

**NORTH MILL CREEK/DUTCH GAP CANAL  
WATERSHED PLANNING MEETING  
JANUARY 26, 6:00 TO 8:00 PM**

---

This meeting summary and all meeting materials (including all presentations) can be found at [www.lakecountyil.gov/Stormwater/LakeCountyWatersheds/NorthMill.htm](http://www.lakecountyil.gov/Stormwater/LakeCountyWatersheds/NorthMill.htm)

**1. *Introductions & Announcements***

Meeting participants introduced themselves. A list of attendees is included with this meeting report. There were no announcements.

**2. *Review and accept December 8th meeting summary***

Minutes were accepted by consensus

**3. *Flood Risk and Flood Problem Areas – Jodi McCarthy Lake County Stormwater***

Jodi discussed that during the development of the issues and opportunities at the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders expressed concerns about flooding and flood damage in the watershed. The developing watershed plan can help to address these concerns through identifying the issues and providing recommendations for actions that can help reduce flood damage.

Jodi reviewed the basic concepts of a floodplain and potential flood risk statistics. Floodplain studies and mapping help to designate the areas of flood storage so that, new construction can be located away from the flood risk areas, areas of existing flooding can be identified and potentially remedied, conveyance and storage can be preserved, and new flood mitigation areas can be evaluated. Currently Kenosha County has an updated floodplain study for Dutch Gap Canal that has been sent to FEMA for review and approval. Approval by FEMA and adoption by the County is expected in Fall 2011. Although the new floodplain maps are not yet reflected on the regulatory Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) maps, the County has adopted the maps into their zoning ordinance and has been using the updated information to guide their development since 2003. North Mill Creek in the Lake County portion of the watershed has not had an updated floodplain study since the original studies were conducted around 1980.

In the Des Plaines Watershed there is a phased study being generated that has been a cooperative effort between federal, state, regional, and local agencies. Phase I of the study focused on reduction of flood damage along the mainstem of the Des Plaines River. Potential flood storage reservoirs and flood walls were considered at flood damage locations along the river. Phase II of the study is currently being compiled and focuses on continuing the reduction of flooding on the mainstem by looking at flood storage in tributary watersheds, and environmental restoration – primarily wetland restoration. A potential dam modification at Rasmussen Lake was identified in Phase I. Since Phase I was completed the Forest Preserve has conducted a more detailed assessment of the dam modification alternative and determined that it would not provide the expected flood storage benefit. Five sites were evaluated as potential flood storage locations in the North Mill Creek/Dutch Gap Watershed for the Phase II study, but were determined to not be effective at reducing flood damage

along the mainstem Des Plaines and were eliminated. Four of these sites (2 in each state) are still being explored as potential ecosystem restoration sites.

As a part of the Lake County All Hazards Mitigation Plan, various types of flooding have been defined. SMC has taken the information from this broader report and applied it to the local level by identifying and mapping Flood Problem Areas, which are areas that experience flood damage to buildings or infrastructure, or threats to health and safety such as septic or well failure. For the development of this watershed plan, SMC has been in contact with the stakeholders and municipalities to update the flooding information. SMC was also able to gather information from speaking to representatives from Kenosha County, the Southeastern Wisconsin regional Planning Commission, and the Village of Bristol. Anecdotal information from the community and flood problem area surveys was used to update the flood problem areas inventory for the watershed.

Following the report on flood damage conditions in the watershed, stakeholders were divided into groups and asked to mark up the flood problem area maps with any additional information they may have about flooding in the watershed. These modifications will be incorporated into the watershed assessment and plan report. A copy of this map can be found at SMC's website at [www.lakecountyil.gov/Stormwater/LakeCountyWatersheds/NorthMill.htm](http://www.lakecountyil.gov/Stormwater/LakeCountyWatersheds/NorthMill.htm) if there are any further comments from stakeholders. A copy of the presentation can also be found at this location.

#### **4. Development of Green Infrastructure Prioritization**

The stakeholders reviewed the green infrastructure network prioritization criteria that SMC had gathered additional information / generated maps for. The criteria were all agreed upon except for #17 where the median parcel size was less than ½ acre. It was decided that the median parcel size will not be an effective prioritization criteria and SMC agreed to generate additional review maps with different parcel sizes to present to the group at the next meeting. A summary of the prioritization criteria results are in the table below.

Draft Version: Incorporated changes from stakeholder comments. Items that required SMC follow up have information on findings in italics for stakeholder consideration at next meeting.

Criteria	Flood Prevention & Reduction	Natural Resources Protection & Enhancement	Water Quality Improvement	Stream or Streambank Restoration/ Preservation
1. Parcels that intersect 100-year floodplain	X			X
2. Parcels within 0.5-miles of the headwaters	X	X	X	
3. Parcels that intersect with a wetland	X	X	X	
4. Parcels that are adjacent to or include at least 10 acres of drained hydric soils	X	X	X	
5. Parcels in an Subwatershed Management Unit where less than 10% of the SMU is existing wetland	X		X	
6. Parcels within 0.5-mile radius of Lake County Stormwater Management Committee known flood problem area	X			
7. Parcels that are within 300 feet of a watercourse or lake	X	X	X	X
8. Parcels that intersect with developed areas-that do not have stormwater management facilities	X			
9. Parcels intersecting with SMU's that are non-point source pollutant hotspots			X	
10. Parcels adjacent to or including forest preserves, land trusts, township, and privately and publicly protected open space.		X		
11. Parcels adjacent to or including high quality wetlands (ADID)		X	X	
12. Parcels adjacent to or including Illinois Natural Areas Inventory sites, nature preserves, high quality natural areas and Wisconsin Natural Heritage Inventory sites.		X		
13. Parcels adjacent to or including Threatened & Endangered species sites		X		
14. Parcels intersecting with or adjacent to a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permitted point source discharge location			X	
15. Parcels with prime agricultural soils		X		
16. Parcels with highly erodible soils			X	X
17. Parcels greater than 5 acres – <i>SMC to present maps with different parcel sizes and present at next meeting</i>	X	X	X	
18. Parcels traversed by, adjacent to, or within 0.25 mi. of a mapped greenway or trail.		X		
19. Parcels that connect existing protected open space areas.		X		
20. Parcels that contain a depression area.	X			
21. Parcels intersecting with an archaeological site.				

**5. Development of Plan Objectives for Goals #3 and #7**

The stakeholders were broken into two groups to identify the specific flooding and sustainable agriculture and farmland preservation issues to be addressed by the watershed plan objectives. The group input is listed below.

Note: These issue statements will be used to formulate the language of the plan objectives and will be presented as draft objectives for review. The groups did not have time to complete the issue statements related to sustainable farming, so these will be completed at a future meeting.

**Goal #3**

Prevent flood damage from worsening in the watershed and reduce existing flood damage to structures, infrastructure and the increasing crop loss due to flooding.

Group 1

**Issues to be addressed by Objectives**

**Indicators**

Dredging channel . . . . .	Less crop flooding
Control beaver. . . . .	No beaver dams
Create Flood storage. . . . .	Number of acre-feet new live storage
Buffer strips on erodible ground. . . . .	Measured area
Maintain lower base level in creek. . . . .	Creek level
Investigate and redesign road structures that are causing flooding. . . . .	Reducing location of intersection and road flooding
Infiltrate precipitation where possible. . . . .	Number of green infrastructure projects
No building in 100 year floodplain in Illinois	
Ordinances for sump pump discharges and downspouts	

Group 2

**Issues to be addressed by Objectives**

**Indicators**

Implement BMP's to increase infiltration and reduce runoff volumes . . . . .

Number of BMP's implemented, volume of runoff infiltrated

Maintenance of existing drainage ways (vegetation) and infrastructure. . . . .

Reporting by maintenance entity of LF or amount of debris removed

More specific maintenance / easement requirements for new developments

Public Education on Flooding. . . . .

Number of flyers, number of interactions with public, number of hits on website

Research and identify stormwater conveyance routes. . . . .

Number of channels / routes (topography)

Enforce regulatory requirements / ordinances. . . . .

Number of contacts, number of enforcement actions

Protect openland and storage areas. . . . .

Number of acres of forest preserve protected, track number of acres lost

**Goal #7**

*Encourage watershed stakeholder participation in farmland preservation programs and implementation of sustainable agricultural practices that meet the watershed goals.*

**Issues to be addressed by Objectives**

Partner with existing farmland protection groups to provide knowledge and develop the group

Identify funding sources and existing agencies (resources)

Education to general public about importance of farming

Create more community gardens

### January 26, 2010 Meeting Attendees

Last Name	First Name	Company
Anderson	James L.	Lake County Forest Preserve Dist.
Burt	Randy	NeuHaven HOA Beautification Committee
Dicke	Faith M.	East Shore Crooked Lake
Doolittle	Thomas	Grubb School Drainage Dist.
Elfering	Dale	Elfering Farms
Elfering	Noel	Village of Bristol
Hall	Susan	Lake County Forest Preserve
McCarthy	Jodi	Lake County Stormwater Mgmt.
Paap	Kathy	Lake County Health Department
Prusila	Michael E.	Lake County Stormwater Mgmt.
Renwick	Jim	Renwick Nursery
Warren	Joe	Lindenhurst Lakes Commission
Welsh	Wesley	Village of Lindenhurst
Werner	Patricia	Lake County Stormwater Mgmt.
Yamin	Yamin	James Anderson Company