arrows along Iroquois Court South, West and North are intended to represent an open V shaped ditch that would potentially be constructed in the area adjacent to the existing roadway for the purpose of conveying overland stormwater flows to proposed storm sewer systems and then to the pump station for ultimate discharge to the river side of the flood control wall. Culverts are not proposed under the Iroquois Court pavement in this area; however, culverts would be required under some residential driveways.

As indicated on the exhibit and as discussed at the recent neighborhood meeting, the location and the size of the pump station is purely diagrammatic at this time. Additional investigations will be performed in the future to determine the size of the pumps and the ancillary support equipment and features; these findings will dictate the overall physical size of the pump station facility.

IC Resident #5 Comment:

Plan as presented not acceptable.

1. Options considered would be wall along river banks
2. Wall moved to back of property line
3. None of the above and we take our chances

IC Resident #5 Response:

Your opposition to the current plan is noted.

1. Construction of a floodwall along the river bank would not be allowed due to the limits of the regulatory floodway. Floodwall construction would have to take place outside of the floodway limits.

2. Reconfiguring the location of the floodwall to the back of your property line could potentially be an option on your property. Currently your back property line is outside of the regulatory floodway and does not conflict with your septic field. A floodwall in this location on your property would be much taller than the proposed floodwall in its current location.

3. Noted.

IC Resident #6 Comment:

The proposed flood protective walls for both Iroquois and Emerald Green pose serious concerns. It would seem that because the flood walls would stop the flow of water from moving out of the floodway and some floodplain, the volume of water in the unprotected floodway and floodplain would increase. This could increase the potential for flooding in other properties, including mine. How is this potential to be addressed? If the berms are installed and in a few years my house and property is flooded worse than it ever has been, what is the County's obligation(s)?

Could any flood mitigation work in the Iroquois and Emerald Green areas be started prior to the rebuilding of the Williams Rd. Bridge?

There appears to be potentially different understandings regarding the responsibility for the maintenance of flood walls and pump station(s). Who would be responsible?

The comment was made that the City has plans in the future to extend water and sewer to Iroquois. That could be years from now and that does not guarantee property owners would choose to connect. Thus, the question becomes, would the County postpone any plans/work until sewer is in, all impacted property owners have tied into it, which would then make it possible for earthen berms to be utilized rather than cement walls.

Overall, the proposed plans presented to the impacted neighborhoods in late October appear to contain many objectionable elements to the property owners and serious engineering challenges. Could other alternatives for mitigating the flooding beyond the most recent plan and beyond the others considered in the Addendum to the West Branch DuPage River Watershed Plan in 2010 be explored?

IC Resident #6 Response:

The proposed floodwalls for Iroquois Court and Emerald Green would prevent flood water from inundating areas within the flood fringe, not the floodway. The floodway would remain open to allow for the conveyance of faster flowing water in and adjacent to the main channel of the West Branch. Floodwalls placed in the flood fringe will be evaluated with hydraulic models to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts to upstream or downstream property owners.

The County's proposed projects must comply with two permit requirements that deal directly with the resident's concern regarding increases in flood elevations and decreases in floodplain storage. The proposed projects must demonstrate through hydraulic modeling that they are designed to not increase flood elevations and/or flood flows above the model tolerances. The current sequencing of the construction activities to comply with the permit requirements requires the re-construction of Williams Road Bridge prior to the construction of the northern flood control berms because the proposed Williams Road Bridge provides an overall decrease in water surface elevations upstream within the project limits.

The project must also provide a minimum of 1:1 compensatory storage for all floodplain storage lost below the base flood elevation (100-yr). The County's proposed flood control

project includes compensatory storage for the construction of the flood protection berms/walls north of Williams Road.

The final proposed improvements will have to be designed to meet the permit requirements to protect upstream and downstream properties from being negatively affected.

Responsibilities for the maintenance of the floodwalls/berms and the pump stations will be detailed in an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Warrenville and DuPage County. It is the County's preference that the County be responsible for the maintenance of the floodwalls and the repair or replacement of mechanical or structural features of the pump stations. The City will be responsible for the routine maintenance of the pump stations. They will perform monthly inspections to make sure the station is ready to operate. The County would be responsible for the repair or replacement of the pumps if they fail.

The floodwall project does not have to be postponed until the sanitary sewers are installed. At this time, the floodwalls in the Iroquois Court area avoid conflicts with the septic fields at the rear of the properties. The project will require that permanent easements be obtained from property owners for floodwalls, earthen berms or other structures related to the pump stations prior to their construction.

Alternatives evaluated for the Addendum to the West Branch DuPage River Watershed Plan considered a regional storage reservoir to mitigate flooding in this area. However, this was not a cost effective solution to eliminate the flooding. No other flood mitigation alternatives are currently being considered.

IC Resident #7 Comment:

I believe I spoke to you after the meeting tonight. Based on our conversation, you mentioned direct feedback regarding the Iroquois Court Project (retaining walls and culvert system) would be helpful to you. We are not in favor of the project. Your explanations and answers were very helpful tonight. Thank you.

IC Resident #7 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted.

Forestview Drive Comments

FD Resident #1 Comment:

This letter is in response to a letter of April 8 I received from DuPage County Economic Development & Planning – a letter regarding berms which your firm has apparently been contracted to design.

This activity is a blatant waste of taxpayer dollars – dollars that are desperately needed to identify and correct the root causes of our persistent flooding problem in Warrenville.

The proposed berm is a joke – a very bad joke – a fraud being perpetrated upon honest residents who deserve better. Shame on you for participating in this fraud.

Your personnel are not welcome on our property.

We will resist trespassing with every tactic at our disposal.

Our home and garage sit more than 200 feet from the near bank of the West Branch DuPage River in Warrenville. However, our septic field, several trees, garden and water lines run closer to the river. These may need to be relocated if part of our property is confiscated to construct a berm.

Specific items to be relocated include two ash trees and one black walnut; several willows (one existing prior to cleanup plus others planted as part of the “restoration”); various fruit trees; underground water lines to our garden and fruit trees; and fencing around our garden.

FD Resident #1 Response:

Your opposition to the project is noted. We understand it is your intent to significantly raise the elevation of your home at your own expense. If this would be the case, the construction of flood protection measures on your property would not be warranted.

FD Resident #2 Comment #1:

Please build berm behind our barns. Please plan for existing fencing on or around the berm. If this is not possible, please move the berm back behind the rear fence line. I’m looking for something architecturally pleasing in the area. Perhaps flat from house to top of berm at front drop with wall or something.

Another option is to avoid our property altogether. We are open to adding a berm to help our neighbors (and maybe add curb appeal to our place) but we don’t flood. Can the berm go on the east side of our place? Just a question and a choice we might consider.

FD Resident #2 Response #1:

In order to avoid the existing sheds, the proposed berm would have to shift approximately 20 feet to the north. This would impact the existing septic field. Consequently, this alternative is not viable.

Shifting the berm south behind the existing fencing would result in a portion of the berm within the limits of the floodway. This alternative could be implemented; however a portion of the existing fence would need to be relocated.

To date, the architectural landscaping of the berm has not been established.

To eliminate flood protection measures for this property, it would be necessary to construct a flood protection wall at the south property line in order to protect the adjacent homeowners. This wall would vary in height up to 6 feet.

The existing rear deck will be about 1 foot higher than the top of the berm.

An easement on the property would be required. It would be approximately 65 feet wide and plantings in the area would be prohibited.

FD Resident #2 Comment #2:

1. What height is the berm in relation to the elevation at the rear corner of the house closest to the county property? In other words. Is the berm elevation higher or lower than the land elevation at that corner. If higher. How much higher?
2. If a flood even were to occur that tops the berm would the berm then help, hinder, or be of no effect.
3. Easements are 15 ft on either side of the berm. Is this correct? And if so a 7 foot berm with a 5 foot top and a 3/1 pitch would create a 77 foot easement from side to side and a 1 foot berm would create a 41 foot easement from side to side. Are those assumptions correct?
4. Is there legal language regarding the easements available for review at this point?

FD Resident #2 Response #2:

1. At the location you are referring to, the height of the berm would be approximately 5 feet high.
2. If a flood of a large enough magnitude were to occur and the berm were to overtop, the berm would be of no effect. This would have to be a very large flood that would cause significant problems throughout the area regardless of any implemented flood control measures. To minimize potential for levee breach from rising or overtopping waters, the County will perform annual inspections and maintenance of the berm, but there is also the expectation that the residents will contact the County if there appear to be any maintenance issues in the interim.
3. Assuming that the limits of the easement would be 15 feet beyond the toe of the slope to preclude woody plantings in close proximity to the berm, on either side, your calculations are correct for the given heights.
4. We are researching and compiling information regarding language for the easement.

FD Resident #3 Comment #1:

Please send copies of all maps. Also – would like to be informed as any changes are made – if someone does not sign off or changes in the design.

Also- where did you get the info on my septic field? Is there an exact location on a map somewhere?

FD Resident #3 Response #1:

The County will provide a copy of the requested exhibit. The County will inform the homeowner of any revisions to the plan during future community meetings. The engineering consultants will verify the location of the existing septic field shown on the exhibits against the County's records and revise the limits, if required. Septic field information was obtained from the DuPage County Health Department.

FD Resident #3 Comment #2:

My comment is I just was wondering if the engineering company has any plans to meet with the individual homeowners to maybe look at solutions on each individual property rather than building a berm all the way across all the properties, you know, on the Forestview Drive area. That's where I'm at. You know, as an alternate plan just to see what solutions for each individual house might work out; you know, if a concrete wall rather than a berm or something like that as an alternative.

FD Resident #3 Response #2:

There has been discussion regarding meeting with homeowners individually to explore potential solutions while attempting to incorporate individual concerns. The County will advise homeowners in the future as to when these meetings would occur.

FD Resident #4 Comment:

Please send maps and pictures. Would love to sell our home and you can have all the easements you want!

FD Resident #4 Response:

The County will provide a copy of the requested exhibit. The desire to sell your home is noted.

FD Resident #5 Comment:

Option 1: buy out.

I would like to keep the wooded lot next to [address] untouched. Would rather have wall and leave forest.

Work with County to raise houses and fill lots from berm to street.

FD Resident #5 Response:

Your desire to have the County buy your home is noted. If a neighboring homeowner does not desire flood protection, a flood control wall could be constructed along the south property line of your lot. As a result, the vacant lot would not be impacted.

FD Resident #6 Comment:

Please send copies of the display maps.

Because of the negative impact of the proposed flood control wall we are strongly inclined to opt out of the system.

Keeping an open mind, I'd be interested in seeing how the engineers might design a wall to minimize the appearance and mesh with our homes, deck and landscaping.

We also own the vacant property upstream. Please keep us notified of changes to the plan and how they would impact this wooded lot.

Our home did not flood in 2008, or any time in the past 12 years.

FD Resident #6 Response:

The County will provide a copy of the requested exhibit. Your desire to opt out of potential flood control improvements is noted.

FD Resident #7 Comment #1:

I am writing in response to the April 8, 2011 letter I received from the office of DuPage County Economic Development & Planning. The letter directed me to write you with concerns regarding the possible flood control berm in relation to my property.

As far as elements of my property that are of concern to me – I would say “all of it.” I have thousands of dollars invested in native landscaping, a planted streambed for sump pump discharge, many trees, and a beautiful view. I'm trying to keep an open mind but I see nothing but negatives when it comes to this project. I bought the house to a very large degree for the view and proximity to nature. To run a 3'-5' berm across my yard would ruin it in my mind and all I've invested in it. And from what I've read, there would be no upside. The flood of '08 which I presume is the impetus for this flooded my basement from underground. Hydrostatic pressure buckled the slab and this was the source of my flooding. I had no surface water enter my basement. My understanding from the county website is that any berm would not protect me from this kind of flooding.

I know my next door neighbor doesn't want this berm either for similar reasons. Perhaps you can create some kind of an L-shaped berm north of his property and leave us out of it. That said, the neighbors I talked to with flooding also had flooding come from below rather than above so I'm not sure who would want this on our block.

FD Resident #7 Response #1:

Your opposition to this project is noted.

FD Resident #7 Comment #2:

1. I want to confirm that for those of us just downstream of the floodwalls/berms that there would be no adverse impact on our property.

2. For those with a wall or berm how will they be forewarned of a record flood event that will exceed the berms? If you don't have one it is easy to monitor the flood level. With a berm, it could be possible that one could be surprised! When the water goes over the top, their houses will flood in a hurry!

FD Resident #7 Response #2:

1. There will be no adverse impacts to property owners or homeowners located downstream of the floodwall/berm projects proposed by the County. Permit submittals for these projects will require hydraulic modeling to show that there are no adverse impacts upstream or downstream resulting from the proposed projects.

2. The floodwalls and berms are currently designed with 2 feet of freeboard above the existing 100-year flood elevation. The general public can check the DuPage County Stormwater Management Website for the latest rainfall and stream elevation information. Flood forecasting models for the West Branch DuPage River are currently being developed in coordination with the United States Geological Survey. The flood forecasting information will be included on the website when available.

General Public Comments Regarding Other Components of the Watershed Plan

General Public Comment #1:

My name is (name and address redacted). What I'm asking about includes Fawell Dam because the study came back showing that the operation of the gates on Fawell Dam affects the flooding in Warrenville. And Fawell Dam was built to protect Naperville between a 50 and 500 year storm. Why is Warrenville not being protected up to a 500 year storm?

General Public Response #1:

This comment does not pertain to any of the projects identified within the Addendum to the West Branch DuPage River Watershed Plan and therefore no response has been provided.

Warrenville Alderman Response #1:

Regarding the bike path along River Road and its termination close to Warrenville Road, my recommendation would be to berm around the parking area on Towne Tap, especially with the farther easterly placement of the river channel, and connect the bike path at the base of the bridge where the sidewalk crosses the bridge so it could actually connect with the bike path on the east side of the bridge along the river.

Warrenville Alderman Response #1:

The County, business owner and City of Warrenville are in discussions to determine the best possible location of the bike path. Providing the bike path around the parking lot on Towne Tap property is one of the options being considered.

Warrenville Alderman Comment #2:

As far as the bike berm on River Road, I would be totally opposed of the phone poles, electric poles, getting moved to the west side of River Road. The residents, it would be in their properties and I just want to – I would strongly be against that, and hopefully they'll keep them on the east side.

Warrenville Alderman Response #2:

At this time, there are no plans to move the poles to the west side, but it is subject to further coordination with the utility company and space availability on the east side without impacting the project purpose and goal.

General Public Comment #2:

The comment that I have is that the business property that I own by Ferry and River Road is flooded not from the water coming over the road, but from the water coming under, and the gravel rock, and coming up through the parking lot and the building foundation, so the additional work on berms will only add to the hydraulic pressure in order to present more water into my property. So, I would like that there be a consideration of reducing the amount of water flooding under the road.

General Public Response #2:

The soils along the West Branch are indeed porous (gravel) in nature and do convey groundwater. The flood control projects proposed by the County have the design goal of reducing water surface elevations and reducing overbank flooding. Though flooding due to groundwater is not being specifically addressed by these projects, the reduction of water surface elevations within the West Branch does reduce the hydraulic pressure which in turn, will have a positive impact on groundwater flooding.

In addition, the fill from the flood control berms is being compensated within the floodplain at a cut to fill ratio of 1:1.

General Public Comment #3:

My comment is I'm interested in the trail. I've learned that it would be a Warrenville jurisdiction trail on the berm that will run parallel to River Road, and in keeping with other regional trails of the Forest Preserve District which surround Warrenville, I'm hoping that a limestone screening trail will be the preferred surface. I prefer that surface because it's considered a multi-use surface. It's better for runners. It keeps the speed of bicyclists and skateboarders minimal, and it is better for the traffic such as horses. I also strongly encourage it because this will be above the floodplain, and since it is above the floodplain, we don't have to worry about that trail being flooded. In the rare event that that trail is flooded, I think that trail is the minimal part of our problem. We have a lot bigger problems than just the trail if that flood goes over that berm.

General Public Response #3:

This will be taken into consideration. However, this is subject to further coordination with County DOT and City of Warrenville.

General Public Comment #4:

I would just like to say that we think it's a good plan overall on River Road to be having the berm across the road instead of raising the road, so I think the capacity – I think compensatory storage is what they're saying. Good idea. I'm sorry to lose the trees and I hope they will get as many trees restored or kept as possible because the character of that road, it was always a tree road and it's kind of a blow to lose all those trees. That's all.

General Public Response #4:

Comment noted. The proposed improvements along River Road, the bike path and the compensatory storage will involve removing many trees. The County is coordinating with the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County to identify and preserve as many high quality trees as possible. It is the goal to minimize the impact to the existing trees while maximizing the flood control benefits. The restoration of all impacted areas proposes the planting of large caliper trees and shrubs, spaced for slight overlap at maturity.

Warrenville Comment #1:

Multiple residents suggested they might not want the berm or wall constructed and would prefer to make improvements to their individual structures to remove the structures from the floodplain. After all, the berm would provide protection, but would not remove them from the floodplain. My suggestion was that the individual homeowners would be responsible for hiring their own architect and contractor and also for building permits with the City, but they would realize savings by having any stormwater submittals / permitting and compensatory storage requirements handled as part of the County's overall West Branch projects.

If they opt out of the berms, but choose to do individual improvements, it seems to me there would be an excess of compensatory storage downstream that could be utilized by them. Questions I have on this option:

1. Would the County be able to incorporate the impacts from the individual improvements into your overall permitting being handled by the County's consultant?
2. Would the County be able to do any grading work required with these individual improvements, if the individual homeowners do their structural improvements on their own?
3. Would the County perform as-built surveys of the improvements and apply to FEMA to remove the various homes from the floodplain?

Warrenville Response #1:

1. Impacts from the individual improvements could be incorporated into the overall permitting being handled by DuPage County and their consultants. The property owners would still need to apply for stormwater certification for their individual

improvements but any compensatory storage requirements could be accounted for through the County's overall permitting of the project.

2. DuPage County would not be able to perform grading work on private property associated with the homeowner's individual improvements. DuPage County cannot expend County funds to design or construct improvements on private property without those improvements providing a public benefit.
3. DuPage County could perform as-built surveys for the individual improvements in order to determine the volume of compensatory storage required for each individual improvement. However, the property owners would have to apply to FEMA for a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR), to remove their home from the floodplain. The County could supply as-built survey information to support the LOMR application to FEMA.

The floodwalls and earthen berms being proposed by the County do not meet FEMA's freeboard requirement for levee construction and therefore, a LOMR will not be obtained for the project.

Warrenville Comment #2:

Near the end of the meeting, one of the residents suggested an idea that seemed to have some traction. Would the County consider building a continuous wall closer to the homes, between the septic fields and the homes and filling behind the wall on the upstream side to create a flat terrace by the homes with steps and or ramps down to the back yards?

Warrenville Response #2:

The County's consultant, Knight Engineers and Architects, Inc., is modifying the plans to show a continuous floodwall between the homes and the septic fields. DuPage County could not pay to place fill behind the wall to create a flat terrace by the homes. This fill would be an improvement to private property without providing a public benefit. In addition, if the floodwall is not "continuous" the County may not be able to construct the wall due to public benefit requirements.

Warrenville Comment #3:

One option to consider is protection to the 100-year elevation rather than 2-feet above to lessen the impact on their properties.

Warrenville Response #3:

DuPage County prefers to design berm and floodwall projects to provide greater than 100-year protection. However, the County would consider decreasing the amount of freeboard on the floodwall and earthen berm projects from 2 feet to 1 foot.