

North Branch Chicago River Watershed-Based Plan Public Comment Period Spreadsheet

| Comment # | Comment | Commenter Name | Commenter Email | Comment Date | Relevant Section or Page | Responder | Response |
|-----------|---|---|--|--------------|---|-------------------|--|
| 1 | One area of comment I would suggest is the Briargate Road along the Middle Fork. Reading the criteria, in my estimation, both banks along Briargate should be classified as Severe/High and listed as a critical area due to the roadway issue. Banks are almost vertical for most of the reach, with severe vegetation overhang, and once you pull the veg aside, the slope is probably 80-90% bare. The roadway edge is generally less than 5' from the bottom of the channel, with some spots maybe 2-3 feet away. The map attached isn't easy to see, but the webapp shows the area as moderate and low. | Mike Warner, GHA | mwarner@gha-engineers.com | 3/24/2023 | <i>Not Provided See attached pdf's in file for reference</i> | Ashley Strelcheck | After looking closer at the stream inventory data along Briargate Road, SMC reclassified some of those areas to "high erosion". Although additional areas were elevated to high erosion, there was still not enough length of stream to designate that stream reach as a critical stream reach. While proximity to infrastructure is considered when identifying projects and assigning priority, it was not a consideration for identifying critical areas. Looking at action recommendation (ID) 25-0370, this action already addresses the need for stabilization in this area and is considered a high priority project. SMC adjusted the length of erosion at this action recommendation, updated the costs and pollutant load reductions for the project. These changes are reflected in the North Branch Chicago River Watershed-Based Plan sections 3.12, 6.3, & 7.1, 7.2, Appendix M (Site-Specific Action Recommendations) & B (Stream Inventory Report) and Webapplication. |
| 2 & 3 | 2. Excellent analysis and well written plan report - congrats! Table 6-14: Is there a reason that Drainage Districts are not included in the jurisdictions column for streambank erosion since they have authority for channel maintenance and repair for the three tributary streams of the NBCR? 3. Tables 6-18, 6-19 and 6-20 that address high priority actions by jurisdiction do not include the drainage districts even though a number of the actions are streambank stabilization, debris removal, stream dredging and water infrastructure in the jurisdictions of the drainage districts. | Patty Werner, on behalf of ESDD | wernerbaker@att.net | 4/6/2023 | <i>Pages 6-31 through 6-36 Tables 6-14, 6-18, 6-19 & 6-20</i> | Ashley Strelcheck | 2. Drainage districts that have critical catchments related to streambank erosion within their easement jurisdiction have been added to Table 6-14, page 6-24. Drainage district stream maintenance is high priority actions for those areas. 3. Drainage districts were added into Tables 6-18, 6-19 & 6-20. A notation was added below the tables to avoid double-counting action recommendations but indicate action recommendation located within or adjacent to drainage district easements: "Drainage district easements are located within several watershed jurisdictions (listed above). Action recommendations located within and/or adjacent to drainage easements are tabulated separately and are a subset of the total recommendations by municipality/unincorporated area. Drainage district action recommendation summaries are not included in the total table summary to prevent double counting of action recommendations." |
| 4 | I recommend including in the plan (perhaps in the executive summary) a table or summary of the primary author(s) of the plan and the stakeholders who contributed to the plan preparation, including government, business and volunteer participants and organizations. As a member of a volunteer watershed organization, we have found it quite helpful to know who was involved in other watershed plans so we can make connections and learn from others who have participated in plan development. Our volunteer group is looking forward to participating in the development of the updated Manitou Creek Watershed-Based Plan, and knowing who has worked on other recently-completed plans (such as the North Branch watershed plan) allows us to learn and collaborate in the future. | Grant Benjamin, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance | Grant.S.Benjamin@gmail.com | 4/6/2023 | <i>Not Provided</i> | Ashley Strelcheck | An acknowledgement page has been created with a list of watershed stakeholders that participated in the watershed planning meetings for the North Branch Chicago River Watershed-Based Plan update. |