

**LAKE COUNTY WETLAND RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION PLAN (WRAPP)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #3 - SUMMARY REPORT**

January 20, 2016 9:00 AM

**CENTRAL PERMIT FACILITY Main Conference Room-2ND Floor
500 W. Winchester Road, Libertyville, Illinois 60048**

MEETING GOALS: Refresher on classification process. TAG awareness of enhanced LCWI datasets. TAG begins development of preliminary functional assessment (W-PAWF) criteria.

TAG Members Present: Mike Murphy, Mike Adam, Dennis Dreher, Rich Knodel, Sue Elston, Vince Mosca, Jim Anderson, Leslie Berns, Mark Bramstedt, Maggie Cole, Tom Ganfield, Darren Olson

TAG Members Absent: Dan Krill

SMC Project Team Staff Present: Mike Prusila, Glenn Westman, Juli Crane, Jeff Laramy

Others Present: Kevin Kleinjan (Hey & Associates)

Meeting started at 9:11 a.m.

I. Welcome and Accept Meeting #2 Report – 5 min (0911-0914)

Mike Prusila open the meeting and the member of TAG congratulated him and wished him well on the birth of his daughter.

Mike Prusila mentioned it would be helpful to go through a refresher on what SMC has done from the outset (GIS datasets: LCWIe & LCWIh, LLWW) and how that will dovetail with input from the TAG

Mike Prusila commented that the room is scheduled until noon if anyone is interested in staying longer that the allotted 2 hours.

Mike Prusila sent out the Meeting #2 report and asked the TAG to approve by consensus.

Meeting #2 report approved by consensus.

II. WRAPP Timeline and Planning Stages—10 min. (0914-0917)

Mike Prusila opened the power point presentation by briefly discussing the timeline and planning stages of the WRAPP process.

III. Wetland Classification Process (Refresher) (SMC)—30 min. (0917-1006)

NOTE: The presentation was scheduled for 30 minutes but this time also included comments and discussion by the TAG

Juli Crane presented a refresher power point presentation on Landscape Level Wetland Functional Assessment.

In regards to historic wetlands, Jim Anderson asked if the SMC was speaking of wetlands that are still represented on the landscape.

Juli Crane replied no. These are areas that could potentially be restored but are not necessarily represented on the landscape at present. These wetlands may have been developed, farmed, etc.

Glenn commented to the TAG not to feel like they have to memorize the terminology and acronyms but please think about the functions and positions of wetlands on the landscape. Think in general terms and don't get caught up in terms like terrene and lotic wetlands. Focus instead on wetlands associated with these descriptions.

Mike Prusila reiterated to the TAG to not get bogged down in the details but rather to have a general functional knowledge of these wetland types. Don't worry about the details and the coding in the GIS.

Jim Anderson asked how the SMC is treating seeps and springs

Mike Prusila answered that a seep would fall into a wetland category

Rich Knodel commented in the mapping, seeps are always a point and a water body is an area.

Mike Prusila mentioned a seep would be classified as a "slope" wetland and not an open water body type.

Mike Prusila mentioned one main question that comes up (and also came up during the Tetra Tech study) is how to distinguish between a pond and a lake. A number of studies have relied on the distinction between ponds and lakes. Mike sought comments and feedback from the TAG on deciding upon a size (acre) threshold.

Rich Knodel mentioned on the GIS side, surface areas equal to or greater than 6 acres are considered a lake and anything less than 6 acres is considered a pond. Rich mentioned working with Mark Pfister at the Lake County Health Department in coming up with a size threshold.

Glenn Westman said that lakes are defined as equal to or greater than 2 acres according to the WDO.

Rich Knodel mentioned that the 2 acre threshold is the size limit for most federal grants.

Glenn commented that the TAG has the decision making power to decide on a size threshold to distinguish between lakes and ponds.

Mike Prusila asked for additional guidance on size for lakes and ponds.

Sue Elston asked if it made a difference if the water body has flow paths. Sue said she typically thinks of a pond as being isolated.

Mike Prusila responded we would like to consider only surface area and not necessarily flow paths.

Dennis Dreher mentioned there are probably a large number of ephemeral ponds in Lake County.

Mike Prusila commented that it would be difficult to identify these but they would be identified if possible

Vince Mosca said an ephemeral pond in his mind is a wetland.

Jim Anderson commented that he would consider an ephemeral pond a vernal pond. Juli Crane asked if there is a size breakpoint for habitat that makes sense.

Rich Knodel commented he would suggest using 6 acres as a size threshold.

Juli asked if there was any objection to 6 acres.

Jim Anderson asked Mike Adam if there is anything smaller than 6 acres that would classify as a lake from a functional point of view.

Mike Adam mentioned there are several lakes in the 4 to 5 acre range that are important from a biological standpoint.

Mike Prusila asked if there was a small enough number of these smaller lakes that we could make an exception to and just change, even if a larger size was agreed upon.

Mike Adam said there are probably 10 or less of these smaller lakes.

Vince Mosca mentioned he has a problem calling a detention pond a lake.

Mike Prusila responded to Vince saying there are codes to flag detention ponds.

Rich Knodel said that Lake County GIS does flag detention ponds.

Jim Anderson suggested using the 6 acre threshold for lakes and then code the 10 or so smaller outliers as lakes too, per Mike Adam.

TAG consensus was to use 6 acre threshold to distinguish “lakes” from “ponds”

Jim Anderson recommended using Al Westermann’s pre-settlement data for Lake County because it considers soils.

Jim Anderson brought up the missing connection east of Rasmussen Lake. One of the slides in the presentation should what looked to be a wetland signature connecting some isolated wetlands to Rasmussen Lake

Mike Prusila agreed with Jim Anderson and mentioned that as part of the QA/QC process, these types of issues will be looked at closer

Glenn Westman commented this is a county-wide dataset and a few of these smaller types of connections may be missed, but every member of the TAG will have an opportunity to review the GIS dataset if they so desire to make additional refinements.

Vince Mosca asked if wetland polygons were being hand digitized.

Mike Prusila responded "Yes" and mentioned it is a combination of hand drawing and using existing data. If the signatures don't line up, polygons will be hand drawn to match wetland signatures on the aerial.

Rich Knodel suggested that the Dynamic DTM layer to look for drainage paths and signatures during the QA/QC process.

Jim Anderson asked if SMC was mapping historical wetlands for the entire county.

Mike Prusila responded "yes". Historical wetlands are being mapping for the entire county.

Jim Anderson asked if SMC was interested in figuring out lost functionality for wetlands.

Glenn Westman responding by saying when the wetlands are tallied up, we'll be able to say for example, flood storage historically was X and now it is Y (difference is lost flood storage due to wetland loss). This analysis will be done after the GIS is complete.

Mike Prusila presented the "Sample of Enhanced LCWI Datasets" and went over GIS samples of the LCWI-e

Mike Prusila wrapped up the presentation at 1006 and suggested the TAG take a break to reconvene at 1015.

Break at 1006

TAG reconvened at 1015

IV. Group Exercise: (SMC/TAG – 20 min. (1015-1025)

Before TAG broke into the individual working groups, Mike Prusila presented an example of a wetland providing flood water storage functionality.

Mike Prusila asked the TAG to think about what types of wetlands will provide significant flood water storage and their position on the landscape.

Mike Prusila went over the assignments and members of the three working groups before breakout session to discuss preliminary functional assessment as it related to flood water storage.

After some general questions by TAG and explanations by SMC staff, the TAG broke into the three working groups.

Functional Categories and members are as follows:

1. “Water Quality” Functional Category

Mark Bramstedt
Dennis Dreher
Sue Elston
Mike Adam
Mike Murphy

2. “Hydrologic” Functional Category

Darren Olson
Leslie Berns
Dan Krill (absent)
Rich Knodel

3. “Biodiversity” Functional Category

Jim Anderson
Vince Mosca
Maggie Cole
Tom Ganfield

V. TAG Working Group break-out sessions to discuss preliminary functional assessment—35 min. (1025-1130)

The TAG broke out into the three working groups to discuss wetlands performing flood water storage function. Wetlands were to be assigned a ranking of LOW, MODERATE, and HIGH for significance of flood storage function.

At 1045, the three working groups gave a brief presentation of their findings. These were recording on flip charts (after the meeting, these charts were given to Darren Olson of the hydrology working group for future reference).

Group presentations ended at 1100

Vince Mosca asked how to specifically score these wetlands for restoration potential.

Glenn Westman mentioned to the TAG that they shouldn't get caught up in “restoration potential” and to focus on the functional assessment ranking at this point in the process. Once the functional assessment rankings are complete, then restoration potential can be derived from weighting the various functional assessment rankings, depending on user priorities.

Sue Elston commented perhaps the three rankings of LOW, MODERATE, and HIGH, are not enough. Sue said a wetland should be not be ranked as LOW in a given function if it can't meet that function.

Mark Bramstadt opined that a LOW, MODERATE, and HIGH ranking was needed.

Jim Anderson said that a LOW, MODERATE, and HIGH ranking system would be important for restoration potential.

Dennis Dreher advised that possibly at a larger scale such as the county, perhaps only MODERATE and HIGH are necessary and then all the rest. No LOW is needed.

Glenn Westman asked if there was a consensus on what ranking system should be used.

Jim Anderson advised to keep a LOW ranking because that is important in determining restoration potential. Jim suggested a HIGH, MODERATE, LOW, and N/A ranking where the N/A would signify a wetland does not meet functional criteria for a certain category.

Sue Elston mentioned that we are not comparing existing sites to potential sites and we should stay with a MODERATE and HIGH ranking.

At 1120 the TAG came to a consensus on the functional assessment rankings and decided on four categories: HIGH, MODERATE, LOW, and N/A.

Mike Prusila went over future action items. He recommended the TAG review the wetland functions to be assessed and SMC will schedule the next round of group discussions.

Juli Crane mentioned that a methodology needs to be agree upon before June to make the field exercises valuable.

Jim Anderson and Mike Murphy asked if the groups can report on functions that can't be assessed.

Jim brought up fishless habitats as an important indicator for amphibian habitats. We lack the data for this but can it still be reported.

Mike Prusila said of course the groups can report but it can't be evaluated.

Dennis Dreher asked that we add the ADID stormwater and water quality reports since it is probably the best we have at this time. He recommended adding the ADID criteria to the SMC draft evaluation criteria table for functional assessments. Mike Prusila will do this and send out the revised table.

Glen Westman reiterated the importance of referring to the MDEQ and Tetra-Tech studies, since the functional assessment criteria in these recent reports has been developed for our region and may just need some refinements from TAG for Lake County.

VI. Wrap-up & next meeting (next Working Group meeting during Feb.) – 5 min. (1130-1140)

Mike Prusila will send out meeting invites for the group break-out sessions.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

COURTESY REMINDER: THIS IS A VOLUNTEER GROUP OF PROFESSIONALS, PLEASE BE RESPECTFUL OF EACH OTHER'S TIME AND SILENCE YOUR PHONES AND/OR STEP OUT OF THE MEETING TO HANDLE CALLS

Lake County Stormwater Management Commission Project Team Contact information:

Mike Prusila, Watershed Planner/Project Manager: (847) 377-7713, mprusila@lakecountyil.gov

Juli Crane, Wetland Specialist: (847) 377-7708, jcrane@lakecountyil.gov

Glenn Westman, Wetland Specialist: (847) 377-7718, gwestman@lakecountyil.gov

Jeff Laramy, GIS Analyst: (847) 377-7709, jlaramy@lakecountyil.gov

Project Website:

<http://www.lakecountyil.gov/Stormwater/FloodplainStormwaterRegulations/Wetlands/Pages/WRAPP.aspx>

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

ADID Advanced Identification study of high-quality wetlands in Lake County (NIPC, USEPA, SMC, 1992)

GIS Geographic Information System

LCWI Lake County Wetlands Inventory (Lake County Department of Information Technology)

LCWI-e Enhanced existing wetland polygons based on LCWI (SMC)

LCWI-h Enhanced historic wetland polygons based on LCWI (SMC)

LLWFA Landscape Level Wetland Functional Assessment, very similar to W-PAWF (Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality)

LLWW “Landscape position, Landform, Water flow path, & Waterbody type” hydrogeomorphic classification scheme developed by USFWS (Tiner) used in NWIPlus

NWI National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS) using ecological classification scheme developed by Cowardin, et. al.

NWIPlus See “LLWW”

PAWF See “W-PAWF”

SMC Lake County Stormwater Management Commission

TAG Technical Advisory Group

W-PAWF Watershed-based Preliminary Assessment of Wetland Functions (GIS-based functional assessment method)

WRAPP Wetland Restoration and Preservation Plan (SMC)