



**DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED WORKGROUP
MEMBERSHIP MEETING
FEBRUARY 11, 2015 10:00-12:00 PM
NORTH SHORE WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT**

MEETING MINUTES

- 1. Introductions and Announcements** – Peter Kolb, Director of Public Works for Lake County and DRWW President, conducted introductions and provided an overview of the meeting.
- 2. Approve 11/12/16 meeting minutes.** Paul Kedzior motioned to approve the minutes, Joe Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- 3. Public Comment.** None.
- 4. Overview of Proposed Chicago Area Waterways Chloride Variance** – Fred Andes, Barnes & Thornburg provided information about the Chicago Area Waterways (CAWs) chloride variance.

Brian provided the background on ICPB rules and MWRDGC watershed variance. NSSD asked Barnes & Thornburg to conduct research and present its findings to DRWW and how it might affect this workgroup.

Fred's Presentation: IEPA rulemaking for Chicago area waterways started in 2007 and is ongoing. Issue that came up during this process IEPA's year-round 500mg/L standard for chlorides (other standards were adopted July 2015). Nearly impossible to meet in the winter – can a variance be sought? The Illinois Pollution Control Board (ICPB) agreed but gave parties 3 years to apply for variances – not a long time. MWRD agreed to lead workgroup (POTWs, MS4 munis, tollway, IDOT, salt providers, industrial permit holders - watershed groups are not part of the group but used as resources for data) to determine what was needed for a successful request for variance.

Plan: When a standard can't be met, the variance process requires individual variances from all entities affected by the variance – which will include all MS4 and Individual Permit holders in a watershed, which makes the task extremely complicated and infeasible in an expanding setting. However, information to support a variance is common to all, so the plan

is to identify and agree on one set of BMPs via the creation of a technical report that describes current waterway conditions, lists entities affected by the standards, why the standard cannot be consistently complied with and methods to monitor success of BMPs. Each permit holder then applies individually for a variance from the chlorides standard and attaches the same report and identifies which of the BMPs in the report will be implemented by that entity. Deadline to submit draft report to IPCB by winter 2017. IPCB decision in July 2018.

Fred's recommendation to DRWW is to conduct the research now, collect the data that would support a report that could be used for a variance request, but do not join the Chicago waterways variance at this time, one reason is that we would be adding to the 100+ current entities seeking a variance. It is logical to add the chloride variance investigation to the DRWW's 5-year plan.

Questions: – does each permittee have to collect data after variance is granted? Once a variance is granted, it is reviewed every 3 years so that kind of information could be required. It's also required when a permit gets reissued. Note that it would take a legislative change to allow the variance to be used on a watershed level verses individual permit holder applications. The Fox River report was about the phosphorous standard and was not created for a variance so while a good model, not applicable to the chloride variance process.

IEPA is anticipated to add a 500 mg/L chlorides standard in future permits, so it's going to make sense for other watersheds to conduct the same work as CAWS is. Also, IPCB may assess watersheds that impact other watersheds but no indication of this yet. Question is when will IEPA start enforcing the standard.

The system the CAWS is putting together will be a good model for others to follow. It is likely the BMPs list will be applicable to all other watersheds in the region. DRWW may want to begin defining its water quality, looking at data, identifying BMPs that will work in Lake County along Des Plaines River. It may want to look at site specific chloride limits if water body does not support species the 500 mg/L standard was based on.

Question – During this 3-year period will the CAWS group be testing whether the BMPs will achieve 500 mg/L? No, the group is looking at literature and making projections based on local conditions for that answer because there isn't enough time to institute BMPs and then study how they are affecting the waterways.

Question regarding liability concerns over reduced salt use – if communities adopt a policy about salt application it protects them from liability – is this a BMP being discussed? Yes, some communities have ordinances and legal committee is studying these.

Innovative BMPs? Not yet discussed. Need a broad list, and analysis of each in terms of effectiveness, feasibility and affordability. List will be split into a must-do and an also-do if appropriate for your community. IEPA wants to see new ideas, but it's not a requirement.

5. 2015 DRWW Accomplishments Document Overview - Peter complimented Andrea on effort to compile document and thanked the members on all the work represented by the list of accomplishments in the document.

6. Financial Status Summary and 2016 Draft Budget Presentation – Mike Warner and Peter Kolb presented the draft budget. Conservative assumption – The draft budget was shown conservatively at \$210,000 in projected dues as the total revenue number – actually collected \$231,000. The \$210,000 level, if maintained, is currently projected expenses through 2019, however other expenses would detract from that number. LC FAS is waiting for the Executive Board approval of final budget line items.

Peter noted that some of the items in the group's 5-year plan are not covered by the draft budget.

Question: Does fiscal year for budget start on May 1st? Yes, it follows most municipal budget cycles. Question: If a member wants to add a monitoring site, who to approach? Attend a Monitoring Committee meeting which the schedule is posted on the website.

7. 5-year Draft Work Plan Discussion – Mike Warner/Peter Kolb

Mike Warner refreshed the members on one of the main objectives in the group bylaws is to develop and implement a Des Plaines River Watershed Based plan. He also thanked County staff and the membership for help in technical and financial aspects of plan. SMC staff also offered their or DRWW's Technical Manager (Andrea Cline) to present to village boards if requested on the benefits of membership and our accomplishments. Peter noted that current membership covers much of the work plan items, but that more members would be welcome. There is no intention to raise dues for 2016.

Peter mentioned key issues to consider:

- a. Complete watershed work plan and monitoring effort.
- b. Research into a nutrient trading program as initiated in other states.

Recommend an approach for the membership to review and provide input. Mike W – IEPA interested in this but what is the actual process – it requires state legislation and IEPA oversight and it is reasonable to expect both to occur? WI program is not going well due to stringent phosphorous standard. Madison is going farmer to farmer to address issue of meeting the standard. Peter – board member interest in OH program so the workgroup should explore the opportunity.

- c. Chloride plan as modeled by Chicago watershed group. This should be added to the 5-Year Workplan and objectives set.
- d. Monitoring program. We have a three-year raw data collection timeline. What type of program will be needed for subsequent years?
- e. Permit holders will have to generate annual reports. What information from the planning or DRWW efforts can added to enhance the annual permit reports?

8. Des Plaines River Watershed Based Plan Status Update - Mike Novotney, Lake County SMC. Mike's presentation will be available on the DRWW website.

- a. Section 319 grant – 3 water quality BMPs
 - i. Mundelein Park District: Bull Creek
 - ii. College of Lake County – bioswales on parking lot redesign
 - 1. Question – any discussion with coal tar sealants? That is not included in their current grant.
 - 2. Monitoring of bioswales? There is a yearly monitoring program in the grant that requires inspection of the project implementation and planting standards, but no chemical monitoring.
 - iii. LCFPD – Agricultural BMPs in 4 farm fields in north Mill Creek watershed
- b. SWAAP Pilot
 - i. 2 study areas chosen to begin assessment and project planning (lake sheds and drainage areas)

- ii. *Strategic planning*
 - iii. *Outcome – detailed field assessments & conceptual plans/budgets for BMPs*
- c. *Umbrella Watershed Plan*
- i. *Update existing watershed-based plans*
 - ii. *Complete plans*
 - iii. *DRWW Plan will define planning area, period (2016-18) & meet with USEPA watershed-based planning requirements, making members more eligible for IEIPA 319 grants throughout the entire watershed.*
 - iv. *Major Plan Elements*
 - 1. *Watershed issues, opportunities, goals, objectives & vision*
 - 2. *Watershed Characterization*
 - a. *Compiling existing data*
 - b. *Collecting new data*
 - 3. *Watershed Problems Assessment*
 - 4. *Action Plan Recommendations (watershed-wide and site specific)*
 - 5. *Evaluating Plan Implementation*
 - 6. *Education & Outreach Plan*
 - 7. *Stakeholders – MS4s, POTWs, Forest Preserve District, private property owners*
 - v. *Planning Process & Status*
 - 1. *Stakeholder-guided – 20 meetings over next 2 years (8 general; 12 topic specific)*
 - 2. *Kickoff meeting – March 17, 2016 – request that members help publish meeting information*
 - 3. *DRWW meeting – August 2016 will feature watershed plan & project update*

4. Data compilation & collection underway (monitoring data & stream river & detention basin inventory. Special acknowledgement to DRWW for its efforts.
5. Questions from Jim Bland – how are road projects or impervious surface increases handled in the watershed plan and can that data be interchangeable with other studies that are ongoing in the watershed. In established watershed plans (USEPA Watershed Based Plans), impervious surfaces or hazardous waste sites do not have enough specifics as part of plan inventory. Also, hydrologic modeling isn't used to link land use to monitoring results in analyzing data.
6. NOTE: IEPA FY2017 is a priority year for implementation grants in the Des Plaines Watershed – SMC staff may be putting out a request for proposals for MS4 communities to gage interest for in-the-ground projects that can be submitted to IEPA. Applications are due August 1st and an RFP would need to be distributed starting in March. Several members expressed interest.

9. Monitoring Committee Report – Joe Robinson – The Committee has 7 voting members but 15+ attend meetings, and their input and help is appreciated.

- a. **Chemical Analysis** – contract in place, started at 45 sites. Sites listed on DRWW webpage.
 - i. **Water** 3 collections – Sept. Oct. Nov, variable flow conditions, next sampling scheduled for March
 - ii. **Sediment** – will coincide with biological monitoring
 - iii. **Continuous** – in process of being developed
- b. Bioassessment Monitoring contract has been signed and is being discussed with the contractor.
- c. Flow Monitoring – contract in place, 21 sites, allows for evaluation of mass loadings, impact of stream flow on biodiversity. Sites are on DRWW website.
- d. Annual Report- NPDES permit holders are required to report so committee is putting data together to use in those reports. Suggestion that MS4s use data for their annual reports.

- e. *Upcoming Meetings – February 18, 2016, Monitoring and Executive Board, next General Membership meeting is 5/12/16. All meetings are posted on the website <http://www.drww.org>*

Comment from Fred Andes – this data is useful in shifting focus on what has to be done on this waterway

10. Lakes Committee Report - Mike Adam

First meeting was on January 28th, committee created a database of all lakes in watershed and is now compiling data, identifying gaps of information, and categorizing types of lakes. FYI, there are over 90 lakes in this watershed, over 50 that are 6 acres or more. This data will be shared with the Monitoring Committee. Next meeting is on April 21st (Quarterly - 4th Thursday 10AM) – meetings are held at the Central Permit Facility in the Health Department conference room on the first floor in Libertyville.

Question – could the list of lakes be added to the DRWW website when closer to final? Yes. Question – can committee identify and examine wildlife migration corridors? Yes, the hydraulics and dams are identified during stream inventory work conducted during the summer can assess that issue.

11. Next General Membership meeting: Quarterly meeting: May 12th at NSSD 10AM

12. Adjournment: *Mike Adam made a motion to adjourn. Paul Kendzior seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

Members and Delegates Present:

Non Members Present:

Mike Adam	K.C. Doyle
Dave Brown	Kathy Paap
Chris Carter	Jim Bland
Brian Dorn	Vern Witthahn
Al Giertych	Tom Morthorst
Charles Hernandez	Willy Dittrich
Donald Hey	Farrah Watson
Brandon Janes	Rob Flood
Paul Kendzior	Mike Novotney
Peter Kolb	Ed Coggin
Marcia McCutchan	Caitlin Burke
Joe Robinson	Cyrus McMains

Randy Seebach	Dan Bounds
Steve Vella	Jarod Oliver
	Marcy Knysz
	Brian O'Neill
	Phil Speck
	Nick Leach
	Patty Werner