

Lake County Wetland Restoration Preservation Plan - Comment Response Summary

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Draft Report Section/Page or Online Tool	Response
1	Letter of Support for WRAPP (copy in file)	Friends of the Chicago River (Margaret Frisbie)	NA	We are encouraged to hear that the Decision Support Tool will be very useful for future work to strengthen resiliency, protect valuable open space, and reduce flooding in the region.
2	I'm an undergrad at DePaul university and an avid supporter of strengthening our environmental infrastructures. I would love for there to be wetland restoration along the North Branch of the Chicago River, and hope that trails and walking areas for people will be included in the plans. Wetlands not only provide flood control and water treatment, but also are a valuable habitat for wildlife. Finding ways to share wetland appreciation with the community is important in a time when people need to care about the environment. Whether this appears as a nature center or a summer camp or a group of weekly birdwatching trips, I'd like for the restoration program to make it easy to foster love for our land.	Rachel Black, DePaul University - Idea Realization Lab Manager	Report pp. 59-60	The main goal of the plan is to encourage wetland restoration throughout Lake County, including within the North Branch of the Chicago River (NBCR) watershed as you referenced. The GIS analysis in the WRAPP identified 1,911 acres of potentially restorable wetlands (PRWs) in the NBCR watershed, comprising 5.1 to 6.6% of the overall watershed area, so there are definitely opportunities for restoration throughout the watershed. We agree that educating the public (" <i>share wetland appreciation with the community</i> ") is very important and hope that many proposed restoration projects will include access to restored areas by walking paths, observation decks, etc. and information signage to explain the important functions wetlands perform, such as flood control water quality treatment and wildlife habitat as you mentioned.
3	I am writing to share comments on wetland #3588 for the WRAPP Decision Support Tool draft (and include Dr. Maine since I have written before about concerns about the protection of this resource). As a resident of 18 years and a local BCN bird monitor, I hope I can provide some useful input. Concern#1 - Two Wetlands, One ADID Yopp Slough: Both wetlands #3588 and #4426 are of interest to me because we live on a property containing a portion of #3588, and the two wetlands are part of one body known as Yopp Slough. My first concern with the WRAPP tool draft is that the northern (#3588) and southern (#4426) parts of Yopp Slough are being treated as two distinct wetlands rather than one. The entire marsh is an ADID high quality resource, which has great value as a combined entity. In addition, #3588 has been subject to some major misuse (unpermitted but dismissed after the fact) and could conceivably be threatened with attempts to damagingly alter it again in the future. I would hate to see #3588 be made more vulnerable to unfavorable decisions or less likely to benefit from conservation efforts, which would impact #4426 as well, due to the two wetlands being viewed as smaller individual pieces of less importance.	Cheryl Van Duyse	Online Tool	The division of the wetland complex is an artefact of the mapping and classification process, which follows a methodology devised by the US Fish & Wildlife Service and is common throughout the countywide mapping layers (many other wetland complexes are divided into multiple polygons). In this case, there appear to be two landform (geomorphic) basins comprising the subject area, and they are therefore divided into two polygons. Both polygons are rated as having "high" functional significance as Unique Wetland Resources based on the ADID classification.
3 (cont'd)	Concern #2 - Ratings of Functions for #3588 I am also concerned that the ratings for two of the wildlife related functions of #3588 seem inaccurate in the tool. While the two wetlands of Yopp Slough contain much similar habitat and wildlife diversity, #4426 is rated High in Wetland-Dependent Bird Habitat, Other and Wildlife Movement Corridors, but #3588 is rated as Low. I would like to offer some evidence in support of High ratings for both of these functions for #3588. 2a - Wetland-Dependent Bird Habitat, Other According to the WRAPP tool draft, a wetland that rates High in the function of Wetland-Dependent Bird Habitat, Other consists of "seasonally, intermittently or semi-permanently flooded, or intermittently exposed/ flooded or continuously saturated emergent and scrub-shrub wetlands (excluding farmed wetlands)" that provide "desired habitat for a variety of wading birds, shorebirds and songbirds (e.g., herons, bitterns, plovers, sandpipers, red-winged and yellow-headed blackbirds)" for "a wide diversity of bird species that nest, feed and reproduce in these wetland types." In support of a High rating for the function of Wetland-Dependent Bird Habitat, Other, I would like to start by sharing the original ADID report. Yopp Slough is site #21 on page 22. This document states that Yopp Slough was a cycling marsh with high quality wildlife habitat and that the north end (#3588) provided good wildlife habitat in the form of hemi-marsh. Species noted were Green-backed Heron, American Goldfinch, Eastern Kingbird, and Gray Catbird, but as I will show, I have observed many more that are wetland-dependent, including some that are threatened and endangered. This habitat should qualify as High in function. ADID Report Link: http://maps.lakecountyl.gov/output/reports/adid_sds.pdf Please see also a summary of observations I have recorded in eBird under #3588.	Cheryl Van Duyse	Online Tool	SMC A2. Without going into great detail on, or defense of, the process we used for the countywide mapping of predicted wetland functions for the more than 20,000 polygons, we would simply state that there are bound to be questionable estimates of functional significance that arise. In this case, we concur with your comments, and there appears to be justification to revise the ratings. We'd caution, however, that function-by-function review of each polygon based on additional data submission or field review is not practical or possible for a project with mapping at this scale.
4	Conclusion: I hope you will consider the concerns and input I am sharing. While I realize it may be necessary to identify #3588 and #4426 separately for reasons having to do with functions other than those involving habitat and wildlife, I hope you will at least reconsider the ratings of the two functions of Wetland-Dependent Bird Habitat, Other and Wildlife Movement Corridors for #3588, as I believe I have demonstrated there is plenty of evidence that these ratings should be High. Please let me know if I can provide any further information. I would invite you to come out and see in person if you have any doubts as to what I am describing. If it is possible, I would greatly appreciate hearing back from you to know whether these comments have been helpful. Thank you for this opportunity to share.	Cheryl Van Duyse	Online Tool	The "Wetland-Dependent Bird Habitat, Other" and "Wildlife Movement Corridors" functional ratings for Wetland #3588 have been adjusted based on the information provided and the rating criteria.

Lake County Wetland Restoration Preservation Plan - Comment Response Summary

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Draft Report Section/Page or Online Tool	Response
5	With changing climatic conditions, is it possible there will be more wetlands due to increased rainfall amounts?	Grant Benjamin	General	There is a possibility that some marginally wet areas on the landscape may trend to wetlands. More likely is existing wetlands may expand as outer edges become wetter and hydric soil conditions form. Some current "farmed wetlands" with limited subsurface drainage also may become more difficult to farm in most years under wetter conditions and may revert to natural wetlands.
6	It isn't clear where the 48 field study sites are located - dots on Figure 7 show very general locations.	Grant Benjamin	Report p. 30	Figure 7 in the report was designed as a quick visual representation of the field study site locations to show their randomization across the county's four major watersheds. The exact locations of the field study sites (as recorded by GPS) are included in the online mapping tool. If you click on the Information Layers icon in the tool and then click on the WRAPP Field Study Sites, the sites show up in gold dots on the map. You can then zoom in to any of the dots to see their exact location and also view a summary sheet that includes a photograph and list of the wetland functional ratings at each study site.
7	Thank you to SMC and the team for preparing this valuable plan. Do you need letters of support for the plan to help its' adoption by Commission and County Board?	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	General	Thank you for acknowledging our efforts. We certainly welcome letters of support and appreciate the partnership of organizations like Openlands.
8	I live across the street from the Middlefork Branch of the Chicago River, and there are recurring flooding problems in the area. How will the WRAPP help with regional planning and flood abatement?	Amy Kahl, Deerfield Resident	General	The WRAPP can be a valuable tool to help communities, park districts, watershed groups and other organizations in their planning efforts to identify and prioritize existing wetland areas within the watershed to be protected for flood water storage function, as well as PRWs rated High for this function. Also, the development community can use the WRAPP to identify potential wetland mitigation sites needed to compensate for wetland impacts in the watershed. This would help maintain no-net-loss of wetland acreage in the watershed and provide valuable flood water storage and other beneficial wetland functions.
9	Did you work directly with the Army Corps on this plan?	Amy Kahl, Deerfield Resident	General	Not directly. Mike Murphy (ret.) of the Army Corps was a TAG member and provided valuable input on the functional assessment criteria based on his background in the biological sciences. He also joined us on a few of the field study site reviews.
10	Is there an interplay between the WRAPP and the currently proposed WDO wetland amendments?	Susan Pribyl, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	General	No; most of the currently proposed WDO amendments are clarifications and updates to new wetland reference materials. The WRAPP is a planning tool not a regulatory tool, and no additional or more stringent wetland regulations are imposed by the WRAPP.
11	From cover letter: As you finalize the WRAPP, we ask that you consider several key themes: a) the role private property owners, citizens, elected officials and other decision-makers can play in achieving the Plan's goals, and language that may improve engagement, b) characterization of open space c) presentation of functional losses and gains, d) identification of wetland areas, functions, and major groups of organisms not included, and e) identification of gaps in information to be included at a future time when resources allow. Details are in the 'Sticky Notes' placed in the right-hand margins of the attached copy of the draft Technical Report, beginning on Page v. We are happy to review these with you if you desire.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report - various comments, suggestions, proposed edits	A) The goal of the WRAPP is to provide a decision support tool to a wide audience of potential end-users, and the main interface is the online mapping tool. The report provides the technical background for that tool. B) Regarding the characterization of open space, please see responses to Comments 43 and 46. C) Tables and narrative sections regarding functional loss and gain have been edited in the report. Additional information is available in Volume 2 (Appendices) - Appendix D. D) The WRAPP attempted to identify all existing and potentially restorable wetland resources that are reliably detectable at the mapping scale used. Presumably some existing and potentially restorable wetlands were not identified; however, because they are not detectable at the scale used, their locations are impossible to determine. Other items are discussed in Section 1.4 and in Chapter 8. E) These are discussed in Section 1.4 and in Chapter 8.
12	Since the "goal of the plan is to provide a wide audience of end-users with the decision-making support to help prioritize wetland restoration and preservation efforts using an on-line decision support tool (DST)," we recommend you improve readability by eliminating at least 50% of the document's acronyms, replacing them with the actual terms they represent. Whenever possible, include jargon explanations in body of document.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. v	We shortened the list extensively by removing 21 less-used acronyms and replacing them with text in report to improve readability.
13	Given the content and target audience, it seems this document might be used more often if it's titled "Users Guide and Technical Report" or similar. Elected officials, laypersons, planners and others might be more inclined then to use this valuable resource rather than jump immediately to the map tool.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.1	We modified the title to "Technical Report and User Guide" on the report cover, summary page, and title page.
14	Perhaps encourage laypersons to reach out for help in understanding and using these potentially daunting resources, indicating that both government and private-sector experts can provide support.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.1	We added a sentence indicating that landowners interested in implementing such practices can avail themselves of public- and private-sector expertise.
15	Delete 'growing' in "...needs of growing communities..."	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.2	The text was revised as suggested.
16	Left column. "...of ecosystem integrity, which in turn supports community and economic resilience."	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.2	The text now states "...of ecosystem integrity, which supports community and economic resilience."

Lake County Wetland Restoration Preservation Plan - Comment Response Summary

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Draft Report Section/Page or Online Tool	Response
17	... Community officials seeking to reduce flood risk by restoring wetlands that can benefit flood-prone areas of their community. ...Homeowner associations and other community citizen groups seeking to protect or improve neighborhood assets ... ecologists striving to restore critical wetland habitat for an important, rare, threatened or endangered species. ...Private landowners desiring to support natural resources, stormwater management, and other land-based conservation values, including those landowners whose management practices and/or development restrictions may qualify them for financial benefits made available through local, state, federal or private incentive programs.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.2	A) Text revised to "...reduce flood risk by restoring wetlands to benefit flood-prone areas of their community." B) Bullet added for "Homeowner associations and other citizen groups seeking to protect or improve neighborhood wetland resources." C) Text revised to "...ecologists striving to critical wetland habitat for important rare, threatened or endangered species." D) Text revised to "...Private landowners desiring to protect natural resources, stormwater management, or other conservation values, or potentially realize a financial benefit by legally dedicating high priority wetland restoration-preservation sites on their property in perpetuity under a conservation easement.
18	Add to list: Community Citizen Groups	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.2	Community Citizen Groups were added to the graphic.
19	Left column. Remote sensing is the use of <insert method used> to effectively <insert primary benefit of this method>. Any mapping effort...	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.3	Text was revised to: "Any mapping effort relying on secondary data sources (including aerial photography and LiDAR), as this was,..."
20	Perhaps there is a good place in this document to identify potentially relevant resources that have become available but that were not used in this project, e.g., Illinois State Geological Survey's surficial geology maps of 2015, and the advanced clarity of the 2018 aeriels.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.8	The following sentence was added to Section 1.4 (paragraph 2): "Additionally, new sources of data have become available that were not used for this project, including geological and hydrological map products as well as more recent aerial photography. These can be consulted by users as further resources."
21	It seems wetlands in this document fall into just two categories: existing or potentially restorable. Perhaps we missed the section that discusses the restoration of existing wetlands.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.9	Section 1.1 was modified to include a definition of "Enhancement," which relates to potential actions in existing wetlands to provide or improve functionality.
22	Regarding "...primarily derive from wind and pressure change..." what about precipitation and evaporation rates, along with other temperature impacts?	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 14	We agree there are various factors contribute to the water level flucuations of Lake Michigan; however, the reference to the wind and pressure change factors was taken directly from the Tetra Tech report to support that Lake Michigan was considered non-tidal for functional assessment purposes in the WRAPP (tidal vs.non-tidal criteria).
22	1. Recommend incorporating the concepts of services and values. 2. Also recommend incorporating the point that some wetlands bring additional functions or benefits to a landscape which are not quantified nor addressed here but which can nonetheless be of significant importance in land-use planning. These include economic, aesthetic, social/psychological, and recreational functions. Additional hydrological and biological functions not quantified nor addressed here (so far as we saw) are groundwater recharge, movement corridors for plant species, and temperature moderation.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 17	1. "Services" is referenced 13 times in the text and for the purposes of the WRAPP is synonymous with "Functions" provided by wetlands and water bodies. As stated in the text, "The human value of the wetland function and the ecological services that it provides is determined by the goals of regulators and watershed planners." For clarity, there are five instances in the text where we have replaced the term "value" with a number or with the term "significance" if referring to a functional rating. 2. We concur that there are additional functions that could be assessed and aid in land-use planning, including the examples noted as well as those referenced in Sections 4.4 and 8.1 of the text. The 13 functions included in the WRAPP were identified by the TAG as priorities for the WRAPP.
23	Left column. Change sentence "The user must..." to better reflect that the services to be provided by most wetlands will not (and should not) be determined by one lone individual nor for one single project undertaken at a moment in time, with the nudge for readers to work collaboratively and with a long time horizon in mind.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 18	Text revised: End-users should collaborate to determine which ecological services are most important, based on project-specific goals and consideration of long-term benefits to the watershed.
24	Left column. Change "slowing climate change" to "buffering against climate change" or "mitigating for climate change"	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 19	The text in Section 4.4.1 for Carbon Sequestration now states "buffering against climate change."
25	...and the deep organic soils at Volo Bog...(I don't think you mean to suggest Volo Bog's functional strength is in a forested wetland.)	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 19	The text of Section 4.4.1 on Carbon Sequestration has been revised: "Volo Bog and the forested wetland at DP-06 (see Appendix B.3) are examples of wetlands in Lake County with high carbon sequestration function."
26	...have moderate functionality for carbon sequestration...	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 19	Section 4.4.1 text on ditched and drained wetlands now includes the additional wording "...for carbon sequestration."
27	Left column. Regarding: "...include those that intersect the U.S. Geological Survey's flood of record,...FEMA floodplain..." perhaps find a way to acknowledge that the trajectories for both stormwater event intensity and land use conversion to impermeable surfaces are increasing, with changing conditions and this data represents a point in time.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 20	Text was added in two sections: 1. Section 1.3 - Changes also could have occurred...Examples include land use changes (e.g., conversion of agricultural land to developed areas with impermeable surfaces) and updated flood hazard mapping based on increased frequency and intensity of precipitation events (Angel and Markus 2020). 2. Section 7.C.- This is particularly important in light of the increases in frequency and intensity of precipitation events (Angel and Markus 2020) and impermeable surfaces created by urbanization throughout the county, leading to more stormwater runoff and higher flood risk.
28	Recommend explaining reason for the focus on fish rather than mussels or other aquatic invertebrates. If due to a gap in mapped data, it would be good to identify that gap. If fish provide a more useful data set for decision making, explain why that is.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 20	The narrative in Section 4.4.3 for Native Fish Habitat was modified to indicate that the shellfish function primarily relates to estuarine and tidal wetlands (of which none occur in Lake County) and because data suitable for performing a countywide assessment of functional significance for aquatic macroinvertebrates (including mussels) in Lake County is lacking.
29	Mention impact of more intense stormwater events on the scouring of streams and streambanks and the flushing out of aquatic organisms.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 20	Noted. See response to Comment 27. This does not affect the functional significance criteria for Native Fish Habitat. No change was made to the Section 4.4.3. text.
30	Delete 'column' in first sentence since some wetlands are 'merely' saturated, with no true column.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 21	The requested edit was made to Section 4.4.4 Nutrient Transformation (Phosphorus focus).

Lake County Wetland Restoration Preservation Plan - Comment Response Summary

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Draft Report Section/Page or Online Tool	Response
31	This is good, but we wonder if the term 'forested' is too limiting. It might be helpful to include a comment about the value of isolated trees and narrow bands of trees along streams so readers aren't misled into thinking a full-sized 'forest' is needed for trees to be of value.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 24	No change; "Forested" is a defined class in the National Wetland Inventory and WRAPP database and most appropriate for analysis of the Stream Shading function in this product. The value of trees to stream shading, in general, is not included in this discussion of the functional significance criteria but is implicit.
32	Ravine drainages are mentioned only in relation to whether or not they feature hillside seeps. It seems they might qualify as unique wetland resources in and of themselves.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.25	No change made because the TAG did not have consensus that ravines should be included in this category except as associated with seeps.
33	Add fens and ravines to list.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p.25	The WRAPP does not include fens as a classification type that could be mapped on a countywide scale for this plan. However, text has been revised to "Hillside seeps/fens..." The Technical Advisory Group did not identify ravines as unique wetland resource; as such ravines have not been added. See also the response to Comment 32.
34	Left column, first sentence: No previous studies reviewed for this effort addressed this ...	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 27	The sentence, found under Section 4.4.12, was revised to: "No prior studies reviewed for this effort addressed wildlife movement corridors."
35	Left column, second sentence, recommend adding reptiles and amphibians.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 27	The Section 4.4.12 narrative was revised to include reptiles and amphibians.
36	Perhaps Liberty Prairie Reserve could serve as a better example than Middlefork Savanna, simply as an opportunity to demonstrate that public and private land protection and stewardship can yield significant functions on a landscape scale.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 27	The Middlefork Savanna reference in Section 4.4.12 is provided as a location that was visited and verified by the project team during the field component of the WRAPP (see the corresponding field summary sheet in Appendix B.3). Liberty Prairie Reserve was used in Section 6.2 as a wetland restoration example.
37	What is basis for 30 foot metric? This issue is highly relevant as it impacts road projects.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 27	Roads are widely considered 'breaks' in environmental corridors. Based on a road profile with two 12-foot traffic lanes and two 3-foot shoulders--as confirmed via GIS analysis--30 feet appeared to be a reasonable width for roads, and thus 'breaks' in connectivity in Lake County.
38	A) This seems to be the only function that does not occur WITHIN a wetland, concerning itself instead with the features of upland non-wetland acres, but only in relation to movement of animals. Perhaps include nod to plant movement (seed dispersal, pollination). Anticipate possible challenges to this function by those who might feel this WRAPP should be limited to wetland acres. B) On related note, not sure you can comfortably exclude all 'manicured' areas and ag fields. Both will frequently support this function. Recommend reconsideration of how this section is presented.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 27	A) The WRAPP identifies the degree to which existing wetland polygons and potentially restorable wetland polygons meet the criteria, in this case for Wildlife Movement Corridors. Text was added to Section 8.1 identifying the potential for future assesment of other functions not assessed in previous studies, including plant movement (seed dispersal, pollination). B) Manicured areas and agricultural fields are excluded only from the "large, naturalized upland" criteria. The text in Section 4.4.12 has been modified to clarify.
39	It would be great to supplement this with a similar field assessment of privately owned sites. The focus on natural, undisturbed conditions perhaps skews this? At a minimum, it seems there is an opportunity to close a gap.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 29	Noted. Access authorization for privately owned sites can be difficult and time-consuming to obtain. Text was added to Section 8.2: Expanding the sample size... Ideally, this would include additional study sites located on both publicly-owned and privately-owned land, if access authorization can be obtained.
40	Yes, the quality of most wildlife movement corridors has decreased, but nonetheless, this sets up a somewhat awkward and odd framework that suggests an increase in acreage of wildlife movement corridors. Similarly, this is set up in a way that suggests the acreage of unique wetland resources has exploded since presettlement times, and though the narrative explains how this number was derived, the way information is presented in these tables may turn out to be counterproductive to the goals of this Plan. Perhaps the tables could be reformatted to highlight opportunities and losses.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 38	We added a footnote to Table 10 and Tables 16 through 19 to direct the reader to sections of the report with narratives that discuss positive changes in acreage.
41	It seems that geography plays a role as well.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 39	The final sentence of the first paragraph in Section 5.2.1 was revised as follows: "While underlying hydrogeographic differences may contribute to the lower acreage in the Lake Michigan watershed, we attribute it primarily to the (relatively) early urban development of that watershed and the relative lack of good pre-development wetland and soil data for much of that watershed."
42	Perhaps re-word to clarify that the Des Plaines River does not occur entirely within Lake County, i.e., it flows in and out of the county, like the Fox, but does not meander like the Fox.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 42	The text in Section 5.2.3 was revised to: "...largely because the Des Plaines River does not meander in and out of Lake County between its entry and exit points (in contrast to the Fox River)."
43	Left column. Ag land, meadow/pasture and forest/shrub should be viewed as open space.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 51	This section and analysis specifically rely on land use/cover classifications developed by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (now CMAP) and applied by Lake County to develop its countywide land use/land cover map. In that dataset, agricultural land, meadow/pasture and forest/shrub are classified separately from "open space." The open space/park land classification mainly includes Forest Preserves, parks and golf courses. We have revised the text in Section 5.3.1 to clarify this: "the open space/park land category, which includes forest preserves, parks and golf courses, makes up just over a third of land cover for PRW acreage in Lake County, followed by the agricultural and meadow/pasture land categories."
44	Left column ...landowner willingness, ability, and other limiting factors... Willingness is a very small part of the equation. Presenting landowners as 'unwilling' suggests a lack of respect and understanding of barriers.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 51	Text revised to change "willingness" to "interest."
45	...are relatively scarce, creating heightened interest the value of restoring them.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 51	Text was modified to reflect that "Nevertheless, opportunities for restoration may exist for these low-acreage types."
46	All categories in this pie chart other than 'urban' are open space.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 53	See the response to Comment 43.

Lake County Wetland Restoration Preservation Plan - Comment Response Summary

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Draft Report Section/Page or Online Tool	Response
47	Another unfortunate characterization of landowners as stubborn, uninformed, or emotional. Recognizing landowners' barriers to your desired actions will help you better engage with them and perhaps lead to barrier reductions.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 54	See Comment 44: Text revised to change "willingness" to "interest."
48	Seems to focus on histosols. Is the potential for forested wetlands included?	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 65	The potential for forested wetlands is included in Section 5.3.3; however, forested wetlands comprise a relatively small proportion of all potentially restorable wetlands.
49	Perhaps we've missed it or misunderstood, but it seems the Lake Michigan shoreline is missing from this.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 72	Only a small number of PRWs are mapped immediately adjacent to the Lake Michigan shoreline, which is a main criterion for functional significance. Large portions of the shoreline that are not highly armored are identified as existing wetland (largely unvegetated beach) and therefore would be potential candidates for enhancement with vegetation.
50	Feel we are misunderstanding something here. It seems the proper planting and care of appropriate species of trees would significantly increase this function.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 75	PRWs are estimated using best available data, including historic wetland mapping. Historic forested wetlands are likely under-represented. Many riparian wetlands potentially could be restored to become forested wetlands, although it is unclear, based on available data, if those areas were historically forested wetlands.
51	Ravines and fens appear to be missing from PRWs for Unique Wetland Resources.	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 78	See response to Comment 33.
52	Is this restricted to terrestrial movement corridors? Seems that Lake Michigan shoreline wetlands can offer significant PRW acres for aerial and aquatic wildlife movement (including resting and refueling spaces).	Openlands (Sarah Surroz)	Report p. 82	PRWs located in the coastal plain have high significance for this function; however, there are limited PRWs identified in the Lake Michigan Watershed, particularly south of Waukegan Harbor along Lake Michigan. See narrative in Section 5.3.2.
53	It is rather tedious to have the switch back and forth between the functional rating layers.	Susan Pribyl, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	Unfortunately, the tool is not customizable to display several different functional rating layers at one time. It was developed on an ESRI platform, which is an "out of the box" product (same as the Lake County online mapping product). ESRI periodically makes enhancements to their mapping system, and perhaps a future enhancement will allow users to display multiple functional assessment layers simultaneously.
54	Do you work directly with ESRI on the mapping system or a 3rd party vendor?	Grant Benjamin, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	The County works directly with ESRI--Lake County has a contract with ESRI.
55	Fig. 8-3 in the Squaw Creek Watershed Plan identifies various opportunities throughout the watershed for flood water control water quality improvement, etc. Particular focus of the SCCWA is on Ray Lake and Nippersink FP (Mud Lake) areas. Does the WRAPP identify potential wetland restoration sites in these areas?	Jack Cahill, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	Yes, the WRAPP identified numerous PRWs in the Ray Lake and Nippersink Forest Preserves. Overall, the WRAPP identified 1,636 acres of PRWs in the Squaw Creek sub-watershed.
56	The online tool is amazing and they used it recently made a presentation to the Forest Preserve. Is it possible to apply a filter to more quickly identify PRW's with high functional ratings in specific locations, e.g. a specific Forest Preserve containing PRW's with high functionality for nutrient transformation, etc.?	Gloria Charland, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	Users can create custom filters for any of the WRAPP layers in the online tool. This feature is found under the "Filter" tab (funnel icon), using the button at the bottom of the dialog box (funnel and pencil icon). The functionality is not ideal, but this satisfies the need for customizable filter settings using the current subscription software available.
57	It's not clear what the High, Medium and Low ratings mean for each function when looking at a particular existing wetland or PRW. How are the ratings determined?	Gloria Charland, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	The ratings criteria for each function are included in Section 4.4 of the companion WRAPP Technical Report. However, we realize it is inconvenient to bounce between the online tool and the report to review the ratings criteria. We will add a hyperlink in the tool so the user can quickly reference the functional rating criteria.
58	How will the WRAPP be used to get grants?	Jack Cahill, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	General	The WRAPP provides a baseline screening tool to help end-users identify and prioritize PRWs and existing wetlands to be preserved or enhanced, based on the end-user's goals and objectives. Additional site-specific information would need to be collected to seek grants. SMC can assist willing partners in seeking funding to implement priority wetland restoration projects.
59	The Land Use layer is dated 2010 - has this been updated, as many changes have occurred on the landscape?	Susan Pribyl, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	The Land Use layer is managed by the Lake County Planning Department; we have confirmed with that Department that 2010 is the most recent data available.
60	To clarify: the WRAPP does not "recommend" (specify) restoration or preservation sites.	Grant Benjamin, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	General	Correct. The WRAPP puts the decision-making process in the hands of the end-users.
61	There seems to be a disconnect between the functional ratings applied to the existing wetland layer and PRWs.	Grant Benjamin, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	The ratings for existing wetlands are mutually exclusive from the ratings for the PRW layer, other than some possible overlap for farmed wetlands.
62	Can the WRAPP be used to make new mitigation banks?	Gloria Charland, Squaw Creek Clean Water Alliance (SCCWA)	Online Tool	Yes. The WRAPP can assist mitigation bankers and other parties with identifying potential sites where wetlands could possibly be restored (restored wetlands qualify for 100% credit for each acre restored). Also, existing wetlands rated Low for some functions could potentially be enhanced (enhanced wetlands qualify for 25% mitigation credit for each acre enhanced).
63	Add to Action Strategy acknowledgement of Watershed Workgroups and goal to increase indices of biotic integrity to meet MS4 and treatment plant requirements (water quality standards).	Mike Warner, SMC Executive Director	Report, Chapter 7, pg 96-97	Text was added in Section 7.