Tara Neff welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions followed. Hala Ahmed introduced Holly Hudson, CMAP’s Senior Aquatic Biologist, who will become the new BBC Planning Manager when Hala goes on leave in July.

2. Recap of previous meeting and project timeline
At the last meeting, Megan Elberts provided information on the modeling process and Jerry Elliott provided information on Biosolids. There was quite a bit of discussion and a number of questions regarding the modeling process, which we hope will be addressed today. Megan Elberts was not able to attend our meeting today. Tim Loftus is here to present information on the impairment data and target pollutant load reductions and facilitate further discussion.
3. Presentation of Blackberry Creek Impairment Data

Tim Loftus provided information on sampling data obtained from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) and the Fox River Study Group (FRSG) on Total Phosphorus (TP), Total Nitrogen (TN), Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and Fecal Coliform. Additionally, Tim distributed the fecal coliforms (#/100mL) data sheet for 5/15/2006 through 9/15/2009 for the months of May through October. IEPA determines whether or not we’re meeting the standards. Samples were taken near mouth of the Fox River (confluence of the Fox River Blackberry Creek Dam on River Rd.) In his presentation (located here- http://foxriverecosystem.org/WatershedPlanning/Blackberry/Presentations/BBC-Data5-18-11.pdf). Tim explained the guideline criteria set as standards for the above pollutants by IEPA and the United States Environmental Protection Agency in their Eco-region criteria. Percentage reduction of the above pollutants will depend on the standards on which the group agrees.

Stakeholders agreed to set a target load reduction for fecal coliform in conformance with the IEPA standard of 200 cfu/100 ml. According to the available data, this will necessitate a 17% reduction in the contributions of fecal coliform. Additionally, the group agreed to not set a predetermined target for TP, TN, nor for TSS; rather calculate what reductions can be attained for these pollutants through the recommended projects.

The importance of project recommendations in a watershed plan is their eligibility for Section 319 funds, generally used for implementation of projects recommended in watershed plans. These funds are available to multiple entities and private landowners whereby for every $6 federal contribution, communities must provide a $4 local match (cash or in kind, volunteers can be the match – it doesn’t have to be dollars). The 319 contract includes an operations and maintenance requirement of 10 years for implementation projects.

While watershed plans do not have any tie to future regulation or legislation they are important public documents and might provide interested parties with various options to implement projects. For example, if a development impacts a wetland, the US Army Corps of Engineers could require mitigation efforts elsewhere in the watershed. The Army Corps is starting to consider watershed plans in its deliberations about where mitigation projects should be located.

The discussion on Biosolids was revisited and stakeholders brought forward some recommendations such as providing incentives for County Health Departments to conduct regular inspection of septic systems and incentives for the agricultural sector to maintain septic systems and drain tiles.

4. Discussion of plan outreach/education

1 CFU: Colony Forming Units
The outreach and education plan chapter is scheduled for discussion at our August stakeholder meeting. Megan Andrews proposed that organizations conducting outreach and education efforts provide that information at one of our stakeholder meetings. This would give stakeholders an opportunity to collectively consider, what makes sense to include in our plan. More discussion on the best manner to present and consider this information will occur in June. Please send any questions or information regarding outreach and education to Tara Neff at tneff@theconservationfoundation.org.

5. Project selection process

Stakeholders identified various project locations using the Google Earth map application. Members are encouraged to use this application to locate potential projects and send their sites to Hala or Holly. Martha Price gave a summary of the 2002 inventory. Many of the stakeholders were able to supply more information. Hala handed out the 2002 NIPC Stream Assessment Stream Bank Erosion map for review and feedback. The group identified horse farms and Holly Hudson provided information about the stream bank stabilization project that was conducted. Jerad Chipman, Village of Montgomery, will provide a copy of the stormwater report the developer supplied before they transferred the land along Blackberry Creek to the Kendall County Forest Preserve District. If you plan to submit a potential project using Google Earth, please provide the exact location, and do not use any punctuation in the description. It would be especially helpful if you would supply any and all information you have, who owns the property, what project you are suggesting for the property, etc. Hala also has poster size aerial photographs of the watershed available for project identification.

6. Meeting Adjournment

Thank you to the Batavia Library for hosting our May meeting. Thank you to all our stakeholders for their continued participation and the open discussions we had today. Our next meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 21 beginning at 2:00 PM at the United City of Yorkville’s City Hall Council Chambers (800 Game Farm Road in Yorkville, Illinois 60560).