

South Fork Kent Creek Watershed Stakeholder Planning Meeting #5

Meeting Minutes

January 30, 2020

6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Webbs Norman Center, Boardroom

South Main Street, Rockford, IL.

Agenda

1. Pollutant Reduction Targets
2. Objectives
3. Best Management Practices Review
4. 2020 meeting dates
5. Basin ID
6. Adjourn

Attending

Roger Peters, Matt Martin, Christopher Baer, Ann Marie Cain, Dennis Anthony, Dick Rundall, Lou Ann Johnson, Shane Anderson, Dave and JoAnn Navinski, Larry McFall, Allen Mills, Sean Von Bergen, Tom Lind (RPD), Rebecca Olson (OES), and Alyssa Robinson (OES)

Minutes

1. Tom Lind started off the meeting with an introduction.
2. We went around the room with each person introducing themselves and stating concerns, why they came, and/or what they hope to get out of this meeting. Some concerns mentioned during introductions include:
 - a. Drainage in woods, parker woods
 - b. Tasked by EPA to form watershed group for Rock River
3. Alyssa and Rebecca discussed pollutant load reduction targets for nitrogen, phosphorus, total suspended solids, and bacteria. They gave estimates that they thought were feasible for reducing pollutant loading into the stream in a 5-year timeframe: nitrogen reduction target of 7.5%, phosphorus reduction target of 12.5%, total suspended solids (TSS) reduction target of 13-15%, and a bacteria reduction target of 32.5%. These targets are not set, but rather a starting point for us. Nitrogen and phosphorus reduction targets are based off the Illinois Nutrient Loss Reduction Strategy. TSS reduction target is based off the phosphorus reduction target. For each BMP implemented that reduces phosphorus, it also reduces TSS since phosphorous is in TSS. The bacteria reduction target was calculated by considering how much fecal coliform would need to be reduced in order to get it off the IEPA impaired list. Fecal coliform would need to be reduced by 65%. Since this target seemed too lofty, we proposed cutting 65% in half to represent a 5-year reduction target

of 32.5%. Each target is based on a 5-year timespan; however, if stakeholders desire to create a different timeframe for the plan we can alter the targets to reflect that.

4. Next, we talked about how to create specific, action-oriented objectives for each of the 8 goals for South Fork Kent Creek Watershed. Objectives answers the question of how we tangibly accomplish each goal in a designated timeframe. These objectives will answer what BMPs can and should be implemented, where should they be applied, and how much area will each BMP cover?
5. We reviewed best management practices (or BMPs) that can be implemented by stakeholders in residential and agricultural areas to reach our goals and reduction targets.
6. Stakeholders and technical advisors shared which BMPs and objectives seemed the most interesting or effective. These will be given highest priority:
 - a. Grassed waterways
 - i. Implement grassed waterways on 5% of the areas that have potential for grassed waterways (see map).
 - ii. Improve or widen ____% of ineffective grassed waterways.
 - b. Forest in 100-yr floodplain
 - i. Forest is the highest land use type located within the 100-year floodzone. Addressing erosion and invasive brush invasion in forest, particularly riparian zones in forests, is of interest.
 - c. Septic System Maintenance Education
 - i. A resident who lives in an area serviced by septic acknowledged that they have never seen a truck cleaning out any septic fields. “Every 2-3 years they should be emptied, but no one does it.”
 - ii. Recommendation: Subdivisions on septic could elect to hook up to the sewer line, which is already in place.
 - d. Wetland restoration/creation
 - i. Wetlands seemed like a good BMP for SFKC, since a large issue is the seemingly increased volume and velocity of water in the watershed. BMPs that store, detain, and filter water will be a great tool for SFKC Watershed, especially when these detention areas are higher up in the watershed.
 - ii. Some concerns that came up with wetlands: will they actually store water and reduce flooding? Will they attract mosquitoes? If designed correctly with the right depths, water table consideration, and proper vegetation then wetlands will store water effectively and not attract mosquitoes.
 - iii. Possible locations for wetlands:
 1. Meridian & State St? did this area used to be a wetland?
 2. South of Bypass 20 near Parker woods. At this location, there is mowed grass, but it can't always be mowed because it is wet a lot.
 3. 20-30 acre area at NW corner of Cunningham and Weldon.
 - e. Stream buffs and bank stabilization
 - f. Vegetated Swales along roadways to help reduce flooding and filter the water along roadways and culverts.
 - i. If we use native plants for these roadway swales, there is potential to apply for ComEd Green Region funding since their funding is for \$10,000 projects focusing on creating pollinator habitat.
 - ii. Parker woods roadway

- g. Parker Woods has a voluntary Association. Can this group find funding for tile failure that is contributing to pollutant loading? Stakeholders have asked that we write this need for funding in the plan.
 - h. All types of detention basins: Sean Von Bergen acknowledged that although this BMP would be a good tool for this watershed, it is possible that wherever a detention basin makes sense to be located, there might already be one. If that is the case, one possibility is to ensure that existing detention basins are working as they were intended to.
 - i. Fix broken drain tiles
 - j. Critical planting area in frequently flooded areas
 - k. Low/Medium Priority BMPs?
 - i. Natural Area Conversion—much harder to implement because more land is needed and the footprint to retrieve the same pollutant reduction as other BMPs is generally larger for natural areas conversion when compared to other BMPs.
 - ii. Porous pavement—this is a great tool when implemented; however, it has limitations, including higher costs and limited in where it should be implemented, and people may not be interested in utilizing this tool.
 - iii. Remeander stream: this is a tough one because it requires a lot of land and can be costly. However, certain areas where this might be possible are where a public entity, like the Village of Winnebago, City of Rockford, Rockford Park District, etc., own are larger undeveloped parcel or municipal ROW.
7. Potential funding sources beyond the Illinois EPA
- a. R1PC created a local list, and Allen will share this.
 - b. Illinois Farm Bureau—agricultural producers and for septic system maintenance?
 - c. ComEd Green Region—pollinator habitat
 - d. Soil and Water Conservation District
8. For the next stakeholder meeting, participants recommended that we
- a. fill in the objectives and allow the stakeholders to react and provide feedback.
 - i. Who pays for it?
 - ii. How much does it cost?
 - iii. How many landowners would be involved? How many large landowners?
 - iv. How do we actually implement these BMPs?
 - v. Comparison of pollutant reduction efficiencies and sizing between BMPs on the same size drainage area (e.g. 100 acre)
 - vi. Where is there enough space to remeander stream?
 - vii. Where is the creek on public land where permission might be easier?
 - b. Prioritize wetlands over detention areas

Additional Information:

- Recommendation for septic systems: Subdivisions on septic could elect to hook up to the sewer line, which is already in place. Enact requirements for maintenance. Inform the homeowners of fecal coliform impairment in the creek

- More details on potential wetland creation site at NW corner of Cunningham and Weldon: Landowner seems interested in this potential project. Some things to consider for this project are cost, the necessity of excavation, sanitary district line and ROW (33ft from centerline, 66 ft total). The Highway Township just pulled 3 beaver dams out of the creek just south of this proposed wetland area. This constructed wetland could be separate from the stream or connected. County engineer recommended having a berm around the wetland to have additional holding capacity.
- More info on detention basins: Other potential locations that might have room for more detention basins would be the headwaters and the Village of Winnebago. Regular detention basins are sized to 100-year storms. WC-SWMO's release rate for detention is 0.2 cfs/acre. For detention purposes Winnebago County Highway Township uses Type II, 25-hr, 100-Year Rainfall for Winnebago County (typically 7.36" is used, but if you're interpolating off a rainfall map it could vary from high 6's to low 7's depending on where the site is in Winnebago County).
- For Illinois EPA funding match hours, stakeholders brainstormed where we could potentially retrieve volunteer hours. Groups who may be capable of providing volunteer hours include Boy Scouts #705, who are sponsored by First Presbyterian Church and the local high schools, which are Winnebago High School and Boylan High School.