Meeting Notes

1.0 Welcome & Attendee Introductions
Tim Loftus, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), welcomed and thanked everyone for coming. Self-introductions by each attendee followed (attendee list attached). Tim thanked Chris Miller with the Village of Wauconda for letting us use the Village Hall Board Room again for our meeting.

2.0 Agenda Changes
There were no changes to the agenda.

3.0 June Meeting: brief recap, questions, etc.
There were no questions or discussion.

4.0 Local Planning Groups Coordination News
Joe Sallak at Lake Napa Suwe reported that it has been very quiet this summer compared to prior years since the weed problems of the last 2-3 years were under control. The board would have lots of phone calls and therefore meetings to address this topic. Eurasian water milfoil was the primary problem, and it’s at less than 5% coverage this year. Joe attributed this to an aquatic herbicide treatment in early spring. The next Board meeting will be in early October and the general membership meeting will be later in October.

Lisa Woolford, Tower Lakes Drain Partnership, noted they will be joining forces with the 4 Lakes Initiative group at their next meeting in late September/early October. Dennis Dreher with Geosyntec Consultants will be speaking about reviewing ordinances with a focus on water quality protections.

5.0 Draft Plan / Resource Inventory
5.1 Discussion of additions/edits
Tim Loftus noted that we tried our best to point out what was new in the draft Plan in our Aug. 16 email. He then overviewed some of the main additions and changes and entertained questions and discussion. Tim pointed out the following:
- Under Population and Demographics, there is a projected 31% increase in population from 2010 to 2040.
- The role local jurisdictions play in water quality protection was put under the opening discussion. Tim asked Mike Novotney for any suggestions regarding the discussion of MS4s; Mike said he would take a look.
- The bulk of the changes are in Section 2.4: Land Use. Tim referred to Table 5 – the relation between impervious surface and water quality. We came up with a
methodology to project the increase in impervious surface from 2010 to 2040. Only one subunit, Island Lake, changed its category (from “approaching impacted” to “impacted”).

- We are working on integrating all of the figures into the main body of the Plan.
- There is not much new in the agriculture section. We found a person to talk to at the Illinois Dept. of Agriculture (IDOA) who will provide the tillage types by acre at the county level. Neither USDA nor IDOA aggregates data at the watershed level. We also learned that NRCS’ database is designed only for tracking payments and cannot be used to query for conservation project types or acreage.
- We heard back from Dave Griffith with Illinois DNR and he will provide information on forest management plans within the planning area.
- A paragraph has been added in the section on climate and topography.
- Section 2.6: 9 Lakes Planning Area Water Resources, has been reorganized and new text added.

5.2 Stream assessments

Tim noted that we segmented and coded the perennial reaches in each stream system, referring to the maps in the Watershed Drainage System section. We did our best to assess the degree of channelization (none/low, moderate, high), degree of erosion ((none/low, moderate, high), and condition of the riparian zone (good, fair, poor) using aerial images and by visiting numerous road crossings. There is no substitute for walking the entire stream channel to more truly and accurately characterize the streams, but we’ve got a start. We will make a recommendation in the Plan for locals to better refine the stream and corridor conditions.

A good discussion ensued. Joe Sallak commented that while he understands the Plan is still a draft, it can get a little confusing when tables get split. Tim stated that in the final Plan, formatting will be done so that tables are not split wherever possible, or headings will be repeated. Joe also recommended that there be consistency in the use of the terms lakeshore versus shoreline. Holly Hudson agreed and described her definition of lakeshore and shoreline, and noted she was in the process of making changes to those terms to be consistent throughout the Plan.

Lisa Woolford asked if the maps of the individual subunits will show the stream segment codes. Tim replied that they probably would not to help reduce map clutter and keep readability as good as possible.

Regarding accessing the streams, Tim pointed out that while Lake Co. SMC staff has the authority to access private property for such things as stream channel assessments, CMAP staff do not, and we are very careful to respect private property. Mike Novotney offered that in the future their staff could go into areas that this group deems high priority for assessing stream conditions such as erosion or stream blockages. Tim noted that these watershed plans can have an addendum, such as a more robust stream channel and riparian corridor condition section. Nancy Schumm added that this information would be especially important in areas of growth/potential growth as an argument for better protecting the stream network.
5.3 Lakeshore buffer condition assessments

Tim thanked all the folks who helped to tour us around their lake, access their shoreline property, or provide a boat for us to use: Joe Sallak at Lake Napa Suwe, Ken Wick at Island Lake, Bill Morris at Slocum Lake, Sue Swanson at Timber Lake, Kathy Mikenas and Nickie and Jim Fischer at Lake Fairview, Tom Kubala and Steve Burgoon at Tower Lake, and Barb Day, Deanna Loughran, Tom McGonigle, and Norm Fein at Lake Barrington.

To arrive at Illinois EPA’s request for an assessment of “good,” “fair,” or “poor” lakeshore buffer condition, we came up with a qualitative methodology that considered an area up to 15 feet inland from the shoreline and for the width of a coded segment. Segments were variable in width as they were typically based on land cover, lot boundaries, or a combination of both. Area percentages were estimated for each of five land cover categories: trees and shrubs, unmowed grasses and forbs, mowed turfgrass, beach, and impervious surface. We assessed the lakeshore condition strictly from a water quality perspective in terms of filtering and/or slowing down overland flow and promote infiltration before surface runoff reaches the lake. “Good” condition was assessed when trees and shrubs, and unmowed grasses and forbs tallied > 60%. “Fair” condition was assessed when these same two categories averaged 50-60%, and “poor” condition was assessed when the combination of mowed turfgrass, beach, and impervious surface tallied 55% or more. We considered that the presence of mowed turfgrass within the 15 foot buffer zone increases the likelihood that fertilizer and pesticides might be applied relatively close to the lake. It is acknowledged that landowners also value views, easy access to the shoreline, and other objectives. Photos showing examples of each category were shown on-screen, along with one map example illustrating the color coded lakeshore buffer as well as shoreline erosion degree for Tower Lake.

Holly noted that the shoreline erosion maps currently in the draft Plan are based on Lake County Health Dept. data collected when they last monitored each lake between 2004 and 2009. The Health Dept. will be updating their shoreline surveys this September and October.

Tom Kubala noted in the Tower Lake example where some buffer areas were green (i.e., “good”) but shoreline erosion was moderate or high, this seemed incongruent. Tim noted that Holly and he had discussions about whether to consider plant species in our buffer condition assessment, and we decided to stay species-independent. So it's possible a lakeshore got a “good” ranking since it may have been largely trees and shrubs, but buckthorn and/or other invasive woody species could have been the primary species. A discussion of buckthorn ensued. Mike Novotney noted his comments to Illinois EPA about what all this really means as well, since other factors including species type and fetch have an influence on lakeshore riparian condition and shoreline erosion. Tim agreed that this assessment can be improved upon but that we didn’t want to spend an inordinate amount of time or taxpayers money on qualitative data with limited value. Mike suggested that adding some text that explains why erosion might be moderate or severe where the lakeshore buffer is good, other factors
such as soil type, lake origin, fetch, plant species, etc. *(Post-meeting thought: While CMAP is responsible for including shoreline erosion data in the plan, we didn’t think it prudent to collect such data since the Lake Co. Health Dept. – Lakes Management Unit was scheduled to do just that. In retrospect, an outcome of two agencies doing different yet related work admittedly sets up the potential for incongruity as pointed out. In some cases, CMAP staff neither required nor was in close proximity to the shoreline for improved viewing of erosion conditions. Thus, erosion may not have been obvious on a forested island or other shoreline, though that land cover was deemed appropriate from a water quality perspective.)*

6.0 Detention Basin Survey

Tim reminded that we were asked by Illinois EPA to quantify the number, type, and condition (good, fair, poor) of detention basins in the planning area. We started with Lake Co. GIS’ 2002 “hydropolys” data layer that identified detention basins built as of 2002. Our summer intern then used maps provided by some of the municipalities and townships and her inspection of 2011 aerials to identify detention basins built since 2002 as well as other waterbodies that might be serving a stormwater function. We subsequently approached all the municipal governments to see what information they had and learned that while they know where the detention basins are, information about them is spread among many documents and there is no one-stop shop for their accounting. Their maintenance is also primarily the responsibility of homeowners associations. So it seems there is a disconnect between the role the basins provide in stormwater management and the highly decentralized maintenance of them.

We will be doing a very basic and relatively quick condition assessment, primarily based on basin type, during September and October. For example, dry basins with a turf grass bottom are generally considered “poor” from a water quality perspective. If it’s a detention basin with a wetland shelf and naturalized buffer, that will be considered “good” from a water quality perspective.

A good discussion followed, including the topics of Lake Co.’s stormwater ordinance requirements, maintenance agreements, Special Service Areas (SSAs), and education for HOAs (Lake Co. SMC hosts a workshop annually for HOAs). Tim said he would include text in the Plan to address what he heard here. He also noted that we’re starting to see stormwater utility programs being created at the municipal level in the region (e.g., Downers Grove began an enterprise fund on Jan. 1, a fee that will shift funding away from taxes and be based on amount of impervious surface).

7.0 Next Steps

Tim stated that after submitting the next draft of the Plan and watershed resource inventory to Illinois EPA tomorrow, it’s time to shift our focus to identifying projects that will help solve problems. We’ve already heard from several of you on project ideas and will need to make sure those and others you identify are specified in the Plan. The pollutant removal efficiency and estimated cost for each BMP must also be calculated. Tim also wants to clarify with Illinois EPA for those BMPs that address stormwater, what is their eligibility for 319 grant funding in relation to MS4 permit requirements. For the nine lakes, we will be using a
lake response model to estimate the percent reduction in phosphorus needed to meet the water quality standard of 50 ug/L.

Discussion included the topics of other funding sources (IGIG, Lake Co.’s Watershed Management Board and Watershed Management Assistance grants, foundations).

8.0 Next Meetings
Our next meeting will be on Wednesday, October 23, 2013, at Viscount Hall (near Slocum Lake in unincorporated Wauconda) from 2-4 p.m. Following requests to mix it up a little bit, our December meeting will be held on a Thursday, Dec. 12, 2-4 p.m., if there is no objection. No objections were voiced.

Since the full draft Plan is due April 1, 2014, we will probably meet in January, February, and March next year. When we meet on Oct. 23, we will set those dates.

9.0 Announcements
8.1 Tim reminded everyone that the FREP website hosts all our 9 Lakes project news and information (http://www.foxriverecosystem.org/9Lakes.htm).

8.2 Holly pointed out the Hydrilla Hunt! Program plant identification sheets available on the table by the door.

8.3 Holly reminded about Illinois’ Harmful Algal Bloom (HAB) & Algal Toxin website.

8.4 Tim made note of the upcoming FREP Noon Network that may be of interest to the group about the Trout Park Forested Fen in Elgin.

8.5 Tim reiterated that since the draft plan is due to Illinois EPA on April 1, we’ll meet in January, February, and March 2014 and set those meeting dates at our next meeting on Oct. 23.

8.6 Others:
Mike Warner announced that Lake Co. SMC has developed General Permit #3 for dredging projects. He thanked Tom Kubala and others with the Tower Lake Improvement Association for helping bring about this idea. Tom reported that the Davlin’s Pond dredging project has been underway for several weeks, begun in late July. They have had the normal share of project issues, such as with silt fences and the TSS concentration in the return water. Discussion ensued that Illinois EPA still wants the return water to WWTP discharge quality, when in fact the background TSS concentration in the receiving water is already above that.

Mike Novotney noted that amendments to the Lake Co. Watershed Development Ordinance regarding runoff volume reduction requirements made in summer 2012 would encourage the use of a variety of green infrastructure techniques and best management practices on development sites, perhaps leading to stormwater being managed closer to its source.
10.0 Adjournment

The meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.
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