

Aux Sable Creek 319 Advisory Committee Comments in Large Group Discussion

Chapter 1

- Font size small on the graphs and charts
- Consider use of word “maintain” in the vision statement.
*Follow up note: The vision statement was considered at several advisory committee meetings and the committee agreed to the following statement in March 2007 as the final one to include for the watershed plan:
“We intend to maintain the Class A rating of the Aux Sable Creek and enhance the natural and economic health of the watershed using sound management practices, education and voluntary cooperation while respecting property owner rights.”*
- 1.4 mentions “watershed document” – does it mean this one (this plan)?
- Solid background (liked that information).
- Make Figure 3 larger & add some road labels? If not, reference a larger one in the Appendix?
- The reason for the update to the watershed-based plan should be clearer (the rules have changed, impact of development, changes in watershed, etc.)
- Move reason for update top the beginning of the document.
- Define the intended use of the plan.
- 1.5 – list the higher priority goals and move the entire list to the Appendix? (Use information from the goals handout to modify this part.)
- The document seems to change tenses a lot: “is” vs. “was”
- 2.3.2 - There are more developments than what are mentioned based on ILR10 (open permits with IEPA).
- Include majority of NPDES permit information in the Appendix. This detailed list of information can be referenced if the reader is interested in knowing more about it, listing it in the document itself may be too complicated to a layperson.
- Explain NPDES.

Chapter 2

- 2.2.4 – What makes Class A, B, etc. Is the last sentence editorial? (p. 18)
- 2.3.1 – Population information flow is confusing.
- P. 8 – Climate – rainfall – reference 1996 flood event (trigger for watershed planning)
- Define acronyms:
 - HEC
- P. 15 – Sampling – date confusion: 1990, 1994, etc. What’s tested? Impairments?
- P. 23 – population – 2010 census help? (difficulty estimating population)
- 2.3.4: urban “growth” v. “sprawl”
- P. 35 – last sentence: dissolved oxygen – review – when will it be released?
- Mussel studies?

- 2.1.3 – Brisbin Road development impact not mentioned
- P. 13 & 14 – if LESA scores indicate soil doesn't support development – consider this
 - *Discussion on this item noted that LESA is a suitability for farming rating, its not about development. An explanation about LESA could be included in a future chapter.*
- Indicate the main channels of the creek and the areas that were created for drainage.
- P. 17 – macroinvertebrae – does the committee have any more information on any studies?
- Readability is good until the wetland & hydrology sections, some issues include:
 - Define assumptions
 - Uses existing, on-record studies (certified)
- 2.2.5 – numbers matching?

Chapter 3

- 3.1
 - first paragraph – define integrated report
 - Glossary for technical terms or include definitions
 - Use everyday language
- 3.2
 - first paragraph “of” missing
 - “injecting” should be “ingesting”?
 - Last line of 2nd paragraph is awkward
 - 1st line of 3rd paragraph is awkward (double negative)
- 3.3
 - Title existing and potential impairments (or make separate sections)
 - Eliminate town names
 - Explain why new development – potential impairments
 - Saratoga creek – add septic (failing)
 - Minooka – I-80 interchange area
 - Include Akzo Nobel
 - Include rapid urbanization & why, can use:
 - future land use based on comprehensive plans
 - prairie parkway
 - fallen trees in Middle Aux Sable
 - remove “Soltwisch” from dam name
- glossary vs. definitions or sidebar
 - recurring terms
 - acronyms
 - designate by bolding? Italics? Asterisk?
- Separate existing & potential impairments, then by subwatersheds
- Landfills, quarry, industrial, commercial – should be discussed as potential impairments
- Impairments & recommendations should be grouped by subwatersheds

- Include map that includes municipal boundaries

Chapter 4

- 4.2 – 2007 Farm Bill has been authorized, should it be referenced & some new programs?
 - *Continued discussion on this point agreed that a mention of checking the current farm bill would be a good way to handle this comment.*
 - Follow up note: *If committee members like a particular program that is included in the 2007 Farm Bill, developing or implementing such a program can be an objective to meet one of the plan goals. IEPA recommends the program concepts be outlined and the recommendation could be that something like it be developed or made available in the watershed (or for a target audience in the watershed). In the event that the program becomes available through a Farm Bill, the government can implement it with the committee's support – if not, the plan guides the local group to develop the program and find its own source of funding to implement it themselves.*
- 4.2.2 & 4.2.3 – Farm Service Agency
- Add a 4.2.4 to mention WRP program
- 4.2.4 T-2000 or Partners for Conservation
 - Follow up note: [HBI780](#) *changed the name from Conservation 2000 Fund to Partners for Conservation Projects Fund. It was approved on August 13, 2007 and was effective on January 1, 2008.*
- 4.2.5 – Environmental Quality program (EQUIP)
- Confused on nutrient management - SWCD and NRCS also have a program
 - *Further discussion clarified the nutrient management program currently identified in the draft text refers to the one IEPA funds through Extension. Later it was mentioned that, perhaps, the SWCD & NRCS program could also be mentioned.*
- 4.5 – Streambank Stabilization Restoration Program (SSRP)
- P. 7 (section 4.1?) – urbanization vs. pressures for development
- 4.2 – CREP – check – this is a confusing part
- 4.2.3 – mention need to check with current farm bill
- Mention programs are cost share?

Chapter 5

- p. 12 Title: “existing” watershed programs to help with clarity on what is current vs. recommendation
- Reference a recommendation will be in Chapter 6? (i.e. what's the follow up?)
- 5.4 – exposed sites: runoff may be bigger issue now due to slow down & bankruptcy
- Put Adopt-A-Stream into action plan – explain what this program does & where it applies (only on public lands?)
- Numbering scheme is hard to follow

- *Further discussion clarified that the scheme uses the six practices of NPDES. An introductory paragraph will be included explaining this.*
- Terminology might be confusing: post-construction vs. pre-construction – maybe say “planning phase”, etc.
- 5.4
 - 40 acre exposure recommendation – may not be practical in all places – what do contractors say?
 - Run pages 17-20 by contractor?
 - *Further discussion clarified that most of what’s in this section is in the Illinois Urban Manual – so they are required practices*
 - Investigate which ones are appropriate to include?
- 5.5 – long term ownership reference – Homeowners Associations also? (private open space)
- 5.7.2.5 – permeable pavers – is detention credit given? (not all local governments do)
- Identify cost implications
 - Upfront, operational, etc.? (capital, life cycle & maintenance costs)
- Credits to developer for implementing/meeting watershed plan (recommend there be an incentive to use plan versus a regulation)
- Recommend conservation design development (will need to be encouraged & compatible among subdivision code, zoning code, etc.)