

**DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup  
Meeting Agenda  
Lombard Village Hall  
June 22, 2016  
9:00 – 11:00 AM**

**1. Approval of April 27, 2016 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)**

**2. Meet the Hickory Creek Watershed Planning Group**

Hickory Creek Watershed Management Planning Group (HCWPG) and its members are collaboratively working with regulators to reduce pollution in stormwater runoff; not only WWTPs discharges themselves, but through collective efforts to demonstrate a positive impact on the overall water quality of the watershed. Thirteen municipalities are incorporated within Hickory Creek watershed, in which 12 are MS4s and eight (8) are active members of the watershed group. MS4 communities who are active members of HCWPG have the advantage to document their involvement in HCWPG's activities to meet MS4 permit requirements.

**Presenter:** Dr. Lindsay Birt, Assistant Project Manager/Project Engineer II, Huff & Huff, a subsidiary of GZA, and watershed coordinator for HCWPC.

**3. Plans to Meet New ILR-40 Stormwater Requirements.**

The new ILR 40 contains a number of new requirements for monitoring, training and education. DuPage County Stormwater Management and the DRSCW have reviewed existing activities in the area and identified what areas are currently addressed and where activities need to be added in order to reach compliance across the DuPage County and the DRSCW area.

**Presenters:** Robert Swanson, and Mary Beth Falsey, DuPage County Stormwater Management, Stephen McCracken, TCF/DRSCW

**4. NPDES Permit Special Conditions (Old Business)**

- Remaining POTW Permits (Elmhurst, Wheaton SD & Wood Dale) Special Conditions Update.
- MWRD-GC Permit Special Condition Update.
- Lower DuPage River Watershed Coalition Permit Condition Update.

**5. Funding update (SB2081) (Old Business)**

- IGIG grant program.

**6. Projects Committee (Old Business)**

- Oak Meadows Update (Special Conditions Project 1).
- Fawell Dam Update (Special Conditions Project).
- Fullersburg Woods Concept Plan Development.
- PAHs & Coal Tar Sealants (CTS).
- IPS Tool Development.

**7. Monitoring Committee (Old Business)**

- Resource Managers Guide to Aquatic Bioassessment.
- DO monitoring started in June.
- The regularly scheduled membership meeting on August 31, 2016 will follow a modified format allowing it to host the kick-off meeting for our Nutrient Implementation Plan (NIP). All members are requested to attend.

- USGS Phosphorus Study – Bill Selbig presenting the findings of an evaluation of leaf collection as a means to reduce nutrient loads from urban basins at the DRSCW’s April meeting. The Executive Board recommends providing \$2500 to USGS for support of the ongoing research.

**8. Chloride Reduction Committee (New Business)**

- 2015-2016 Deicing Questionnaires – we have not yet received responses from all agency members.
- Chloride Offset Program with the Illinois Tollway - Proposals from Bensenville and Wood Dale have been submitted.
- The possibility of a level of service workshop is being explored with DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference and the Salt Institute.
- A draft trends analysis has been submitted and is being reviewed by the chloride committee.
- Chloride Workshops (Parking Lots & Sidewalks, September 22, 2016; Public Roads, September 29, 2016).
- Chloride Toxicity Study – Jim Huff presented a proposal to DRSCW members at the April meeting. He is requesting support to begin a process that would result in report that may start the process of supporting seasonal chloride standards. The Executive Board recommends supporting this investigation in the amount of \$2500.00.
- CAWS and Des Plaines River Chloride Variance Update.

**9. Watershed Permitting Update (Old Business)**

**10. Update on TMDL Development for the DuPage River/Salt Creek (Old Business)**

- Illinois EPA’s TMDL Division has requested assistance with data gathering for the QUAL 2K model on the northern segment of the West Branch DuPage River. If the proposal is accepted the monitoring would occur in two phases (calibration and validation) July/August. The Executive Board recommends supporting this initiative, not to exceed \$4000.00 and approximately twenty-four hours of staff time.

**11. Watershed Committee Updates – West Branch, East Branch and Salt Creek**

- Lower Salt Creek 319 Watershed Plan update.

**12. Business Items (New Business)**

- Welcome Sergio Serafino, MWRD-GC.
- Membership Dues 2016-2017 (Attachment 2).
- Financial Report Summary – (Attachment 3). The Executive Board has reviewed the first monthly DRSCW financial report, prepared by Tara Neff and Larry Cox. The first report contains three months, March/April/May, but future reports will cover one month. The report includes:
  - Revenues and expenses for each budget line item by month, year to date and total annual budget amount (financial report summary).
  - Dues and assessments received, by member.
  - Bank statements, including the reconciliation detail for the Itasca checking account, to allow independent verification of the account balances shown on the last page of the financial report.

The intent of the report is to increase Executive Board knowledge and oversight of financial activities in a concise report. From June 2016 forward, the Executive Board will review and approve the financial reports for the preceding two months at each scheduled Executive Board meeting and provide the financial report summary to members.

- Agreement with the Conservation Foundation (Attachment 4).  
Agreement with The Conservation Foundation for the provision of staffing services to the Workgroup will expire on 6/30/16. The attached renewal agreement for the period from 07/01/16 through 06/30/17 has been approved by the Executive Board and is recommended for approval by the Workgroup. The Workgroup is currently paying \$11,210.82 to TCF at the beginning of each month in personnel and overhead costs. The amount in the new contract will be \$12,463.60 per month.
- New FTE. Has been advertised on several career and water resource-focused sites and will be open until mid-day on July 11, 2016.
- Other Business.

### **13. DRSCW Calendar, Presentations and Press Coverage (Old Business)**

- May 2, 2016 – Audubon Society. “Watershed Management in the Upper DuPage and Salt Creek”, Stephen McCracken, TCF/DRSCW.
- May 19, 2016 – APWA. “Chloride Management in the Upper DuPage and Salt Creek”, Stephen McCracken, TCF/DRSCW.
- May 25, 2016 – Watershed Partnership Signing at Oak Meadows. Dave Gorman spoke on how we gain efficiencies by collaborating.
- May 26, 2016 – DuPage Advisory Council. “Watershed Management in the Upper DuPage and Salt Creek”, Stephen McCracken, TCF/DRSCW.
- June 7, 2016 – Chicago Wilderness Confluence. “Rethinking Implementation of the Clean Water Act” Stephen McCracken, TCF/DRSCW.

### **14. Workgroup Meeting Schedule**

- August 31, 2016
- October 26, 2016
- December 14, 2016
- February 22, 2017
- April 26, 2017
- June 28, 2017

**DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Lombard Village Hall**  
**April 27, 2016**  
**9:00 – 11:00 AM**

**1. Approval of February 24, 2016 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)**

*Motion to approve the February 24, 2016 meeting minutes as presented made by Nick Menninga; seconded by Steve Zehner. Motion carried unanimously.*

**2. Reducing Urban Phosphorus Load: Identifying Sources and Controls Update** - Over the last 10 years, the USGS has evaluated several Best Management Practices that are commonly used by MS4s as a means to reduce pollutant load, including leaf litter collection programs. Recently, the USGS began a study to evaluate leaf collection programs as a means to reduce nutrients from urban basins. An early report to the DRSCW showed leaves to be a significant source of phosphorus to stormwater in the fall. As DRSCW's wastewater permits now require a study on non-point source nutrient loading, it is an excellent time to review what the USGS findings have been to date.

**Presenter:** Bill Selbig, Research Hydrologist, USGS - Wisconsin Water Science Center

*John Norton asked whether they are able to extrapolate the total load area for p – enhanced treatment costs and the estimated load from the canopy to the stream (lbs p) and whether they had enough data to evaluate the cost effectiveness of this versus POTW treatment.*

*Selbig responded that they had not produced a cost comparison but it would be something that the City of Madison may have done. As of October, they implemented 24-hour leaf collection through November; it seems that the costs for personnel and equipment pale in comparison to capital costs. The study shows the dissolved p blasts right through the storm drain system.*

*A primary objective for the proposal is to build the case/tools to allow other communities to use a survey to estimate how much p reduction they might expect from an enhanced leaf pick up program. For example, in a small basin or service area – bagging leaves on the street, use categories (low, medium, high) can be applied with the regression analysis USGS hopes to develop. Rather than monitoring stations, the idea is to use a windshield survey to estimate the end of pipe benefits. We hope regulators will adopt and allow cities to use bagging for some p credit.*

*Jim Knudson inquired if there are other sources of p that may be removed that are not leaf litter generated.*

*Selbig said that are other sources of P in runoff besides organic detritus such as atmospheric deposition, soil erosion, pet waste, automotive detergents, etc. These sources would be considered relatively constant in spring, summer and fall. Since our study showed no reduction in P from street cleaning in spring or summer we can conclude street cleaning is not an effective way to reduce P from non-organic sources. In fall, the amount of organic*

*detritus increases significantly, as do concentrations of P. Removal of that detritus showed significant reductions of P in runoff.*

*Stephen McCracken asked about nitrogen. Selbig responded that we did see an increase in N during the spring, and to a lesser degree, fall. He attributed this to fertilizer application which generally occurs during this period of time. Fertilizer contains N but not P since Dane County has a ban on P for commercial fertilizers. If there wasn't a ban, he would have expected to see an increase in P as well as N. Others make the argument that fertilizer would not contribute to N and P in runoff since there's little runoff from lawns in the first place; this data suggests otherwise. Another argument is that microbial activity in street gutters consumes N in leaves and therefore decreases the overall N concentration in runoff. Selbig disagrees with this as the residency time of leaves in gutters seems too short to allow that to be a factor.*

*Robert Lewis asked whether the pH of rain fall had any contribution to p load. Selbig responded he would certainly expected pH to drop in runoff with contact with high acidity from leaf bud, but they didn't see that; it stayed relatively neutral. As water moves across a street surface, there are enough carbonites to neutralize water. They did not measure the pH of rainfall itself.*

*Larry Cox mentioned that in Madison, the runoff drains into lakes which are sinks for p. In Illinois streams, it wouldn't cause excess algae growth. P removal would address the Gulf of Mexico or in between. How would removing p in the fall eliminate excess summer algal growth?*

*Selbig replied that is a valid question. Madison Sanitary District is responsible for that. They are required to reduce effluent by X amount and could spend millions in capital improvement costs and distribute into the landscape (Chain of Lakes, Rock River, etc.); there are serious p concerns in the Great Lakes. P that enters a stream may not be so high, but it ends up going somewhere. A larger concern was to address TMDL requirements to minimize the impact to area lakes, which are a popular source of recreation. This was a concern for the sewage district. There was a small amount reduction, but the cost was high.*

*Tom Price asked about the method used to remove leaves. Selbig answered that leaf blowers were used, which are a little over the top for many municipalities. However they were trying to exaggerate the preparation work as a kind of sensitivity analysis. Timing is very important; they removed debris as close to start of storm event as possible.*

*Stephen McCracken noted that the study was not trying to create standard municipal operations. An objective was to verify how impactful the practice could be, could the loading be reduced? If practices were conducted at the overkill level and only removed 10%, then it would not be worth the effort. If the impact was substantial then the level of effort could be dialed back with the knowledge that a significant impact was possible.*

*Another question was how realistic the timing was before an event if the City was implementing leaf collection 7 days a week. Selbig replied that there were weekly collections*

*in the test basins to get just the leaf piles. They followed with HE street sweeper. Blowers are easier; they don't expect municipalities to incorporate this as it is costly and logistically impossible. The point is to determine the maximum potential for leaf collection on p removal. This year, they will go back to the normal frequency for cleaning streets and not use blowers and expect less than 80% removal. City entertained the idea of using a massive blower. They would have to buy a couple; \$100K is a small expense in the overall cost projections to meet TMDL requirements.*

*Rob Swanson inquired whether there have been any studies on streets without curb and gutter. Selbig responded negatively and added that is a really great point – all were similar, all curb and gutter and storm sewers. What does it mean if streets are not curbed? What are all the factors that contribute to reductions? What do most people do in terms of leaf collection, primary interests and hot spots? Residential area with tree canopy got the most attention – no tree canopy, not as much attention. City of Madison is working with them through 2017. This could be added on to the scope. Questions answered depends upon how much folks are willing to pay.*

- 3. Cold Weather Chloride Toxicity** - It is possible that chloride toxicity may vary with water temperature and the temperature associated life cycles of aquatic taxa. If this was the case, then it is possible that a seasonal chloride standard would make sense in Illinois waterways. Such a standard would both protect aquatic life (warm weather) and reduce legal exposure on winter storm releases of chlorides (cold weather). The presentation will outline how such a standard might be investigated, what the process includes and how it would be promulgated.

**Presenter:** Jim Huff, P.E., Huff & Huff, Inc.

*Stephen McCracken asked if US and Illinois EPAs are on board. Jim Huff replied that a detailed work plan for comments was sent to US and Illinois EPAs. A water effects ratio for US EPA is about \$10K per study. After comments, he got a 10 page response for a \$100K study. The fear is they will demand a huge scope expansion – so you'll need more money. In Illinois the Pollution Control Board makes rules and regulations, Illinois EPA takes enforcement. Illinois PCB has a different structure than other states. They are the ones that would need to be convinced.*

*Jim Knudsen asked whether there is anything that considers rainfall (drought higher concentration) and dilution. Does the study take this into account? Huff referenced winter. We probably didn't have a violation last winter. With high snow events, winter application rates increase. US EPA allows a violation every three years. We would need to discuss this. In a terrible storm event, public safety trumps environmental impacts.*

*Stephen McCracken added that the standard is concentration-based and is biologically driven. It is not based on feasibility rather the biological response. Huff stated that in Illinois anyone can propose a statewide standard. Hopefully with Illinois and US EPAs' approvals.*

*Jim Knudsen stated that municipalities shouldn't be paying for the study, it should be the state; however, there is little confidence the state would give EPA money to do a study. Huff replied affirmatively that the state has no money. They have talked to US EPA but they are happy with the toxicity database they already have. There may be others who are interested - Where's the Salt Institute? This would cover the entire US. Huff was working in the Chicago area on a Use Attainability Analysis (UAA) 8 years ago and it is still not there.*

*Antonio Quintanilla asked if the study considers seasonal effects. Huff replied that the primary focus is winter. Illinois and US EPAs will use whatever data is out there. Not toxicity testing, just how to structure.*

*Antonio Quintanilla asked for clarification that the summer is chronic not acute. Huff responded usually correct.*

*Stephen McCracken stated that if winter toxicity concentrations were higher it may well be that summer concentration were lower. Under this scenario, summer toxicity concentrations are important because they impact biodiversity at a critical time. Stephen said he was supportive of the analysis but everyone should be aware that summer limits may also fall and this could potentially impact plants. For example West Chicago effluent is over 200 mg/L. While expressing support it should be kept in mind that it's a two way street; you don't want to trade one set of problems for another. The advantage here is this would better fit reality.*

*On that vein Larry Cox asked why we couldn't look at only winter or only summer. We can't say we are science driven then ignore summer standards. If we use all the best winter BMPs, can we meet the number that comes from the study? Then what do we do, site specific?*

*Huff responded that if the study lent empirical data to the hypothesis the acute could be 1000 mg/L in colder temperatures. Can we get to 1000 mg/L with BMPs? If the chronic level is 600-700 mg/L, what about a third of the year with a terrible storm; it allows biology to come back.*

*Jim Knudsen asked what kind of commitment is being sought. Huff replied that he just needs an email to know if you're on board. Illinois Natural History Survey (INHS) rates vary; Huff & Huff rates versus rates for municipalities. Jim said Huff & Huff would be internalizing some of the costs. Jim Knudsen requested a synopsis with the scope and deliverables to take to his board. Huff replied the hand outs are available on the back table.*

*Stephen McCracken added that Region 5 noted other ions play a role such as sulfates and hardness that may need to be taken into account. .*

*Jennifer Hammer reminded attendees that moving forward doesn't change what we're doing; we still need less chloride in the stream whether we aim to meet one target or another.*

*Jim Knudsen mentioned EPA would drive or provide the best scientific information. Jim Huff added that Citgo objected to the new docket – we want a decision. They got 3 years to figure out what they want to do.*

*No matter how we run the calculations, we can't meet 500 mg/l with storms and we still need to decrease summer values.*

*Larry Cox asked if the estimated \$100K funds to administer all this is sufficient. Huff replied that he is confident \$100K will be sufficient and anything over that sum will be Jim Huff's responsibility. Huff added that the consortium is what would provide him clout for all that he is representing. Larry Cox noted the municipalities are targeted to provide funding but not the Salt Institute.*

*Steve Zehner asked whether municipalities outside the DRSCW's program area have been approached. Huff replied affirmatively: the Hickory Creek Watershed Planning Group, DuPage County Mayors and Managers and anyone he has entry with. He is expanding industrial contacts, making slow but steady progress.*

*Lake and McHenry Counties could also be approached. Larry Cox stated the municipal league should be interested.*

#### **4. NPDES Permit Special Conditions (Old Business)**

- The first report to the Illinois EPA on our special conditions ([http://drscw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/DRSCW-NPDES-SC-Report\\_1-March-31-2016.pdf](http://drscw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/DRSCW-NPDES-SC-Report_1-March-31-2016.pdf)) was made on the 30<sup>th</sup> of March.
- Elmhurst Special Conditions Permit Issuance Update
- MWRD-GC Permit Condition Update  
May be locked down by next meeting
- Lower DuPage River Watershed Coalition Permit Condition Update- Group met with Illinois EPA on the 14<sup>th</sup> of April. A follow-up document is being prepared.  
*LDRWC boundary begins at the confluence of the East and West Branch DuPage River. Most plants already have P removal. Expand DRSCW Special Conditions to get funding to remove downstream causes of impairment, notably the low head dam in Shorewood and the upstream channel form. Illinois EPA met with them and Sanjay Sofat seemed more optimistic than he was with DRSCW discussions. Illinois EPA asked for a letter providing arguments for why LDRWC should get the same special conditions. Arguments include: same watershed, same water quality standard, fish migration, downstream impacts; the same arguments the DRSCW made. Sanjay Sofat asked why there are two groups instead of one. If we have the same conditions and improvements are made, there may be some logic to combining the LDRWC and the DRSCW.*

#### **5. Funding update (SB2081) (Old Business)**

- IGIG grant program - *No news.*

#### **6. Projects Committee (New Business)**

- Oak Meadows Update (Special Conditions Project 1) – The MOU with the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (FPDDC) was signed and the first installment paid.
- Fawell Dam Update (Special Conditions Project)



*The project is moving forward and addressing some modeling issues. FEQ modeling has been problematic. A move to the HEC RAS model may resolve the modeling conundrum.*

- Fullersburg Woods concept plan development – Projects Committee will develop and issue an RFP for this item. Contract not to exceed figure will be \$15K.

*This is in all POTW permit special conditions so we have to complete and we need to keep the project moving. An RFP will be announced to get concepts and what it entails. Stephen McCracken requested the release of up to \$15K for the projects committee to draw up a contract.*

*Steve Zehner made a motion to release up to \$15K to the projects committee; Shirley Burger seconded the motion; motion carried unanimously.*

- PAHs & Coal Tar Sealants (CTS) Update

*New publications are coming out from other groups (not USGS) that support the conclusions of the USGS study.*

- Ammonia – N Standards Development

- IPS Tool Update - A contract and scope of work were agreed on for this project.

*Contractor is Midwest Biodiversity Institute (MBI). The total project is \$110,436.85. DRSCW has \$55,000 budgeted and a signed agreement with the Lower DuPage River Watershed Coalition (LDRWC) to pay the remaining invoices up to a total of \$55,000. Stephen McCracken stated the IPS contract is a little over the budgeted amount. The Board will review the scope before we sign the contract. Requesting authorization for the Board to sign up to \$110,436.85. DRSCW holds the contract with MBI and has an executed MOU with LDRWC.*

*Larry Cox made a motion to authorize the Board to sign this contract with MBI; seconded by Jennifer Hammer. Motion carried unanimously.*

## **7. Monitoring Committee (Old Business)**

- Contract and scope for the 2016 biological and habitat assessment of Salt Creek has been drawn up with the contractor, Midwest Biodiversity Institute (MBI). The quote totals \$143,005.58 and includes three reference sites and an additional site at the Oak Meadows location that will score macroinvertebrates and QHEI. The 2016 budget allocates \$144,250 for this line item. Seeking permission to proceed.

*Nick Menninga made a motion to proceed with the MBI contract; seconded by Karen Daulton Lange. Motion carried unanimously.*

*Steve Zehner added that it would be good to open a day to observe MBI doing their assessments as we have in the past.*

- Contract and scope for the 2016 chemical assessment of Salt Creek has been drawn up with the contractor, Suburban Laboratories (SLI). The cost is \$ 78,902.60. The 2016 budget allocates \$78,020 for this line item. Seeking permission to proceed.

*Larry Cox made a motion to approve the contract with SLI; seconded by Jennifer Hammer; motion carried unanimously.*

- A contract and scope for 2016 chemical assessment of three reference sites. The 2016 budget allocates \$7,700 for this item. Seeking permission to proceed up to a total of \$7,700.

*There will be discussion about which streams will be used as reference reaches. Chemical testing outside our watersheds, in areas that meet CWA goals, is critical information for IPS tool. This is for chemistry data.*

*Steve Zehner made a motion to allow the Board to sign a contract up to the budgeted amount (may cost more); Shirley Burger seconded; motion carried unanimously.*

- Resource Managers Guide to Aquatic Bioassessment Update

*Nutrient roundtable: We need to answer questions about the NIP such as what we need to know about washoff P N; trading for plants; schedules and type of information necessary to move to scope and contract phase. In next 6-8 weeks we will send information out for a workshop.*

## **8. Chloride Reduction Committee (Old Business)**

- 2015-2016 Questionnaires have been sent out.
- Chloride Offset Program with the Illinois Tollway - Working on proposals from Bensenville, Wood Dale and Elmhurst.
- Chloride Trends Analysis Update  
*We will take a look at loadings over the last decade and try to answer whether our activities are having an impact in comparison to other waterways. Summer and winter data – draft plots will be presented to the chloride committee and the analysis will be finalized after QA/QC check.*
- Chloride Workshops (Parking Lots & Sidewalks, September 22, 2016; Public Roads, September 29, 2016)
- CAWS and Des Plaines River Chloride Variance Update  
*Antonio Quintanilla reported they are working on the variance and added that Jim Huff's study is interesting.*

*Tony is retiring at the end of May. Stephen McCracken thanked Tony for his service and expertise while serving on the DRSCW Board. We wish him the best and thanks.*

*Able Haile provided a TMDL update. Progress into Stage 3 TMDL. Requested DO data from Stephen McCracken and the Des Plaines office. They are asking workgroups for target load reduction strategies and had a conference call with some members. Discussion is focused on which data to use in the study.*

*Stephen McCracken added that north of WB north of MWRD Hanover Park, we need help with continuous DO and water quality grab data. We will provide the number of samples and a cost estimate. Two locations for DO and demand/nutrients. This is voluntary and not reimbursable. However the integrity of the model is dependent on having quality data.*

*Tom Minarik noted that MWRD has a site at Springinsguth Road for water chemistry on the first Monday of the month when there is enough flow. The DRSCW did not have a location in mind and will coordinate with MWRD.*

## **9. Watershed Permitting Update (Old Business)**

### **10. Update on TMDL Development for the DuPage River/Salt Creek (Old Business)**

- TMDL Division's Request for QUAL 2K data gathering on northern West Branch during July 2016.

### **11. Watershed Committee Updates – West Branch, East Branch and Salt Creek**

- Lower Salt Creek 319 Watershed Plan  
*Holly Hudson stated there is agreement on the watershed boundary. She plans to use DuPage County portions and obtain more from Cook County. Work will be on the resource inventory (soils, land use, natural resources, etc.) and regular stakeholder meetings, a steering committee and general public meetings will be held quarterly. This will all get moving along in near future.*

### **12. Business Items (New Business)**

- Membership Dues 2016-2017
- Accounts Update – (Attachment 2)
- Watershed Partnership MOU  
*Tuesday, May 3rd the Board approved the partnership MOU. There will be a ceremony on May 25<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM at the Maple Meadows Golf Course. The river restoration work is scheduled to be completed by Memorial Day and the golf course work is underway.*
- Comments on the draft 2016 Integrated Report were sent to Illinois EPA  
(<http://drscw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/DRSCW-2016-IR-Comments-Final-03.11.2016.pdf>)
- New FTE  
*New advertisement – looking for 3-5 years environmental engineering and GIS proficiency.*
- Other Business

### **13. DRSCW Calendar, Presentations and Press Coverage (Old Business)**

- A newsletter was released that features articles on permit special conditions, Oak Meadows, chloride reduction and the new MS4 permit. Thanks to Rob Swanson (DuPage County SWM), Scott Weber (Village of Hanover Park), Ed Stevenson (FPDDC) and Lindsay Birt (Huff & Huff) for contributing.
- March 8<sup>th</sup> – FPDDC Board of Commissioners and Staff: Introduction to the DRSCW, Stephen McCracken.
- April 7<sup>th</sup> – Northwest Indiana Urban Waters Partnership: How the DRSCW prioritized and funded its watershed priorities, Stephen McCracken.
- April 19<sup>th</sup> – Urban Stormwater Committee Meeting: at the invitation of Illinois EPA DRSCW and DuPage County Stormwater SWM both participated in this group.

- May – Possible event at Oak Meadows Golf Course to mark the signing of the Watershed Partnership MOU. Would include DuPage County SWM, the FPDDC, MWRD-GC and the DRSCW.
- May 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> – APWA Conference in Schaumburg: Chloride reduction efforts in Cook and DuPage County, Antonio Quintanilla, MWRD-GC and Stephen McCracken.
- June 7<sup>th</sup> – Chicago Wildernesses Confluence 2016: Toward a More Vibrant H2O Future: How the DRSCW prioritized and funded its watershed priorities, Stephen McCracken.

#### **14. Workgroup Meeting Schedule**

- June 29, 2016
- August 31, 2016
- October 26, 2016
- December 14, 2016
- February 22, 2017
- April 26, 2017

*Nick Menninga made a motion to close the meeting; seconded by Steve Zehner. Motion carried unanimously.*

Dupage River/Salt Creek Workgroup  
Account QuickReport  
March 1 through June 17, 2016

	Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Amount
<b>47200 - Program Income</b>						
<b>47220 - POTW Project Assessments</b>						
	Deposit	03/14/2016	170219	Village of Bolingbrook	2015-2016 POTW PA	28,908.00
	Deposit	06/01/2016	174949	Village of Bolingbrook	2016-2017 PA	29,776.00
	Deposit	06/06/2016	955603	Glenbard Wastewater Authority	2016-2017 PA 2nd Year	94,644.00
	Deposit	06/13/2016	37715	Village of Carol Stream	2016-2017 POTW SA (2)	31,902.00
	Deposit	06/15/2016	37238	Wheaton Sanitary District	2016-2017 POTW SA (2 YEAR)	52,580.00
Total 47220 - POTW Project Assessments						<u>237,810.00</u>
<b>47230 - Agency Membership Dues</b>						
	Deposit	03/07/2016	66947	Village of Westchester	2016-2017 Agency Membership FIRST YEAR	1,508.00
	Deposit	03/14/2016	170219	Village of Bolingbrook	2015-2016 RegularDues	9,229.00
	Deposit	04/18/2016	230268	Village of Schaumburg	2015-2016 Agency Dues	6,772.00
	Deposit	05/25/2016	63977	City of Northlake	2016-2017 Northlake	1,338.00
	Deposit	05/31/2016	102879	City of Oakbrook Terrace	2016-2017 Agency Dues	823.00
	Deposit	06/01/2016	174949	Village of Bolingbrook	2016-2017 Membership	9,506.00
	Deposit	06/01/2016	301208	Village of Westmont	2016-2017 Membership	1,810.00
	Deposit	06/06/2016	955603	Glenbard Wastewater Authority	2016-2017 Membership Dues	29,449.00
	Deposit	06/07/2016	221363	Village of Glen Ellyn	2016-2017	2,968.00
	Deposit	06/07/2016	11949	Village of Lombard	2016-2017	4,277.00
	Deposit	06/07/2016	202341	Village of Woodridge	2016-2017	2,425.00
	Deposit	06/07/2016	30747	village of Winfield	2016-2017	1,285.00
	Deposit	06/13/2016	37715	Village of Carol Stream	2016-2017 Membership Dues	13,862.00
	Deposit	06/13/2016	805741	City of Wheaton	2016-2017 Membership Dues	4,890.00
	Deposit	06/13/2016	9184	Village of Downers Grove	2016-2017 Membership Dues	6,097.00
	Deposit	06/15/2016	37238	Wheaton Sanitary District	2016-2017 Membership Dues	16,464.00
	Deposit	06/15/2016	149446	Village of Lisle	2016-2017	2,987.00
Total 47230 - Agency Membership Dues						<u>115,690.00</u>
<b>47231 - Associate Membership Dues</b>						
	Deposit	03/01/2016	1146	Sierra Club River Prairie Group	2016-2017 Associate Sierra Club River Prairie	115.00
	Deposit	03/15/2016	685470	HR Green	2015-2016 Membership	112.00
	Deposit	05/31/2016	8959	RHMG Engineers, Inc.	2016-2017 Dues	115.00
	Deposit	05/31/2016	1096	Huff & Huff Incorporated	2016-2017 Dues	115.00
	Deposit	05/31/2016	12076	Walter E Deuchler Associates, Inc	2016-2017 Dues	115.00
	Deposit	05/31/2016	18248	Trotter & Associates, Inc.	2016-2017 Dues	115.00
	Deposit	06/01/2016	10992	Prairie Rivers Network	2016-2017 Membership	115.00
	Deposit	06/01/2016	27306	Inter-Fluve, Inc.	2016-2017 Membership	115.00
	Deposit	06/02/2016	5784	Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.	2016-2017	115.00
	Deposit	06/02/2016	28641	V3 Companies	2016-2017	115.00
	Deposit	06/07/2016	200940	Elmhurst-Chicago Stone Co.	2016-2017	115.00
	Deposit	06/07/2016	173863	The Morton Arboretum	2016-2017	115.00
	Deposit	06/13/2016	1248	Salt Creek Watershed Network	2016-2017 Membership Dues	115.00
	Deposit	06/13/2016	42941	Lisle Township	2016-2017 Membership Dues	115.00
	Deposit	06/13/2016	40506	K-Tech	2016-2017 Membership Dues	115.00
	Deposit	06/15/2016	95822	DuPage County Health Department	2016-2017	115.00
	Deposit	06/15/2016	108462	Naperville Park District	2016-2017	115.00
	Deposit	06/15/2016	1141807	CDM Smith	2016-2017	115.00
Total 47231 - Associate Membership Dues						<u>2,067.00</u>
Total 47200 - Program Income						<u>355,567.00</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>						<u><b>355,567.00</b></u>

DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup	Current	Current	Current	Year to	
Monthly Financial Report - March, April & May, 2016	Month	Month	Month	Date	FY 16-17
May 31, 2016	May	April	March	Actual	Budget
<b>Monthly Budget to Actual Report - FY 16-17</b>					
<b>Revenues and Expenditures</b>					
<b>Workgroup Activities Fund</b>					
<u>Workgroup Revenues</u>					
Agency member dues	\$2,161.00	\$6,772.00	\$10,737.00	\$19,670.00	\$417,900
Associate and individual dues	460.00		227.00	687.00	3,920
Grants				0.00	0
Interest	299.46	329.94	573.37	1,202.77	4,960
<b>Total Workgroup Revenues</b>	<b>\$2,920.46</b>	<b>\$7,101.94</b>	<b>\$11,537.37</b>	<b>\$21,559.77</b>	<b>\$426,780</b>
<u>Workgroup Expenses</u>					
Administration					
Staff salaries	\$10,137.13	\$10,137.13	\$10,137.13	\$30,411.39	\$190,750
Staff salaries - 401 K match	150.83	150.83	150.83	452.49	2,860
Fixed office expenses	922.86	922.86	922.86	2,768.58	11,290
Mileage				0.00	2,650
Travel, parking, tolls, train, hotel, etc.				0.00	450
Cell phone				0.00	1,580
Postage, mailing, etc.				0.00	180
Printing, copying				0.00	50
Supplies, checks, etc				0.00	50
Other				0.00	50
Staff training				0.00	500
Laptop, battery, power cord, etc				0.00	1,800
Insurance		2,060.00		2,060.00	1,950
Audit	6,200.00			6,200.00	7,400
Tax returns				0.00	1,040
Software				0.00	40
Meeting expenses				0.00	460
Memberships				0.00	420
Registration and filing fees				0.00	40
Web site - monthly fee				0.00	390
Web site - consultant				0.00	750
Monitoring					
Dissolved oxygen monitoring program					
Purchase/replace probes				0.00	23,570
Maintain probes		10,556.15		10,556.15	10,560
Maintain handheld probe				0.00	780
Supplies/training				0.00	410
Watershed monitoring program					
Biological & habitat assessment					
WBDR (2015)				0.00	72,580
Salt Creek (2013/2016)	15,614.00			15,614.00	144,250
EBDR (2014)				0.00	10,020
Chemical monitoring					
Salt Creek (2016)				0.00	78,020
Reference site chemistry			(3,348.51)	(3,348.51)	7,700
Supplies				0.00	310
Data management					
Maintain database				0.00	3,000
Database hosting fee				0.00	150
Staff cost (intern or part time)				0.00	2,000
Chloride reduction					
POTW chloride testing		183.96	1,165.08	1,349.04	1,140
Workshops					
Expenses				0.00	5,290
Registration fees				0.00	(5,290)
Project identification from bioassessment work					
Update IPS tool jointly with LDRWC				0.00	55,000
<b>Total Workgroup Expenses</b>	<b>\$33,024.82</b>	<b>\$24,010.93</b>	<b>\$9,027.39</b>	<b>\$66,063.14</b>	<b>\$634,190</b>
<b>Net Workgroup Activities Fund - Revenues Over Expenses</b>	<b>(\$30,104.36)</b>	<b>(\$16,908.99)</b>	<b>\$2,509.98</b>	<b>(\$44,503.37)</b>	<b>(\$207,410)</b>

DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup	Current	Current	Current	Year to	
Monthly Financial Report - March, April & May, 2016	Month	Month	Month	Date	FY 16-17
May 31, 2016	May	April	March	Actual	Budget
<b>Monthly Budget to Actual Report - FY 16-17</b>					
<b>Revenues and Expenditures</b>					
<b>Workgroup NPDES Permit Special Condition Project Fund</b>					
<u>Workgroup Project Fund Revenues</u>					
Agency member project fund assessments			\$28,908.00	\$28,908.00	\$682,430
Project sponsorships/local matches				0.00	0
Total Project Fund Revenues	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$28,908.00	\$28,908.00	\$682,430
<u>Workgroup Project Fund Expenses</u>					
Oak Meadows - dam removal and stream restoration		\$120,000.00	\$380,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$1,000,000
Fullersburg Woods - concept plan				0.00	15,000
Fawell Dam Modification				0.00	65,000
NPS Phosphorus Feasibility Analysis				0.00	20,000
Nutrient Implementation Plan (NIP)				0.00	20,000
Phosphorus trading program for POTWs				0.00	10,000
Chloride reduction program				0.00	
Phase VI contract				0.00	5,410
Publication on chloride reduction				0.00	3,000
Tollway offset program				0.00	7,000
Future initiatives				0.00	5,000
Total Project Fund Expenses	\$0.00	\$120,000.00	\$380,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$1,150,410
Net Workgroup Project Fund - Revenues Over Expenses	\$0.00	(\$120,000.00)	(\$351,092.00)	(\$471,092.00)	(\$467,980)
<b>Workgroup Grant Project Fund (assuming Governor and IEPA approval)</b>					
<u>Workgroup Grant Project Fund Revenues</u>					
IEPA grant				\$0.00	\$900,000
Local matches from project sponsors				0.00	300,000
Total Grant Project Fund Revenues	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,200,000
<u>Workgroup Grant Project Fund Expenses</u>					
IEPA grant projects				\$0.00	\$1,200,000
Total Grant Project Fund Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,200,000
Net Grant Project Fund - Revenues Over Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0
Beginning Fund Balance				\$1,000,906.76	\$1,046,359
Ending Fund Balance				\$485,311.39	\$370,969
<b>Cash and Investments</b>					
Itasca Bank checking account				\$21,120.80	
Evergreen Bank money market account				28,534.14	
EverBank money market account				28,599.60	
Synchrony Bank money market account				147,351.21	
Capital One 360 savings account				54,526.54	
EverBank certificate of deposit				101,746.14	
Synchrony Bank certificate of deposit				103,432.96	
Total				\$485,311.39	

AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DUPAGE RIVER SALT CREEK WORKGROUP AND  
THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into by and between the DUPAGE RIVER SALT CREEK WORKGROUP (DRSCW), an Illinois not-for-profit corporation, and THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION (TCF), an Illinois not-for-profit corporation, concerning the provision of staffing services by TCF to DRSCW as described herein.

WHEREAS, DRSCW and TCF share mutual goals of maintaining and improving water quality in the watersheds of Salt Creek and the East and West Branches of the DuPage River;  
and

WHEREAS, TCF retains professional staff necessary to perform various tasks associated with monitoring and improving water quality in these watersheds; and

WHEREAS, DRSCW and TCF both desire to utilize TCF personnel to provide services for DRSCW projects and activities.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above stated preambles and the mutual covenants and promises hereinafter contained, DRSCW and TCF formally covenant, agree, and bind themselves as follows to with:

1. The term of this agreement shall commence on July 1, 2016 and end on June 30, 2017.

The parties acknowledge that this agreement, subject to any amendment thereto, may be continued in future years, however, such continuation is subject to written approval by both parties.

2. During the term, TCF shall provide technical staff to perform tasks as directed by the DRSCW President or other member of the DRSCW Executive Board. These tasks may include, but are not limited to the following: prepare agendas and minutes and attend all



DRSCW meetings; deposit revenue checks; review invoices and prepare disbursement checks; administer investments; maintain accurate financial records and provide financial reports; manage and direct DRSCW projects and consultants working on DRSCW projects; coordinate and maintain data from DRSCW monitoring programs; apply for and manage grants; prepare an annual budget and five year financial plan for submission to the DRSCW President each year; maintain the DRSCW website; assure timely response to DRSCW dedicated cell phone; conduct correspondence on behalf of DRSCW; subject to the authority of the President, represent DRSCW and respond timely to requests from DRSCW members and Executive Board members. The assignment of individual TCF technical staff to perform DRSCW work shall be subject to DRSCW approval and assigned staff shall maintain their expertise with current developments in the profession.

3. The fee for professional services under this agreement shall be a fixed amount of \$11,522.60 per month, which is calculated as the sum of 100% of the cost of the full time position of Director of Watershed Protection, 60% of the cost of the full time position of Water Resource Assistant and employer expenses. This monthly amount includes salary (\$11,352.32), an employer match on employee contributions to a 401 k plan, to a maximum of 1.5% of direct employee salaries (\$170.28). These amounts may be revised by addendum during the term of this agreement following concurrence by both parties on the hiring of an additional staff person. It is agreed that the Director of Watershed Protection shall provide de minimis services to TCF, not exceeding 40 hours per year. TCF shall provide a monthly summary of hours worked by each employee by task in a format mutually agreed upon by both parties. This fixed amount shall be adjusted, if necessary, on a quarterly basis in the event that the level of service provided is less than stated

above. In addition, if a designated staff position does not contribute the necessary 401 k match, any unused DRSCW employer match will be refunded to the DRSCW on a quarterly basis.

4. The fee for expenses provided to DRSCW under this agreement shall be a fixed amount of \$941.00 per month for generally fixed expenses such as utilities, telephone, copy machine, fax, and other office equipment. TCF shall provide DRSCW with documentation of these fixed expenses upon request.
5. DRSCW shall pay TCF for other expenses related to services provided to DRSCW under this agreement, including but not limited to office supplies, monitoring supplies, cell phones, travel by car at IRS rate per mile, staff services other than those described in Paragraphs 2 and 3, etc. TCF shall submit itemized invoices on a monthly basis for DRSCW review and approval, detailing all such expenses related to work for DRSCW under this agreement,
6. DRSCW agrees to reimburse TCF for said costs in the following manner. DRSCW shall pay to TCF the fixed amounts described in Paragraphs 3 and 4 on the first day of each month for services to be provided during that month. DRSCW shall pay approved expenses described in Paragraph 5 within 30 days of receipt of the invoice.
7. Both parties acknowledge that TCF personnel providing services to DRSCW are not employees of DRSCW.
8. DRSCW shall indemnify and hold TCF harmless from and against any and all liabilities, demands, claims, suits, losses, damages, causes of action, fines or judgments, including costs and attorneys fees, and related expenses that arise out of the actions of DRSCW, and DRSCW assumes all the risk in the operation of its business hereunder and shall be

solely responsible and answerable for any and all payments, accidents or injuries to persons or property arising out of the performance by DRSCW under this Agreement.

9. TCF shall indemnify and hold DRSCW harmless from and against any and all liabilities, demands, claims, suits, losses, damages, causes of action, fines or judgments, including costs and attorneys fees, and related expenses that result from the intentional acts or omissions of TCF.
10. This agreement may be terminated in whole or in part, in writing by either party in the event of substantial failure (“termination by default”) by the other party to fulfill its obligations under this Agreement through no fault of the terminating party, provided that no such termination may be effected unless the other party is given (1) not less than twenty-one (21) calendar days written notice (delivered by certified mail, return receipt requested) of intent to terminate and (2) an opportunity for consultation with the terminating party prior to termination. In addition, DRSCW and TCF reserve the right to terminate this agreement if its respective board of directors determines funding is not available to continue this agreement or that the mission of either organization is not furthered by continuing this affiliation.
11. This document shall be a final embodiment of the Agreement by and between DRSCW and TCF. No oral changes, modifications, or additions to this Agreement shall be permitted or allowed. Changes, modifications, or additions to this Agreement shall be made only in writing and contain the necessary and proper signatures of DRSCW and TCF.

12. Any dispute arising under or in connection with the Agreement or related to any matter which is the subject of the Agreement shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the state and/or federal courts located in DuPage County, State of Illinois.
13. In the event that any provisions of this Agreement shall be held invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not invalidate or render unenforceable any other provisions hereto.
14. This agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefits of the parties hereto, their successors and assigns.

Dated in Naperville, Illinois, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
President

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

Dated in Lombard, Illinois, this 22nd day of June, 2016.

DUPAGE RIVER SALT CREEK WORKGROUP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
President

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary