1.0 Welcome & Attendee Introductions
Tim Loftus, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), welcomed everyone. Chris Martin, Village Administrator for the Village of Lake Barrington, welcomed everyone as well and overviewed the Village’s involvement in watershed planning, open space initiatives, and water supply planning. Through his experience participating in the Flint Creek Watershed planning process, he noted a key element is to incorporate ideas from across the board, and that what has been most useful is the implementation plan action items – not only for on-the-ground projects but those addressing the concepts of best practices as well. One of the projects identified in the Flint Creek Watershed Plan was a detention basin retrofit at Village Hall, for which the Village subsequently received a 319 grant from Illinois EPA. The project received a Chicago Wilderness / U.S. EPA Conservation and Native Landscaping award in 2011. Introductions by participants (see attached attendee list) followed.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements
Tim Loftus noted there were no changes to the agenda.

Holly Hudson, CMAP, announced that the Lake Co. Stormwater Management Commission (LCSMC) is offering a “Workshop on Native Landscape Design for Stormwater” on August 7, and noted a brochure was on the sign-in table in the hallway.

On behalf of Brian Valleskey and the 4 Lakes Initiative, Nancy Schumm extended an invitation to all to participate. The group will probably be moving to a quarterly meeting schedule during the 9 Lakes TMDL planning process, with the next meeting being planned for August.

Tim informed the group that after our June meeting, we’d heard from Illinois EPA that the TMDL Stage 3 report would be delayed one year (to late summer/early fall 2013) due to loss of key staff at the consulting firm that was doing the analysis. While this is disappointing, it is not a show stopper for our planning process. Hopefully the report will be published in time so that we will be able to use the pollutant load data to help inform our BMP selection process. We have invited Trevor Sample, the TMDL project manager at Illinois EPA, to come talk at our September or November meeting about the TMDL development process.

3.0 June Meeting: brief recap, questions, etc.
Tim Loftus provided a brief overview of June meeting and requested any corrections or additions to the draft meeting notes (copies were available on the sign-in table). Holly Hudson noted that a couple folks had brought to her attention a typo in section 4.1 regarding the due dates for the draft and final plans (the year should be 2014, not 2012).
4.0 Barrington Area Conservation Trust & Tower Lakes Drain Partnership
Lisa Woolford, Land Protection Specialist with the Barrington Area Conservation Trust (BACT), noted they had started the process of meeting with stakeholders within the Tower Lakes Drain Watershed to discuss forming a coalition to support and contribute to the development and future implementation of the 9 Lakes TMDL Implementation Plan. The first meeting of the Partnership will be on Tuesday, August 28 at 7:00 p.m. at the BACT office in Barrington Hills. One of the initial efforts will be to gather available data and information, such as studies and plans, for those lakes and municipalities within the Tower Lakes Drain Watershed to provide to CMAP for this planning process. Please contact Lisa via e-mail (lisa@bactrust.org) if you would like to be added to the Partnership’s contact list.

5.0 Planning Area and Subwatershed Boundary Delineation Update
Holly Hudson reported that she met with LCSMC and Lake Co. Health Department – Lakes Management Unit (LCHD-LMU) staff last week to discuss the origins of and differences in the various stream watershed GIS shapefiles available (USGS HUC-12 watersheds, ISWS Fox River basin subwatersheds, and LCSMC Lake Co. subsheads). Jeff Laramy, GIS Specialist at LCSMC, recently re-delineated the Tower Lakes Drain watershed utilizing the county’s 2-foot contour digital elevation model (DEM), the shapefile of which he sent to Holly along with a “flow lines” shapefile. Mike Adam provided Holly with shapefiles for eight of the subject lakes (all but Island Lake) that LCHD-LMU staff had delineated, along with morphometric information (including surface area, maximum and average depth, watershed area) for each of the lakes. Holly pointed out the various discrepancies in the stream and lake watershed boundaries while showing a map of the planning area on paper and the overhead screen. Lake County now has a 1-foot contour DEM, as does McHenry County, so those will be utilized, along with storm sewer drainage maps, to better delineate and refine the 9 Lakes planning area’s stream and lake watershed boundaries. Patsy Mortimer offered that the Flint Creek Watershed boundary that was delineated by the consulting contractor for the Flint Creek watershed-based planning process would be helpful, and that BACOG has those shapefiles.

6.0 Stakeholder Interests & Expectations, and Watershed Issues & Concerns—group discussion
A question was posed about the number and role of local watershed groups. Tim Loftus noted that the participation of local groups was particularly key, especially for providing local support and match for future grant funds. CMAP’s role essentially is to help kick start the planning process, helping to facilitate and formulate the plan in association with the local community members, who we knew had an interest in pursuing this planning process already. After the plan is written, it will be in the hands of the local stakeholders to run with implementation. Lisa Woolford added that a smaller footprint is part of the bigger picture. Participants in the local groups can work together and more easily keep the lines of communication open toward making best choices and supporting best practices locally to promote water quality protection – not only for the 9 lakes but for the Fox River and the streams that enter it too. Brian Valleskey offered that it can be confusing how the local groups have been constructed. For example, the 4 Lakes Initiative started off with 4 lakes but has expanded through local interest to additional lakes as well as direct drainage areas to the Fox River. He added that it’s a great way to share information.
A concern was voiced by Dolores Jarchow that a number of people could not attend afternoon meetings. Tim acknowledged the dilemma of holding day vs. evening meetings, and noted we had discussed this at our June 9 Lakes meeting. It is hoped that representatives of the local watershed groups (e.g., 4 Lakes Initiative, Tower Lakes Drain Partnership) would share the 9 Lakes TMDL information with and provide feedback from the participants at their respective evening meetings. We’ll also see what we can do to mix it up, perhaps holding a meeting or two in the evening at certain points during the planning process.

Nancy Schumm inquired whether this planning process would be including areas west of the Fox River. Tim noted that it would not. Holly noted that a watershed-based planning process was recently completed for the Silver and Sleepy Hollow Creeks Watershed which is directly west of the 9 Lakes Planning area on the west side of the Fox River.

Based on her experience with the Flint Creek Watershed planning process and subsequent applications for 319 funding, Patsy Mortimer encouraged every participant to think of every conceivable project that could possibly be done. She encouraged a lot of public input throughout the planning process and ensuring that commitments for local match prior to developing grant applications are understood. Tim noted that we would be utilizing a model that in theory will capture all the pollutant generating “hot spots” and potential areas and sites for best management practice implementation, which would be verified through windshield surveys, field visits, and meetings with potential project sponsors (e.g., municipalities, park and forest preserve districts, homeowner associations, individual landowners, not-for-profit groups, etc.).

7.0 Planning Goals and Objectives—group discussion
As a starting point for discussion, Tim offered four goal statement ideas along with some potential objectives. A summary of the group’s discussion and recommendations follows. CMAP staff will do additional word-smithing based on the group’s discussion and will notify the group when a revised draft goals document has been posted on the project webpage (http://foxriverecosystem.org/9Lakes.htm). Discussion will continue at the next meeting in September.

Initial goal idea:
- Achieve removal of lakes from Section 303(d) List of impaired water.

Initial potential objectives:
- Reduce phosphorus loads in line with TMDL
- Reduce fecal coliform loads in line with TMDL
- Improve dissolved oxygen levels in line with TMDL

Revised draft goal:
- Improve water quality to achieve removal of lakes from the Section 303(d) List of impaired waters

Revised objective ideas:
- Remove X lake from the 303(d) list
- Practice sensible salting
Questions and discussion ensured about the time period of data that is used by Illinois EPA for listing a waterbody on the 303(d) impaired waters list, and if that is different than the data being used by the consultant for developing the TMDL allotment to the 9 subject lakes. It is Tim’s understanding that waterbody assessments are made using data collected during the previous five years (so for the 2010 Integrated Water Quality report, Illinois EPA would have used data from 2004-2008, since there is a two year lag between the reporting year and quality assured data availability). However, participants noted it appears that data older than five years, and/or minimal data sets (e.g., fecal coliform), have been used for some lake assessments; thus, some folks are having conflicting emotions about their lake being on the 303(d) list, in so much that it’s hard to accept that data from 10 years ago or only a couple data points are being used to determine designated use impairments. Tim acknowledged that data is everyone’s challenge. Patsy Mortimer thought that you could object to a 303(d) listing/TMDL if you could provide additional data that showed that lake should not be on the 303(d) list. Mike Adam noted that they (the Lakes Management Unit) try to monitor each of the lakes in the county every 5-6 years, and there are several in this planning area that are due and hopefully will be able to be monitored next year. Another question was posed about once a lake is on the 303(d) list, how does it get off the list? For example, Norm Fein noted that Lake Barrington is listed for impaired aesthetic quality due [in part] to aquatic plants. However, through an effective harvesting program over a number of years, they no longer have to operate the harvester as many weeks each year, thus indicating that aquatic plants are no longer a big problem or “impairment.” Tim reiterated that Trevor Sample will be coming to talk to us in September or November about the TMDL development for the 9 lakes and hopefully answer many of our questions.

The group agreed with Chris Martin’s recommendation that the goal statement needed to be more digestible/understandable for the average person who doesn’t know what all this means. Cindy Skrukud offered that this is a “clean up plan,” although others noted that this was more than that, also being a protection plan. Deanna Loughran suggested using the term “water quality” rather than “clean up.” Nancy Schumm noted that this provides an opportunity to educate folks on the possible sources of pollution (e.g., failing septic systems) and that identifying sources, not just solutions, is an important part of the planning process. She offered some wording such as “policy to protect the health of all.” Tim agreed that fecal coliform was a hard concept to understand, and noted that pet waste ordinances may be one of the recommendations in the plan.

Joe Sallak, VLMP volunteer at Lake Napa Suwe, noted the availability of his Secchi transparency readings and another volunteer’s collection of water samples and recording of dissolved oxygen (D.O.)/temperature data. Holly reiterated Joe’s proclamation that even just the Secchi disk transparency information provides very useful and informative data from season to season and year to year, and that this year’s VLMP water chemistry and D.O. data for Lake Napa Suwe will help contribute to this planning process.

Initial goal idea:

- Build local capacity to ensure TMDL plan implementation.
Initial potential objective:
- Support development of local watershed groups.

Revised draft goal:
- Build local partnerships and expertise to protect and improve our lakes and streams.

Revised objective ideas:
- Support sustainability of local watershed groups.
- Involve private landowners ...

Discussion revolved around the word “capacity” vs. “partnerships”: capacity has to do with building expertise, while partnership implies cooperation. It was felt that the term capacity was over used. Frank Jakubicek noted that homeowners don’t realize they can be a part of the solution.

Initial goal idea:
- Protect sensitive aquifers.

Initial potential objectives:
- Advance water-use conservation and efficiency.
- Practice sensible salting.

Revised draft goal:
- Protect shallow groundwater - quality and quantity.

Revised objective ideas:
- Advance water-use conservation and efficiency.
- Practice sensible salting.
- Protect recharge areas.
- Educate local officials and the public...

Tim noted that groundwater was everyone’s water supply, and that groundwater also likely contributes to two glacial-origin lakes, Slocum and Woodland. There was discussion about what “sensitive” means. Tim noted that while McHenry and Kane Counties have completed studies to determine their aquifers’ sensitivity to contamination, as far as we know no similar study has been done in Lake Co. Thus, the recommendation was made to focus on “shallow groundwater.” Regarding water use conservation and efficiency, Tim noted that the Northwest Water Planning Alliance (NWPA), which includes our planning area, is working to enact a lawn watering conservation ordinance for all its member communities. Regarding “sensible salting,” discussion focused on the current water quality standard and the need for education, especially for homeowners, small businesses, and possibly township highway departments. (Note: Participants agreed with Nancy Schumm’s recommendation that an education objective be included under each goal. Afterthought by Holly: perhaps the group would want to consider an overall goal regarding education.) Mike Adam noted that U.S. EPA is looking at lowering the chloride standard, which is now 500 mg/L.

Initial goal idea:
- Ensure landscape level green infrastructure.
Initial potential objectives:
- Align planning area with local, county, and regional green infrastructure vision.

Revised draft goal:
- Protect natural resources and open space.

Revised objective ideas:
- Identify key areas for protection.
- Protect natural resources during the development process.
- Educate local officials and the public…

Tim noted that the concept behind this goal has to do with how our planning area grows and develops without compromising surface water and groundwater quality. The group agreed that the wording was too “CMAP-ee” and needed to be such that anyone could understand it (can pass the “next door neighbor test”). Discussion ensued regarding likes and dislikes for using the word “open space.” Lisa Woolford stated that they (BACT) uses the word open space. Tim noted that open space also includes agricultural land, to which Lisa added that a conservation easement can be put on ag land and conservation practices required. Beth Adler noted that this concept also includes homeowners where they can convert areas on their property to increase water infiltration, such as installing rain gardens and gravel [or permeable paver] driveways. Holly stated that she saw the open space concept as a three tiered approach for protecting and improving water quality: from the largest landscape level where additional public and private open space is identified to ideally be added to the existing network of forest preserves, parks, and trails; to new development where low impact/conservation design practices are incorporated; and down to the neighborhood or individual site level where conversion or “retrofitting” of existing conditions is conducted. Frank Jakubicek related his experience with talking about water quality and fisheries management, including field BMPs, with farm pond owners and noted that this process is really about connecting with your local constituents. Nancy Schumm then suggested another goal:
- Align community goals and policies with implementation of this plan.

8.0 Resource Inventory: data needs and whereabouts—group input
Holly referred to a handout listing the numerous data categories that will be utilized for the watershed resource inventory, along with potential sources of each. Rather than going over each category in detail since it was nearing 4:00 p.m., she asked the group to look the list over and let her know any additional sources. Patsy Mortimer noted that Citizens for Conservation should be added to the sources under private conservation lands/conservation easements.

9.0 Next meeting
Our next meeting is proposed for Wednesday, September 26. Please let Tim or Holly know if you have a suggestion for or can offer a location to host.

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