9 LAKES TMDL IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING
Thursday, January 30, 2014 ♦ 2:00 – 4:00 PM
Lake Barrington Village Hall, 23860 N. Old Barrington Rd., Lake Barrington, IL

DRAFT Meeting Notes

1.0 Welcome & Attendee Introductions
Chris Martin, Village of Lake Barrington Administrator, welcomed everyone. Tim Loftus, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), thanked Chris and the Village for hosting and their generosity with snacks and refreshments. Tim also welcomed and thanked everyone for coming, especially with the forecast calling for more snow. Self-introductions by each attendee followed (attendee list attached).

2.0 Agenda Changes
There were no changes.

3.0 October Meeting: brief recap, questions, etc.
Tim pointed out that the notes from our October meeting were posted on the 9 Lakes project page on the FREP website. He asked everyone to let us know any corrections, edits, or questions. He noted that we hadn’t finished the detention basin inventory by the time of our October meeting but we have since and can provide an update today.

4.0 Local Planning Groups Coordination News
Lisa Woolford, Tower Lakes Drain Partnership (TLDP), noted no specific activities were planned for this quarter. In November, the TLDP met with Brain Valleskey and the 4 Lakes Initiative group regarding ordinance reviews.

5.0 2013 Lake Shoreline Erosion Assessment
Tim noted that in the current draft of the plan, the shoreline erosion section reflects the Lake County Health Department’s earlier assessments from 2009 and prior years. Our aim is to update the plan with the new 2013 data. Tim then introduced Kelly Deem, Water Quality Specialist with the Lake County Health Department – Lakes Management Unit.

Kelly noted that the LCHD has been collecting water quality data on the county’s lakes for 30 years. While she is only covering the shoreline erosion aspect today for lakes within the 9 Lakes Planning Area, she would be happy to come back to one of our spring meetings to present additional information collected in 2013 including water quality and aquatic plants.

Kelly then overviewed the process, impacts, and identification of causes of shoreline erosion. She explained the methodology they have used since they began doing shoreline erosion assessments in 2002, which includes using GPS to demark each shoreline section categorized as none, slight (1-3” vertical), moderate (3-6”), or severe (>6”) erosion. The results are mapped over an aerial image of the lake. Kelly then showed maps and summary statistics
for several of the lakes within the 9 Lakes Planning Area and commented on changes
between assessment years:

- **Bangs Lake, 2002 vs. 2009** (Kelly noted that the severe spot seen on the northwest
  shore on the 2009 map has been addressed by the Wauconda Park District.)
- **Ozaukee Lake, 2002 vs. 2009** (Kelly commented that this is a good example of when
  you don’t take care of slight erosion, it can advance to moderate and severe in a short
  amount of time.)
- **Timber Lake, 2007 vs. 2013** (Nancy McGranahan from Timber Lake noted that their
  association is looking to put together a shoreline plan [for stabilization and buffers ?]
  for the whole lake and getting it approved/permitted by Lake Co. SMC(?), thereby
  helping to streamline implementation by each individual shoreline homeowner.)
- **Lake Fairview, 2007 vs. 2013** (Kelly noted that this lake’s shoreline has taken a turn for
  the worse, especially the eastern shoreline.)
- **Lake Napa Suwe, 2007 vs. 2013** (Kelly observed that there has not been much change
  over the four years. An improvement was evident at a community park area along the
  east shore where the homeowner’s association focused on installing native plants.)
- **Lake Barrington, 2007 vs. 2013** (Kelly pointed out the overall increase in shoreline
  erosion and commented that the shoreline here seems to be in a constant state of
  repair. She speculated that the approach to shoreline stabilization could be improved
  with more substantial solutions such as more toe protection, especially in light of the
  lake’s water level fluctuations following storm events.)
- **Tower Lake, 2007 vs. 2013** (Kelly noted the decrease in overall erosion, especially in
  the north arm, where Nancy Schumm offered that a buffer had been installed. Kelly
  suggested focusing on the southwest shore that has gone from slight to moderate
  erosion. Rich Bahr felt that Snake Island should still be depicted with moderate
  erosion rather than none to slight. Tom Kubala offered that the island could have
  eroded so much that it was no longer noticeable. Kelly stated that her coworker
  Kathy Paap, who did the survey, is extremely careful and aims to be accurate in her
  work. Kelly agreed that the shoreline slope has changed and that the outline of the
  island has increased in size, thus corroborating Tom’s theory.)
- **North Tower Lake, 2007 vs. 2013** (Kelly noted the improvement in overall erosion,
  especially along the east shoreline. She suggested addressing the new moderately
  eroded area on the west shoreline.)
- **Slocum Lake, 2001 vs. 2013** (Kelly noted the decrease in overall erosion, primarily
  along the south and southeast shorelines. Brian Valleskey couldn’t think of any
  shoreline protection projects. He noted that while much of that shoreline can’t be
  seen because of cattails and Phragmites, he thinks with the increase in emergent
  plants and not much boat traffic, shoreline erosion has probably decreased because of
  that. Kelly pointed out an area of slight erosion on the northwest shore to focus on
  before it becomes worse and more expensive to address.)
- **Island Lake, 2003 vs. 2013** (Kelly noted the overall 10% increase in erosion, primarily
  in pockets without seawalls. This lake has more power boating, and wave action off
  seawalls gets concentrated on non-stabilized areas. Nancy Schumm asked if they
  evaluated the condition behind the seawalls. Kelly said that if they can see behind the
  seawall and it is eroding, they will rate the shoreline erosion accordingly.)
In summary, Kelly reiterated that shoreline erosion is just one aspect of a lake’s condition among all the parameters that they look at including water quality and aquatic plants. She noted that the Timber Lake 2013 report was done and that the reports for the other lakes should be completed by April since the 2013 water quality data was just certified last week. Brian asked whether Kelly thought shoreline erosion at these lakes was more human-caused versus natural. She said it was very lake-specific, with causes often a combination of human impact and watershed inputs (e.g., stormwater influx, noting that the lake to watershed ratio has an influence). In terms of methods to prevent shoreline erosion, Kelly pointed out several considerations and suggested a document she likes: Understanding, Living with & Controlling Shoreline Erosion: (http://www.watershedcouncil.org/resources%20and%20publications/files/Shoreline%20Erosion%203rd%20Edition.pdf). Holly Hudson stated that a PDF of Kelly’s PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the 9 Lakes page on the FREP website. [Post meeting note: Holly also suggests the Chicago Botanic Garden’s “Lake Shoreline Erosion Control and Habitat Enhancement” webpages for ideas (http://www.chicagobotanic.org/research/shoreline)].

6.0 Draft Plan

6.1 Discussion of additions/edits

Tim noted that there has not been much change to the draft plan. The most significant addition is the planning area scale information regarding green infrastructure. We used GIV 2.0 (Green Infrastructure Vision, version 2.0) from Chicago Wilderness/CMAP/The Conservation Foundation as the basis for the map. This reveals that approximately two-thirds of the GIV in the planning area is in protected land status. Of the other one-third, about one-third of that has limited opportunity for green infrastructure due to land-use change and/or development while the other two-thirds is developable and thus could be developed in a conservation-oriented way (i.e., using principals of conservation design) or put into protected land status. Tim noted that pollutant-load reductions associated with new conservation efforts aimed at remaining unprotected green infrastructure will not be calculated. Furthermore, green infrastructure is not a required component of a watershed-based plan. Ensuring that developable land within the GIV 2.0 that remains unprotected be managed / developed using principles of conservation design should be a watershed-wide plan recommendation. He asked the group to comment as needed after reviewing that section.

6.2 Information and Education component

Tim noted that this is one of the nine required components of a watershed-based plan and referred to the document Guidance for Developing Watershed Action Plans in Illinois. Our planning process and meetings over the two year planning period is part of the information and education component, but what we really want to do is look forward. In other watershed-based plans, there have been a variety of approaches taken to address this component. He asked that folks offer what they want to do, would commit to do, in terms of their goals for information and education. Tim pointed out that Lisa Woolford had offered BACT’s Conservation@Home Program as an example where they had a goal of having a certain number of homes adopt the program. For municipalities, information and education initiatives probably could be carried out through their
municipal newsletter or MS4 plans. Tim noted that tours are one way to educate, such like those that Golden Oaks Farms offers for groups. What a group such as the Tower Lakes Drain Partnership plans and aims to do can be incorporated into the 9 Lakes Plan.

Questions and discussion followed. Lisa asked whether committing to distinct numbers might limit future funding opportunities, and Tim offered that we can word information and education strategies accordingly. Brian Valleskey wondered if a first goal was to get individual municipalities to adopt the 9 Lakes Plan. Tim said he’d been involved in doing such for several other watershed plans and noted it could be an education component, as adoption raised the profile and awareness of the plan. Mike Novotney offered that in absence of getting future resources, we have to focus on the present. A recommendation would be to expand existing resources and do something new. Tim noted that education is a big part of the Lake County Forest Preserve District’s mission and asked Gary Glowacki to let us know of any District programs that involve water quality or ideas for incorporating water quality into their educational programs. Tim asked everyone to let us know what you’re doing and what you’d like to do with more resources. Rich Bahr noted the Tower Lakes’ 4th of July celebration where four years ago TLIA added an education tent. Tim asked if he would like to put together a paragraph about that. Tim offered that promoting information about dog poop pick-up is a great opportunity for educational outreach.

6.3 Implementation Schedule

Tim expressed the view that watershed plans ideally should be updated every 5 years, but more realistically these are 10-year plans. For BMP implementation, he asked how projects might be categorized, such as within 2 years, 5 years, 5-10 years. We have not made a hard and fast decision on how to categorize BMPs, but he’d like to emphasize the first 5 years. Nancy Schummm noted that the village of Tower Lakes reviewed their BMP list yesterday, and she asked how we would like the BMPs categorized such as priority projects vs. longer-term. Tim stated that we ought to have a column in our BMP table with priority level. Nancy said they categorized their projects as 1-5 years, 5-10 years, and greater than 10 years, with an eye on highly flood-prone areas, things coming into the lake, and things going out of the lake. Tim said we’d want to know which BMPs would be in the “greater than 10 years” category because we would not calculate pollutant load reduction or cost estimates for those. Nancy suggested that the greater than 10 years BMPs at least get included in a long-term project list. Brian Valleskey gave an example of downtown redevelopment opportunities that may come up in the future. Tim followed with a potential caveat about the requirements of MS4 stormwater regulations versus projects addressing nonpoint-source pollution. Nancy wanted to make sure all potential projects are included in the plan to help support future grant opportunities and noted how village boards and priorities change, and grant rules change. Mike Novotney said to make sure the watershed-wide BMP recommendations cover/encapsulate the ideas everyone has (e.g., downtown redevelopment opportunities). Brian noted that in comprehensive plans, stormwater does not make the top of the list in topics addressed.
7.0 Best Management Practices (BMPs)

7.1 Last Call!

7.2 Status of modeling efforts and list of BMPs thus far

7.3 Next steps: calculate p-load reductions for BMPs

Tim pointed out the “list of BMPs identified to date” handout is available on the check-in table. For each site-specific BMP, we have to delineate the drainage area contributing to it and calculate the pollutant load reduction associated with it. The completion of a web-based interface to help us do that is delayed. If it is not available within the next couple weeks, we will still be able to use our original pollutant loading model to get to the BMP pollutant load reductions, though with considerable more effort.

Holly explained the organization of the BMP list and the accompanying display map and noted that they will be posted on the 9 Lakes page on the FREP website. The projects are numbered generally in a west to east, north to south manner, grouped by planning area subunit in the following order: Cotton Creek, Island Lake, Lake Napa Suwe, Direct Drainage, Slocum Lake, Bangs, Lake, Slocum Lake Drain / Fiddle Creek, Tower Lake Drain, Tower Lake, Lake Fairview, and Timber Lake. The BMPs represent those that have been identified by local stakeholders (primarily the Tower Lakes Improvement Association, Villages of Tower Lakes and Port Barrington, and Timberlake Civic Association) as well as by Tim and Holly when a BMP opportunity was noticed while out in the field conducting stream condition and detention basin assessments. Holly pointed out that no site-specific projects were currently identified in the Woodland Lake, Ozaukee Lake, or Lake Barrington subunits, and some large areas were devoid of any site-specific projects. Regarding shoreline stabilization BMPs, only those specifically called out by local stakeholders are currently included in the BMP list and located on the map. The remaining linear footage of eroding shoreline/stabilization opportunities will be represented, probably in some sort of lake-specific summary of BMPs. Similarly, a summary of lakeshore buffer opportunities will be made for each lake.

Holly noted that she had contacted the Lake County Forest Preserve District (LCFPD), Village of Wauconda, McHenry County Conservation District, and Lake Barrington Shores (LBS) to remind and solicit their input. Gary Glowacki with LCFPD stated that a reply e-mail was in the works and was expected to have been sent to Tim and Holly today. Gary noted quite a bit of work has been done already in the Ozaukee Lake watershed restoring farmed land to prairie and wetlands. There was extensive discussion regarding BMP opportunities within Lake Barrington Shores, and several participants voiced their hopes that LBS would include some BMPs in the plan.

Tim then led a discussion about watershed-wide BMPs in agricultural areas. For grassed waterways, we’re not sure yet whether we will be able to identify each individual opportunity as we look at 1-foot contours over aerial photos, or whether there will be so many that they are better represented as a watershed-wide BMP. It’s a similar situation with field borders and filter strips. While field borders are not terribly popular, they have a role to play in protecting water quality. We will probably estimate
the need/opportunity for these and come up with a watershed-wide recommendation of x acres, for which we can estimate a watershed-wide pollutant reduction. For filter strips, there might be a few instances where we can see a specific opportunity for these along stream corridors, and/or they will get put into a watershed wide estimate as well. Nancy Schumm asked whether we have considered incorporating some of the standards from CRP programs as a basis for some of this. Programs and funding are available to ag land. She thinks most urban people aren’t aware that ag land is treated differently. Jim Kirby noted that the same piece of ground can be a hay field for five years and then can becomes a corn field where the tillage practices are very different. It’s not a lawn. There is not always a simple solution. Tim stated that we are not going to recommend x amount of land be in CRP. What we can see are opportunities for grassed waterways, livestock exclusion from streambanks, possibly filter strips and field borders – the implementation of which is all voluntary. Nancy Schumm thought a note about ag land, how it’s different, was worthy of a paragraph. Nancy McGranahan noted a couple equestrian horse farms upstream of Timber Lake may be worthy of pointing out for BMP opportunities and referred us to their consultant’s lake management plan. Nancy Schumm pointed out that most equestrian operations remove manure on a weekly basis. She suggested we look at the Spring Creek Watershed-based Plan for general ag recommendations.

8.0 Next Meetings
Tim announced that the next meeting will be on Thursday, February 27, at Lake Barrington Shores. A location for the March 27 meeting has yet to be determined.

9.0 Announcements
• Tim reminded everyone that the FREP website hosts all our 9 Lakes project news and information (http://www.foxriverecosystem.org/9Lakes.htm).
• Kelly Deem overviewed the LCHD’s Aquatic Plant Management Workshop to be held this Saturday from 9 a.m. to noon at the Lake County Permit Facility in Libertyville and invited all to attend. RSVP to Peggy Ratliff at LCHD at 847-377-8030.
• Mike Novotney noted the 2014 line-up of Center for Watershed Protection webcasts that SMC hosts. The next one is entitled “Reimagining the Parking Lot & Roadway as a Stormwater Practice” and will be presented on Weds., Feb. 12, from 12 - 2 p.m., at Lake Co. Div. of Transportation in Libertyville. RSVP to Susan Vancil at svancil@lakecountyil.gov.
• Holly noted a “Current Stormwater Regulations and Policies Seminar” to be held Thurs., Mar. 6 [new date], 8 a.m. – 12 p.m., at Hickory Knolls Discovery Center, 3795 Campton Hills Rd, St. Charles; sponsored by Kane-DuPage SWCD, Illinois EPA. For questions and to register, call KDSWCD at (630) 584-7961 x 3.
• Holly pointed out that the Illinois Lake Management Association (ILMA) conference will be held April 10-12, 2014, in Sandwich, IL (http://ilma-lakes.org/ilma-29th-annual-conference).

10.0 Adjournment
The meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.
ATTACHMENT

ATTENDEES
9 Lakes TMDL Implementation Planning Meeting #10
Date: January 30, 2014
Hosted by: Village of Lake Barrington, Municipal Center, 23860 N. Old Barrington Rd., Lake Barrington, IL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Bahr  Tower Lakes Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Colwell Integrated Lakes Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Deem  Lake Co. Health Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Erfort Village of Port Barrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Giertych Lake Co. Div. of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Glowacki Lake Co. Forest Preserve District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Hudson CMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Kirby Golden Oaks Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Kubala Tower Lakes Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Loftus CMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Martin Village of Lake Barrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>McGranahan Timber Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Novotney Lake Co. Stormwater Management Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Schumm Village of Tower Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Valleskey Slocum Lake, 4 Lakes Initiative, Manhard Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Warner Lake Co. Stormwater Management Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Woolford Barrington Area Conservation Trust, Tower Lakes Drain Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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