

DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup

April 29, 2009 Meeting Agenda

1. **Minutes for the February 25th Meeting.** (Attachment 1). *Motion to accept minute made by Larry Cox, seconded by Nick Menninga. Accepted unanimously*
2. **Continuous DO Monitoring Program –**
 - **Presentation** - DO results from 2008 and plans for the 2009 season. *Stephen McCracken presented data from 2008 and reviewed plans for 2009, which included new sites on Salt Creek (upstream of the Oak Meadows Dam and the Graue Mill Dam).*
 - **DO Training** - April 7th meeting of the DO monitoring teams was held in Lisle. The meeting covered a review of the program, how the data was being used and a review of standard operating procedures.
3. **Stream Dissolved Oxygen Improvement Feasibility Study for Salt Creek and East Branch of the DuPage River.**
 - 1) **East Branch DuPage River**
 - **DuPage County DRSCW Official Agreement** – The agreement between DuPage County and DRSCW for project management of the design work for the Churchill Woods Project and use of the 319 funds allocated to the project has been signed by the County and the DRSCW (attachment 2). A copy of the agreement is attached (see second bullet for explanation of why agreement amount differs from amount in the annual budget amount). *Larry Cox explained that IEPA had agreed to supply an additional \$36,000 to the project as the aggregate bids for the two scopes had been higher than originally anticipated. The local match for the 319 funds will be supplied by the County.*
 - **Churchill Woods Restoration Design** – The County has signed a contract with Huff & Huff for the environmental assessment and wetland services. The County, FPDDC and DRSCW are still working on the developing a contract for the dam removal and stream channel restoration design. The final contract will be signed by County. IEPA has also agreed to increase the grant amount by \$36,000 to provide extra funding for the design process. County Stormwater will provide the additional match. *Sarah Ruthko brought members up to date with contract negotiation for the project. A contract has been signed with Huff & Huff for the wetland delimitation and to fulfill other permit requirements. Agreement has not yet been reached on retaining an engineering contractor. There was conversation on the merits of Interfluve, Dennis Streicher pointed out they were up to date on the project and had performed very well during the feasibility study. Jennifer Hammer asked if it was not better to get a local firm to take on the construction part of the project, a much larger project than the design. Jim Knudsen pointed out that the projects were supposed to be shovel ready. The development of the plan had now been delayed by three months and time was of the essence. He noted that while multipliers were important capability was the most important thing.*
 - **Public Outreach on Churchill Woods Project-** Update

2) Salt Creek

- **Report Update and schedule-** The DO Committee is currently reviewing chapters of the report. The draft will be available for review by the whole Workgroup before the end of May. The IEPA has agreed to leave the report open after the grant deadline ends in order for the Workgroup to vote on the report at the June meeting. A draft report would be submitted in May to allow the IEPA time to comment and to allow the Workgroup to close the grant. The extra time was requested given the nature of the reports recommendations. *There was talk about weighing the non- DO impacts of the alternatives at Fullersburg Woods. Larry Cox suggested that this be part of the restorability analysis in order to give the DRSCW direction on which (partial breach alternatives offered the most environmental benefits. Jennifer Hammer suggested that aeration be included.*
- **Public Meetings Update-** Two public meetings were held in the Oak Brook Village Hall on the 18th and 31st of March to discuss the Workgroups findings and conclusions. *Dennis Streicher and Tom Richardson and updated the members on the two public meetings. They noted that the meetings had been held in Oak Brook in order to hear opposing points of view. Comments on the modifications had focused on flow through the race way, flow over the dam, the view of the impoundment from neighboring properties. Jim Knudsen asked if there were other aspects of the project that could be changed to create incentives. Dennis Streicher said at this stage the DRSCW had gathered the information it wanted for the report and would not be pushing for the project until some other projects, notable Churchill Woods, had been completed. Ross Hill agreed with this position, the FPD had a number of dam removal projects on its plate, and that the bankruptcy of Tronix had complicated work on the West Branch.*

4. Chloride Usage Education and Reduction Program.

- **Monitoring.** Data from the monitoring project will be presented at the July meeting.
- **Workshops.** The committee will be meeting in May to discuss technical workshop schedules for agency and private operators as well as several other items under development. *Dan Bounds gave a quick update on chloride reduction activities. The committee was developing a 'no chloride' area map and plans for workshops for both private and public operators*

5. Monitoring Committee Update

- **2006-2008 Bioassessment** - The amount authorized for the 2006-8 Bioassessment plan was \$396,000, divided between chemistry (\$196,000), biological assessment and report writing (\$200,000). While the chemistry monitoring came in under budget by \$44,676.57, the biological monitoring and report writing went over budget by a total of \$39,362.49. Final total aggregate cost for the Bioassessment plan was \$390,685.92 which was under budget by \$5,314.08. The reasons for the overrun were on biological sampling were: amount of time to get from site to site in watershed, greater QA/QC than expected, samples being sent for external QC not accounted in budget, scope increases (stressor analysis) and report writing. Lastly State payment laws for some staff overtime

changed and pushed up costs. MBI had reported in June 2008 that they would go over budget and projected the overrun would be approximately \$35,000; final overrun was \$4,362.49 more than that estimate. The Executive Board was very satisfied with the final report and recommends full payment of these final invoices. *Stephen outlined why MBI had incurred cost overruns and recommended payment. Motion to pay was put forward by Larry Cox, seconded by Steve Zehner. Accepted unanimously.*

- **2009 Bioassessment** – The Monitoring Committee recommends that the Workgroup approve the following two contracts at the April 29 meeting:
 - Contract with Suburban Labs for 2009 in the amount of \$57,715.30. The tasks for the 2009 chemistry monitoring on the West Branch is attached (Attachment 3). DRSCW budget adopted in February allocated \$52,050 for this work.
 - Contract with MBI for 2009 in the amount of \$104,958.00. Tasks for the 2009 Biological Monitoring on the West Branch is attached (Attachment 4) which includes a full report. DRSCW budget adopted in February allocated \$83,490 for this work.

The combined total of these two contracts (\$162,163) is greater than the \$135,540 amount which was budgeted and authorized at the last meeting. Since then we have received the updated price quotes from both contractors. The SLI quote is actually equal to what we spent in 2006 for the West Branch. The budget amount of \$52,050 was calculated by taking prior total expenditures and dividing it by three, which does not reflect the variance of cost between watersheds. For the biological monitoring, the MBI proposal was negotiated down to this amount and any efforts to reduce it any lower will mean cutting scope. It was the consensus at both the last Workgroup meeting and the Monitoring Committee meeting that scope should not be cut and that a report should be generated for each year's monitoring. The possibility of going back out to bid was also discussed, but a review of past proposals did not suggest that it would provide cost savings. To address the increased costs, the committee discussed either going to a four year sampling schedule or determining how much of a dues increase would be required to provide the long term funding necessary to retain a three year monitoring schedule. As the decision on a three or four year monitoring schedule does need to be made at this time, the Monitoring Committee proposes to prepare a more detailed budget estimate for each watershed, after completion of the 2009 work, for presentation to the Workgroup at a future meeting prior to budget development for 2010.

Larry Cox made a motion to accept the contracts at the new amounts, seconded by Jim Huff. Accepted unanimously.

- Fecal coliform monitoring – We are discussing with Illinois EPA to determine what level and where sampling would be most useful for the development of the TMDLs.
- The Monitoring Committee also discussed working with USEPA to develop a program to monitor for pharmaceuticals and PAH's in our waterways. This will be a cutting edge program and we still have many more questions than answers. Updates on this topic will be brought to future Workgroup meetings.
- DuPage County Health Department has had further discussions with the Workgroup on monitoring of endocrine disrupting compounds in surface water.

6. Business

- **By-laws amendment** Update by-laws attached (Attachment 5)
- **Membership list and 2008 dues received** (Attachment 6)
- **Conservation Foundation Contract Amendment** (Attachment 7 and 7.1)
- **Investment update**
- **Membership** Invoices for 2009 DRSCW dues will be mailed by April 30.

It was also noted that the DRSCW had sent comments on the TMDL to the IEPA. Bruce Yurdin confirmed that they had been received.

7. Grant Management

- Quarterly Grant reports for grant agreements faa3190522 and faa3190707 have been completed and submitted to IEPA.
- The Workgroup should start to think about submittals for the 2009 round of 319 grants. Applications are accepted by IEPA from May 1 through August 1. Do we want to make an application and if so for what? *It was agreed that an application should be made. Bruce Yurdin suggested looking into CSO compliance. Jim Knudsen asked about the limits of using 319 Funds for compliance. Bruce Yurdin said as long as this monitoring was beyond the scope of what was mandated it should be acceptable. Manju Sharma said that MWRDGC does SSO and CSO monitoring and could serve as a model for this in the DRSCW program area.*

8. DRSCW Calendar

A presentation on the Workgroup was delivered at the IWEA 2009 Watershed Management Symposium on March 16, 2009.

9. Workgroup meeting schedule

- June 24, 2009
- August 26, 2009
- October 28, 2009
- December 9, 2009
- February 24, 2010 (Annual Meeting)

Dennis welcomed a representative from Tinley Park to the meeting