

STATE WATER PLAN TASK FORCE MEETING

December 21, 2021, 10:30 A.M.

Illinois Department of Natural Resources

Web-Ex Meeting Minutes

Task Force Members Present:

IDNR–OWR: Loren Wobig, Wes Cattoor, Terra McParland, Rick Pohlman. Jim Casey, Steve Altman, Megan McKinney

IDNR–ORC: Brian Metzke

ISWS: Laura Keefer, Walt Kelly, Trent Ford, Yu-Feng Forest Lin

IDOT: BJ Murray

IEPA: Scott Twait, Gary Bingenheimer, Christine Davis, Michael Summers, Jeff Edstrom, Abel Haile

IDOA: Michael Woods, Brian Rennecker

Agencies not in attendance: IDNR–OMM, IDPH, IEMA, DCEO, IWRC, IPCB.

Non-Members Present:

Lauren Lurkins, IL Farm Bureau (IFB)

Gloria Charland, Sierra Club

Iyana Simba, IL Environmental Council (IEC)

The Meeting was called to order at 10:30 A.M. The meeting agenda, meeting recording and minutes are posted on the State Water Plan Task Force (SWPTF) website. The website also contains general information about the State Water Plan’s history and current activity.

<https://www.dnr.illinois.gov/WaterResources/Pages/StateWaterPlanTaskForce.aspx>

Note: An Illinois State Water Plan (SWP) was first published in March of 1967 and was updated in 1984. The Task Force which compiled the 1984 report continued to meet and publish several subsequent documents to continue the planning process and to provide updated information. That State Water Plan Task Force (SWPTF) continues to meet quarterly to address issues related to the waters of Illinois. The SWPTF is comprised of state agency representatives and invited federal and local partners.

Welcome: Loren welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked everyone for attending and participating in this effort. Loren reminded the group that today we are going to dive into two topic areas for the SWP. We want to have some general discussions and feedback.

Wes reviewed the agenda. There will be no formal presentation today since we are going to be reviewing the submitted topic recommendations instead. Today we’re talking about: *Water Use Laws & Regulations* and *Long-Term Funding*. When reviewing the draft sections, we need to discuss cross cutting issues. The two topics will be shared online for discussion purposes and we will discuss each issue and recommendation separately.

Topic Discussion: Long-Term Funding – Steve Altman

- The Overview and Issues narrative was not provided for review at this time.

- Comments from the Task Force are listed below for the Topic Leader’s use. Blue font is suggestions for word changes noted during the meeting. Yellow highlight indicates cross-cutting with another water topic.

Recommendation	Comments
1. A full review of Water Use Act to assess what has been properly implemented, determine how to implement actions proposed in the act, and determine If modifications to the act are needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water Use Act of 1983 has NOT been implemented. - Wes asked were they looking at anything in particular? Steve says mostly emergency powers, should we do anything different? Is there anything we need to expand on within the act?
2. Propose State Legislation defining regulation for water reuse.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No more than 500 gallons/day.
3. Legislation is needed to address for diversions outside the State of Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is recommendation just that legislation is needed? It might be good to develop this recommendation a bit more. - We are currently working with 5 states for the MS River Basin, do we need to say continuing to collaborate to create legislation that supports.... - Steve will work with group to beef up the recommendation. - Other states might be in the same boat so need to work with them. - It was noted that basic water law should be revamped so that neighbors can’t flood other neighbors.
4. Work with regional water supply planning committees to develop state and regional strategies for implementation during emergencies including stream low flow protection (Coordination with Water Sustainability section)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loren asked what kind of legislation? - Like the Upper MS river basin group?
5. Improve the accuracy of high capacity well water use reporting by adding metering requirements to Water Use Act of 1983. (Coordination with Water Sustainability section)	
6. Availability of funding under FEMA’s Building Resilient Infrastructure in Communities (BRIC) is limited because the State of Illinois does not have statewide building code. (Coordination with Flood Damage Mitigation Section)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is actual recommendation? - Per Steve, get a group together to determine how code would impact different groups. - Governor’s group has interest in this due to tornados last week. - Terra – It might be easiest to recommend adopting the International since that is very standard throughout the country and see what

Recommendation	Comments
	push back you get then. That would speed up the process. - Per Steve, FEMA might be changing some of the reqts for the building codes in the Brick Grant process since so many were ineligible.

Topic Discussion: Funding – Jeff Edstrom

- Comments from the Task Force are listed below for the Topic Leader’s use. Yellow highlight indicates cross-cutting with another water topic.
- Overview – This cuts across all agencies and departments, a lot of different organizations throughout the state and also across all the chapters.
- This group looked at what the state water activities are that we’re funding and what is the funding needed as identified in the other chapters. There are capital and technology needs, and also local funding since they are an important partner in many of the recommendations.
- Funding options are operating revenues, state capital, budgets, state and federal grants, revolving loan from federal funds, user fees and a whole host of options.
- Some topics are looking at one time capital funding for larger projects and there’s a need for a new one-time funding for planning (our report). Other groups are looking at programmatic funding by either maintaining existing state funding or increasing state funding.
- **Note: each committee lead should send a list of their specific types of funding needs to this group so they can make sure all funding needs types are being addressed.**
- Note: IL does not have a funding hub like some other states. Perhaps a recommendation should be to provide IL the authority /agency to do funding for all agencies. They can administer the money, work with agencies about requirements. This idea seemed very favorable since when preparing the Urban Flood report, it was noted that sometimes different agencies have inconsistent requirements for spending state dollars which affects equity. For example, one agency might have benefit/cost reqts. and another might give money and just report how it was spent. This would allow agencies to track/monitor and regulate funds. A new program focused on funding.
- Maybe start some of these funding options as pilot programs to determine the methodologies to then make more far reaching recommendations after they are tried.
- It was noted that each group is asking for tremendous amounts of funding so we will all need to think about how realistic all the asks will be. If we ask for too much, we might lose credibility. If we prioritize, we need to be careful not to be competing with each other for funding.

Recommendation	Comments
1. Provide dedicated State funding for integrated water resource management planning (Coordination with Integrated Water Management)	- to cover the programmatic needs and one-time funding needs outlined in this report. - Will need to prioritize the recommendations to know who much to ask for. - Reminder that recommendation has to be measurable to determine when you’ve accomplished the task. This might be vague but

Recommendation	Comments
	<p>this section is a bit different than the rest so maybe ok.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -This recommendation really meshes with Integrated Management and the Hub, and providing funding for all as one optional approach.
<p>2. Establish a new State-funded State revolving loan program that mimics the current SRF program to provide funds for long-term water resource management needs not already addressed by the existing Illinois EPA SRF program.</p> <p>(Coordination with Integrated Water Management)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is to address issues that aren't eligible by the current revolving loan fund. So far only water supply, ww, and stormwater (if addresses WQ). - It will take time to establish a base fund - This funding can be run by any agency but can follow the methodology from IEPA's current system. - This is a proven success story that the legislators are familiar with and can be sued to fund things traditional programs cannot. - Will need staff once up and running. Current IEPA staff of 20 people running the program., maybe staff of 10 to get it rolling. - Is there a way to expand the current program to include additional funding categories since staffing in place and tools already in place? However, since such a wide variety of water resource needs, IEPA might not be best fit. - Need to determine what qualifies, examples: recreation, homeowner's septic systems, urban flooding, conservation practices, etc. - Another option used in the past is to use existing banking institutions to provide loans - MN uses this for lots of agricultural projects. They also have one for transportation, small community wastewater program, point source implementation program, etc. - This provides a more sustainable funding source which GA will be interested in. - An example is that WWTP need to do nutrient reduction but trades with landowner upstream to reduce their nutrients, takes a loan to pay farmer, the reduced sediment ends up costing the WWTP less in operational costs and they use those proceeds to pay back loan. -This will require legislation and annual funding to run the new program
<p>3. Establish a State strategic fund or financial assistance program to address critical long-term water resource management issues</p> <p>(Coordination with Integrated Water Management)</p>	

Recommendation	Comments
4. Require existing public water supply, wastewater treatment, and stormwater management providers to utilize asset management to review and identify the system cost of service if receiving state or federal funding	<p>This allows community to better understand the value of their infrastructure and also of natural infrastructure as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This would likely require legislation but then each agency would probably have to modify their admin rules as well.
5. Encourage municipalities to implement stormwater utilities to address local flooding, water quality, and other stormwater related and water resource management issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even if a community doesn't have a stormwater utility, formally, they need one to access funding so they will need to form one.
6. Develop technical and financial support tools for Environmental Justice communities to address local water resource management issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Looking at problem with local match since some communities cannot provide. - Lots of groups were asking for group outreach to help them with technical portions of design and planning to help determine what resources are out there. -Grants might be easier than getting revolving funds or that funds go to r - Grants are challenging since the main issue is to determine how to best make disadvantaged groups aware of and how to use existing funding sources. As other groups have suggested, provide technical expertise. Maybe fund regional planning commissions to hire consultants to help those communities. - Wes indicated that this is something they are currently doing with water supply planning, work with regional planning councils to help local communities identify issues now and let OWR know that we need to provide technical expertise beyond their abilities, especially complex modeling. Those groups also know which communities are in most need.
7. Adopt technology to streamline state agency operations for water resource management recommendation implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What kind of investment is needed upfront in technology to improve data collection more effectively to make better decisions and for sharing. Technology can make work easier or better.
8. Support Public-Private Partnerships including guidance development and participation to help meet water resource management recommendations to increase non-government financial resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What can state do to make these P3 easier to form and sustain. -What can state do to provide better guidance. - One example is stormwater trading and PPPs using funds to try to meet permitting reqts. - Not sure if legislation is required or exactly how to address.]

- This group will determine the funding and action columns later.
- One idea for the Agency lead is the Agency that gets the cash. That might help groups decide which agency to list.
- They had 2 options for this section – look at each group’s needs and develop recommendations that tied in or make it a standalone chapter without tying them together. The group seemed to agree with the former.
- It was noted that this section shouldn’t serve to reiterate all the other specific needs but to address overall funding options.
- It was noted that in the 1960’s when the Water Plan was initiated, the then governor asked for 1 billion dollars to get things going. But funding has not continued.
- Chris might pull in leaders from some of the groups to get more input to generate more details.

Table of Contents:

- The funding topic and climate change are standalone topics so perhaps later, we decide to make them their own chapters that don’t fit the existing recommendations table since it doesn’t really fit.
- Our report is different than original SWP since original provided lots of background and was almost 500 pages. So, looked at that TOC but it doesn’t really fit our report.
- Looked at other states and some of their main intro and recommendations sections.
- Our audience is the General Assembly so we want to cut to the chase quickly.
- The TOC is a draft and will likely change as we begin writing.
- If anyone is interested in writing a particular Intro or Recommendation section, let Wes or Terra know.
- Cross cutting issues and Social Justice might be woven into the intro but for now separate as placeholders to make sure they are adequately addressed.
- The references can either be in appendix or in each section (proposed for now).
- If we prioritize, we’ll need to determine a method and then explain the process. Also, how we are measuring our success
- Also discuss our ongoing website and updates.
- If anyone has any ideas from other reports they’ve done that could enhance our report, let us know.

General:

- Meeting Schedule:
 - Jan: Erosion & Sedimentation and Climate Change
- Project Schedule: (shifted by one month to allow more time to collaborate on each section)
 - Draft Sections due mid-March (basically take your section presented at the Task Force meeting and make changes as recommended by the Task Force)
 - Compiled Reports by mid-April for Task Force internal review
 - Public outreach mid-May
 - Final report Summer
- Try to include graphics, figures, tables, maps in each section to provide interest to the reader.

Schedule: The schedule will be revised and posted on the website.

Next Meeting Outline: It was determined using a poll that the next meeting will be set for **January 31, 2021 at 9:00 A.M.** to be held via Web-Ex. The agenda will include a discussion about 2 topics to identify cross-cutting issues and recommendations. If time remains, we'll talk about report section format and the cross-cutting issues.

The meeting was concluded at 12:15 P.M.