

**DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup
Annual Meeting Minutes
Lombard Village Hall
February 24, 2016**

Equivalent of 1 PDH Recognized for Attendance

9:00-9:05 Welcome, Introductory Remarks

Dave Gorman – DRSCW President and Assistant Director of Public Works,
Village of Lombard

Dave Gorman made welcoming remarks and introductions by attendees followed.

9:05-10:00 Annual Business Meeting

• **Approval of the minutes for the December 9, 2015 meeting (Attachment 1)**

Motion to approve December 9th meeting minutes as presented made by Steve Zehner, seconded by Sue Baert; motion carried unanimously.

• **Election of Officers and Members-at-Large, New Business**

- President – Dave Gorman, Village of Lombard
- Vice President – Sue Baert, Wheaton Sanitary District
- Secretary – Treasurer, Robert Swanson, DuPage County
- At Large – Rick Federighi, Village of Addison
- At Large – Nick Menninga, Downers Grove Sanitary District
- At Large – Antonio Quintanilla, MWRD-GC
- At Large - Steve Zehner, Robinson Engineering, Inc.

Motion to approve slate of officers as presented made by Dennis Streicher, seconded by Karen Daulton-Lange; motion carried unanimously.

• **Adoption of FY 2016-2021- Budget, New Business**

- Approval of the FY 16-17 Annual Dues Schedule and Annual Dues by Agency (Attachment 2). A 3% increase in member annual dues is included in the schedule. It should be noted that beginning last year, the staffing assessment was included in Agency member dues. A motion to approve the Dues Schedule is required.
- POTW Agency member project assessments related to the NPDES special conditions is proceeding on schedule.
- Chloride management and project construction funding has been moved to the special conditions funding.
- Staff: Addition of 1.0 FTE.
- Review and approval of the FY 2016-17 Budget (Attachment 3 - one page budget summary). A motion to approve the Budget is required.

Motion to approve FY2016-2017 Budget as presented made by Steve Zehner, seconded by Jennifer Hammer; motion carried unanimously.

- Detailed Five Year Financial Plan for Fiscal Years 2016-2017 to 2020-2021 (Attachment 4) will also be presented and discussed. A motion to post the Five Year Financial Plan for information and planning purposes only is required.

Larry Cox stated the financial plan includes the project assessments. Karen Daulton-Lange asked whether the POTW assessments reflected on page 22 are in addition to regular membership dues. Larry Cox affirmed that the POTW assessments are in addition to regular membership dues.

Motion to approve the Five Year Financial Plan for Fiscal Years 2016-2020 as presented for informational and planning purposes only made by Dennis Streicher, seconded by Bill Blecke; motion carried unanimously.

- Accounts Update (Attachment 5).
- **Appointment of Committee Chairpersons by incoming President, New Business**
 - Monitoring Committee Chairperson – Jennifer Hammer, The Conservation Foundation
 - East Branch DuPage River Watershed Committee Chairperson – Larry Cox, Downers Grove Sanitary District
 - West Branch DuPage River Watershed Committee Chairperson – Erik Neidy, Forest Preserve District of DuPage County
 - Salt Creek Watershed Committee Chairperson – Dennis Streicher, Sierra Club – River Prairie Group
- **Other business**
 - Agreement with the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County for funding Oak Meadows Projects (Attachment 6).

Stephen McCracken reminded members that Oak Meadows project is first on the list of special condition projects, and will be the first recipient of payments from the projects fund. The FPDDC is to be commended for accepting enhanced stream restoration work proposed by the DRSCW, for which they fronted the money that the DRSCW will reimburse. The agreement has been through review by the FPDDC attorneys and DRSCW executive board. This agreement will be used as template for future project partners moving forward.

Karen Daulton-Lange inquired about what was specifically enhanced and how it benefits the DRSCW's goals. Stephen McCracken replied that enhancements were made to the physical aspects of the restoration activities: more gravel (IPS tool identified the site lacks hard riverbed) which was one of the most expensive items; more grading around the banks, removal of armor and the dam removal. These additions were made because of the funding the DRSCW provided. The upland riparian improvements would have happened regardless of the DRSCW's involvement. He added that the Salt Creek comprehensive basin assessment is scheduled for this year and that the future budget includes 3 sites at Oak Meadows for surveying macroinvertebrates (insects).

Larry Cox asked about project costs with and without the DRSCW funds. Stephen McCracken responded that the river riparian and wetland components are estimated at \$6M-\$6.5M, but would have cost about half of that without the DRSCW's additional items. The FPDDC may have enhanced the project, but with the DRSCW's additional data and finances there was hope to draw in other funding.

Larry Cox gave kudos to the FPDDC; all they had was the DRSCW's promise of money - if we ever got it. The FPDDC Board was committed to do the project as is. It was a boost to both the DRSCW and US EPA Region 5 that ground was broken right after the special condition was approved. Stephen McCracken noted that in 2008 there was no interest in this project.

Dave Gorman proposed holding another meeting at the site when the restoration part of project is completed, maybe as early as June. The golf course will not yet be constructed but the river should be back in place. Repayment has been stretched out a year to improve cash flow. Funds are needed now to pursue the Fawell project and development of the Nutrient Implementation and Trading programs. In addition, the Fullersburg Woods project concept planning is scheduled to begin this year.

Dave Gorman stated that a vote is needed to authorize the DRSCW's executive board to start transfers of cash \$500,000 by March; \$500,000 by end of FY 2016, \$1.0M following and \$250,000 following. A total of \$2.25M will be transferred. MWRDGC may contribute to this project. The agreement specifies that any funds provided by Workgroup members for this project will be added to the DRSCW's total reimbursement amount. For example, if a Workgroup member paid \$1.0M to the FPDDC for this project, \$1.0M would be deducted from the DRSCW's overall commitment of \$2.25M.

Dennis Streicher commented that the process looks positive. MWRDGC would be voluntarily funding projects which provides more resources. Should this happen, the DRSCW could immediately begin spending funds for the Fawell project, freeing up cash flow.

Motion to authorize the DRSCW Executive Board to sign the Oak Meadows Funding Agreement made by Larry Cox, seconded by Steve Zehner; motion carried unanimously.

- *Partnership Agreement. DuPage County Stormwater Management, FPDDC, MWRDGC and DRSCW are reviewing a partnership agreement to help avoid duplicating efforts and establishing a consensus mechanism for projects. The draft agreement was reviewed by the DRSCW's executive board with extensive comments.*

Karen Daulton-Lange inquired about the four-way partnership. The agreement will set the tone for implementation partners and ensure their recognition for their involvement. It is relatively informal; it includes points of contact at each agency to share information. Karen Daulton-Lange asked whether this agreement would help the agencies secure future grant opportunities, showing collaboration. Stephen McCracken responded that was a possibility. The agreement provides an umbrella for contributing partners to collaborate on water quality improvement projects and the Board believes it is useful for the DRSCW to participate.

- *Newsletter (Attachment 7, to follow). Stephen McCracken reported that the newsletter is (still) not yet ready for review. There have been many competing priorities recently.*

- New State MS4 permit was reissued on February 10, 2016 with an effective date of March 1, 2016.

Huff & Huff held a training on this last Monday and they agreed to have the information posted on the DRSCW's website. The document breaks the information down into digestible portions; there are many new requirements. Baxter & Woodman will also hold a workshop on MS4 permit requirements on the 16th.

Rob Swanson will provide clarification for which monitoring with DuPage County SWM is covered in existing agreements. Dave Gorman mentioned the DRSCW's website includes a model ordinance for salt storage. The permit allows two years to get permanent salt storage facilities in place. There is still confusion about the NOI process; new permit 90 days or 180 days prior to expiration date.

Larry Cox inquired about the wet weather monitoring. Stephen McCracken replied that monitoring wet weather is found in the permit. Some requirements are specific but you can do other things with ambient monitoring. DuPage County SWM and DRSCW monitoring should cover wet weather monitoring. Jim Huff added there are 6-7 pollutants specified for stream monitoring.

Jim Knudsen asked why a provision for retrofitting didn't get passed with the previous stormwater rule. The permit now requires evaluation of all stormwater BMPs (detention/retention ponds). Permittees must develop plan to monitor all BMPs throughout the MS4 area, regardless of whether the municipality owns them.

Rob Swanson added that we need to determine needs to develop regional implementation for IDDE monitoring language and monitoring programs. We are missing "within 48 hours" and should assess this (formalized IGAs?).

Dan Bounds noted that MS4 permits are getting more requirements. Jim Knudsen added that they said it would happen, but now it is. Some items municipalities will have to manage individually.

- The 2016 Integrated Report and 303(d) List was released. Comments are due by March 11, 2016.

The DRSCW will submit comments, which members will have the opportunity to review. If your municipality submits comments, please send a copy to Stephen McCracken.

- The DRSCW and the Lower DuPage River Watershed Coalition (LDRWC) signed a funding agreement to update the IPS tool.

Updating the IPS tool is budgeted this year and the LDRWC is committed to paying half. The stressor analysis was used to help identify the projects in the special condition. We now have more reference site data, which should give us top end of good fish/habitat. The updated IPS tool will include the data we have collected since the initial tool was developed and the LDRWC's assessment data from two assessments.

The City of Naperville approached the DRSCW about the possibility of signing on to the special condition. They felt it was a good deal fiscally and environmentally.

Larry Cox stated that the City of Naperville is already a DRSCW member for stormwater, but their plant discharges into the DuPage River. Their POTW is a member of LDRWC. Naperville initially inquired about funding the DRSCW special condition projects. However, it might make more sense to look at projects in the LDRWC watershed; there is a large macrophyte issue, driver for p conditions, biological and also fish passage issues. The City of Naperville approached Illinois EPA with a plan for an identical permit special condition but with different projects as an alternative to taking a phosphorus limit at their facility. Illinois EPA is interested.

Illinois is interested in expanding this approach to other areas. Good incentive for LDRWC and DRSCW to collaborate and spend funding outside watershed boundaries. This collaboration can help manage and execute projects the DRSCW would have to execute in the future. Looking forward this, would keep Illinois EPA, DRSCW and LDRWC stakeholders happy. Jim Holzapfel stepped out of the meeting and was not available to comment. Amy Ries commented that they are pleased with the response they have received and have to move quickly to get their POTWs together to discuss a similar formula.

Larry Cox added that triggers for phosphorus include sections with algae impairments; that is the target of this effort. Dennis Streicher noted that what is happening downstream impacts impairments. When you try to define downstream, it keeps moving south. Macrophytes can be seen on the bottom of a stream and we can redesign the corridor to help mitigate or reduce them; that's a big positive. Anti-backsliding – if p removal did not work, we cannot stop doing it. With this approach money, is still available to try something else.

- *A POTW workshop was held on January 28th covering pre-treatment, phosphorus optimization and point source trading. The workshop had excellent attendance. Board members Nick Menninga, DGSD, and Rick Federighi, Addison, both provided excellent presentations. Jill Kostel, The Wetlands Initiative, provided a spot-on presentation on trading. The workshop provided clarification to members on the special conditions, which are DRSCW responsibilities and which are individual POTW responsibilities, and to help start planning and acting on them.*
- *Illinois EPA approached the DRSCW about putting a chloride variance in place for the program area's three watersheds. A meeting with Illinois EPA was held on February 19th.*

The meeting was scheduled to discuss two issues related to chloride: Would the DRSCW support legislation to provide Illinois EPA with tools to implement waterbody, watershed or multiple discharger variances and would the DRSCW be interested in pursuing a chloride variance in our program area. We will have more information available at the April meeting. Discharges in the CAWS are currently pursuing a chloride variance; MWRDGC is heading this initiative. The

DRSCW must determine whether we will we support the initiative and if we need or want to pursue a variance; including understanding repercussions for not having a variance. Dave Gorman noted that the DRSCW should have no reason not to support Illinois EPA's request for support of variance tools, but have not yet decided to pursue a chloride variance process in the area. The CAWS process prescribes group documents that individual discharges would use to file individual variances.

Jim Huff clarified that only individuals can get variances under current state law. USEPA released variance guidance in August 2015. It makes sense to support the use of other tools identified in the document. Stephen McCracken concurred that support for access to other tools makes sense.

Jim Huff added that the DRSCW has protection through the approved TMDLs, where there are none in CAWS. The CAWS must now meet 500mg/L within 3 years or have a variance in place, which would set a different standard they could achieve through the process (5-years). Already 3 options. MWRDGC is also heading up support of legislation.

Dave Gorman stated that the variance comes with conditions. Jim Huff agreed and added that you have to show compliance in 5 years. Meeting the standard after even 10 years is difficult. This item will be discussed in more detail, including the essentials for what DRSCW members must understand, at the April meeting.

Stephen McCracken added that Vince Mosca from Hey & Associates attended the variance discussion meeting and provided an example of a water quality certification being held up for a parking lot construction because of post-construction increases in chloride loadings. It is clear that chlorides are being looked at differently than in the past. A variance allows for non-compliance with the law for 5 years, while it is unlikely to get into water quality compliance.

- **DRSCW Calendar**

The DRSCW is presenting information on stressor analysis – how the DRSCW analyzed phosphorus as a stressor impacting biological life, at the IWEA annual conference on Tuesday, March 1st in Champaign.

No other questions. Moved to presentations.

- **Workgroup meeting schedule (9:00 AM start time)**

All meetings are scheduled to occur at Lombard Village Hall beginning at 9:00 AM.

- February 24, 2016 (Annual Meeting)
- April 27, 2016
- June 29, 2016
- August 31, 2016
- October 26, 2016
- December 14, 2016
- February 22, 2017

11:10-12:00 Presentations of Implementation Program

1. Permit Condition Review and Schedule - The DRSCW special permit condition requires a number of physical projects and studies to be implemented over the next 8 years. The presentation will cover the project schedule, objectives and key deliverables. – Nick Menninga, DGSD, Stephen McCracken, TCF

Individual permittees are responsible for certain activities on their own; others the DRSCW as a group will complete. DO watershed impairments – we have to do monitoring collect/evaluate. Offensive condition impairments – our 303d and 305b include a small smattering of sections, one stretch on the mainstem West Branch DuPage River. There are a couple tributaries as well, but for the most part, there are not a lot of offensive conditions identified by Illinois EPA. There are certain sections to focus on and a main component is to identify projects. This is all spelled out in the permits. It is up to us to flesh out what our projects look like. We have limited funds so we must be judicious, with realistic expectations for these projects. The goals identified are ones which we have a high degree of certainty.

The Fawell dam modification, which will modify the channel and dam for fish passage at that location, is slated to be completed by the end of 2018. Fish scores are significantly higher downstream of the dam. Biological habitat restoration has occurred upstream of dam but we need fish downstream of dam to migrate there. This year we will focus on concept development and permitting.

Springbrook 12/31/2019

Short term concept plan for Fullersburg Woods dam. There was great resistance from both the village and project neighbors when the idea of this project was initially floated. We will need to have a good vision, statement and materials to show decisively what a successful project might look like. Some might picture mud flaps and flopping fish as the alternative to the impoundment. The DRSCW must demonstrate what it could look like to nay-sayers. The DRSCW will focus on those materials and sell the project more effectively to local stakeholders.

Longer term – southern West Branch and East Branch stream enhancement. We don't have specific locations or lengths. We need to start thinking how much money will be available to negotiate the biggest bang for our buck. Further downstream, scores are generally better for fish and bugs; we may start lower and aim to bring those conditions upstream.

The DRSCW is also working on chlorides and significant nutrient and phosphorus issues at a watershed scale. Individual POTWs will study their plants, provide costs, and identify projects – the DRSCW will collect all the information and investigate trading possibilities. For example, one POTW might be able to make higher reductions at a lower cost (trading). The Nutrient Implementation Plan will focus on narrative standards (offensive conditions/ DO) and investigate correcting these issues; many cases of upstream POTW discharges. Permittees are obligated to work on these.

Chlorides: The DRSCW is probably in the best position to make progress in reducing chloride use and evaluating impacts on receiving streams. Obviously, we will continue to educate salt users for winter operations. DRSCW will also generate an annual report for

individual POTWs to use to satisfy requirements in their permit to identify progress (history of usage, potential impacts) for the upcoming year.

The DRSCW is collecting significant revenue in exchange for a delay in expenses for phosphorus removal at POTWs (less than phosphorus removal).

Stephen McCracken added that the budget shows projected expenditures and O&M costs associated with phosphorus removal. Larry Cox added that the project completion dates are also available.

2. Chloride Reduction and Management - Implementation of the Chloride Reduction Program began in 2007 and is ongoing. The presentation will provide an overview of program elements, progress to date, and how the Program's successful training workshops have evolved. An update on current developments and changes to chloride regulatory standards will be provided. – Dan Bounds, CDM Smith

A model facilities plan is available on the DRSCW's website.

Rishab Mahajan inquired about hotspots. Dan Bounds replied that we do not have much spatial analysis but do focus on municipal and specific points. Stephen McCracken added that we have some summer spatial analysis and had three (3) hits for high summer chlorides; these looked like storage facilities. We are investigating whether they are the source and how to address. Dan Bounds noted that a study from a different area of the country found a storage facility impacted residential wells.

Stephen McCracken added that he didn't like linking the POTW condition to chlorides (a stormwater pollutant) but US EPA felt that this was an important item. Chloride questionnaires will be out in April; please be sure to return them.

3. Oak Meadows Construction Update - Oak Meadows construction is continuing on schedule. The river restoration work is on track to be completed by June 2015 and the golf course is scheduled to reopen in May 2017. – Beth Wentzel, Interfluve

Kelsey Musich asked how the agreement with the golf course for sediment and phosphorus reductions compared to plans at other golf courses. Stephen McCracken responded that the FPDDC's golf course operations already had in place optimized pesticide, herbicide, fungicide and nutrient applications; they applied very conservatively. The FPDDC plan went so far as to prescribe when (and when not) to apply fertilizers and fungicides. Stephen McCracken added that documentation of stream restoration and turf maintenance regime can be shared with others post project for other courses to utilize.

Deanna Doohaluk inquired whether the redesign included traditional turf. All wetlands and buffers include the use of native plants in natural areas. The golf course was reduced by 9 holes so the existing golf footprint is much smaller. The FPDDC will increase native planting throughout playable areas. Stephen McCracken added that most of his time was spent on river design and not much attention was paid to the golf course architecture except where it intersected with the river. However FPD staff were involved and the architect was very focused on producing a green design. While we are

unsure of the scale to measure, there will be much more naturalized than traditional golf courses.

Jen Boyer added that the FPDDC added upland buffers to wetlands and riparian areas. There were some permitting concerns related to nutrient runoff from the lawn into wetlands. Boyer added that the FPDDC introduced BMPs in the riparian buffer before flowing into the wetlands and/or creek. Good job.

4. Fawell Dam Modification Update – Analysis of the culverts is underway with the objective of having a completed design in place by the end of the year to allow permitting to take place in 2017. – Stephen McCracken, TCF

Rishab Mahajan inquired whether analysis for how the channel will evolve after modification will be completed. Stephen McCracken replied that an upstream depth of refusal study was conducted, before it hits gravel, to learn what the downcut will look like after. The face of dam thalweg after would lead us to modify east side instead of the west. We have a good idea from the cross sections of what the channel will do. We plan to let the river find its own course; it will move and downcut, then we'll look at what further restoration can occur. Beth Wentzel added that predictions will be made with a practical perspective – what makes sense, what the system should do passively, and regulatory issues as well. We do not want to lock the channel in place before the modification; it's more expensive and less fruitful. The drawn down water level should bring QHEI benefits.

Rishab Mahajan inquired about the use of a non-steady state model. The FEQ model ends upstream of the face and starts downstream of the face of the dam. DuPage County uses the FEQ model for permit work. There may be a need to incorporate the use a different model, due to the characterizations of the proposal. The FEQ model is still our first process; we can look at other models that might offer more flexibility.

Dennis Streicher asked for clarification that the original plan was a single box culvert and now is two. Yes, to get the in-culvert velocities we want, we are now looking at modifying two. The sluice gates look like they remain in place. These do not close completely; they are dropped and gradually opened. DuPage County just completed the process to change the use protocol with IDNR; IDNR owns the dam and DuPage County SWM operates it. While we would prefer not to open that process again for modification, we may have to; on the bright side IDNR should be up to speed on what's going on with dam.

Larry Cox referenced the project schedule slide. Our timetable calls for construction in 2018. 2018 is the year we are scheduled to complete the basin assessment for the West Branch; we won't fully assess the basin for another three years to ascertain the impact on fish. Oak Meadows project impacts can be measured within the footprint of project. Fawell is unusual in that it can impact the entire system upstream. With the project completed in 2018, we could delay the basin assessment by one year. We could survey upstream fish, but it would be nice to have whole basin assessment. There are marginal costs for additional sites, but this project warrants the entire basin assessment. It is out of sync with the existing basin assessment schedule.

Another observation, same post-project assessment scheduling conflict occurs with Oak Meadows, comprehensive basin assessment in 2016 then not again until 2019. We can add two passes (July and September) the following year for the three sites in the project's footprint.

John Norton asked whether the plans to improve stream water quality and functionality while acting as a flood minimization structure are competing interests. Stephen McCracken responded that the water quality benefits may be small while the biological improvements could be massive. The project considers both chemistry and biology. DuPage County SWM is a great partner and they are committed to seeing this project through. The first priority is that Fawell dam must always operate as flood control structure. However, there should not be any competition between flood control and fish passage.

This is an example of the precise application of funds. The project has a relatively small budget, but can have a very high impact on fIBI scores and meeting special conditions.

The two other barriers upstream are now gone (Warrenville and McDowell). New species could possibly make it to Hanover Park/Schaumburg. Stephen McCracken has not assessed how far north they may move. FPDDC's habitat restoration throughout the river system has improved mIBI; they should be able to support a more diverse fish population.

Dennis Streicher inquired about the scores that drop considerably north of Hanover Park in Schaumburg. Stephen McCracken replied that we don't know why the scores drop. After the project is completed, further information may point to an answer (low flow?). The drop in scores is replicated in both years but neither TSD identified a cause.

Dave Gorman proposed providing QHEI and IBI education at a future meeting.

Larry Cox noted that the graph depicting fIBI scores should be updated to include data through the current year.

Jennifer Hammer stated the DuPage River Sweep is this May 21st and encouraged attendees to take and post the flyers are available at the sign in table.

Nick Menninga made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Sue Baert; motion carried unanimously.