

STATE WATER PLAN TASK FORCE MEETING

June 6, 2022, 9 AM

Illinois Department of Natural Resources

Web-Ex Meeting Minutes

Task Force Members Present:

IDNR–OWR: Loren Wobig, Wes Cattoor, Terra McParland, Rick Pohlman, Steve Altman, Megan McKinney, Ania Byers, Wei Han

IDNR–ORC: Brian Metzke, Brennan Caputo

ISWS: Laura Keefer, Trent Ford, David Kristovich, Glenn Heistand, Walt Kelly

IEPA: Scott Twait, Jeff Edstrom, Gary Bingenheimer, Michael Brown

IDOA: Michael Woods

IWRC: Amy Weckle

IDPH: Brian Cox

IEMA: Zachary Krug

Agencies not in attendance: IDNR–OMM, DCEO, IPCB, IDOT

Non-Members Present:

Kelly Warner, USGS

Clayton Heffter, DuPage County

Jennifer Boyer, DuPage County

Kerry Behr, DuPage County

Rachel Siegel, IL Beaver Alliance

The Meeting was called to order at 9:00 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 June meeting and thanked everyone for attending and participating in this effort. This meeting will cover report highlights and the feedback protocol that the team wants to use. Also focusing on recommendations and making sure they are measurable for the next 5-8 years. Also being discussed is social and environmental justice and cross cutting exhibits. We want to have some general discussions and feedback.

Wes reviewed the agenda and turned it over to Terra. Terra’s big highlight was “speaking with one voice”; making sure this report sounds cohesive and looks like it was written by one person rather than several.

Terra encouraged everyone to read through the section on social, environmental justice and provide feedback.

Examples were shown of Sections 6, 7, and 8 that all looked nicely put together but their recommendations table formats were all different. Is one format easier than others for the average reader to understand and comprehend? Terra will send a poll out to the group to vote on the final choice and each lead will need to update their tables with the final method. It was mostly related to how to present the Issues. It was noted that general sections are formatted with blue footer and each topic section has been assigned a color. When referencing each topic those same colors are used throughout the report, when applicable. Other formatting ideas are welcome, so please forward them to Wes/Terra.

Cross Cutting:

146 total recommendations so far, 13 topics.

Some topics had 24 recommendations, some had as little as 3. Questions to be asked of your section is are these recommendations really feasible in the time we have (5-7 years). Wes mentioned that they are planning to do annual, ideally quarterly updates to the website, giving updates to each recommendation. Are some recommendations overly ambitious? What happens if it doesn't get done? That explanation will be needed to the Task Force and the general assembly.

Checking percentages for social and environmental justice, 17% of recommendations addressed it in some way. Terra said she thought that percentage could be higher. Each section should have at least 1, if not more recommendations to include this topic. A table was made to show which recommendations address Justice so look at that and make sure your topic has covered this issue adequately. In some cases, you can simply add a sentence to an existing recommendation or sometimes you can add a global recommendation. If you add something to a recommendation to include Justice, please send a note to Terra so she can update the Justice table.

25% of recommendations included Outreach. More conversations will be needed later on what that looks like and how to accomplish that within different agencies. 32% of recommendations require some sort of data collection or sharing, which the new Integrated Water Information Center (IWIC) might be a good headquarters for that type of information. 14% of the recommendations require working groups or collaboration which also points to the need for the IWIC.

Several recommendations were duplicates, so Terra shared a few exhibits she made. She also made exhibits for all the cross-cutting recommendations and the impacts to the other topics. The idea was to show that each recommendation had a multitude of benefits. However, due to the large number of exhibits, perhaps putting them in an appendix might be better. Laura mentioned it would also be good to show how each recommendation relates to other recommendations. She will take a stab at pulling that information together. Adding arrows to the existing exhibits from one to another might be one way to accomplish this connection. We're going to try to put together a small subcommittee to look at other ways to present this information. If you're interested on helping, please let Terra/Wes know.

Discussions will need to be had about presenting some sort of flow chart for when a sequence is required to implement recommendation and deciding what that will look like. These things also can relate and affect each other, and those things need to be seen too. It also needs to be recognized that

some people won't immediately go to sections, they may just jump to the summary tables and exhibits for information.

Measuring Success:

Collaboration has been such a big part of this Task Force but an important component of the SWP is measuring success. Some recommendations in the report body may need to be rephrased to make sure we have a way to measure and improve that, for instance, supporting a program; how do you know when that is going to be accomplished?

By compiling a status list annually, the public can see which things have been started and which ones may have obstructions or restrictions, problems with funding, and list those so they can see where the hang up is.

Measurable outcomes can look different. Some people's were as simple as recommending a report be written, but sometimes people just said 'outreach, which could be measured by outlining number of meeting held Terra encouraged topic leads to go back and meet with their committees and come up with some recommendations that are measurable. Terra will be sending around a table that can be filled in to show exactly how each of your recommendations will be measured. This can also be used to help generate future Task Force status reports.

David spoke up and mentioned that he does like the measurable outcome but publishing them may be unwise as over the years as political climates change, priorities are likely to change as well. Publishing the outcomes now may become too restrictive. Wes said as we go through publishing quarterly, it would be likely 20 or 30 recommendations may get discarded as time goes on, but the important thing is to be clear and transparent with the public about why this issue is or is not moving forward. Wes said that is why he would encourage the publishing so that that transparency could be shown and not hide it if political changes shut initiatives down. However, the group decided to not publish the outcomes now, but track them internally to be used for future status reports.

It was brought up that metrics and measurable data are different to different people. Some examples are putting up 6 gauge stations, which are easily measurable vs perhaps climate change which takes time and requires papers to be published. Terra stated that is a good way for the website to take over and make it more of a living document to document these type of things and broadcast this information more. The living document is an ongoing lineage of our work. Loren brought up that it will largely direct where these Agencies prioritize and focus the next several years.

Tracking changes- OneDrive

Terra brought up OneDrive and how its used through most State Agencies and "track changes" through Word. By clicking on the "Review" tab in word, you can also add comments or notes to each other. That way there aren't multiple documents out there being marked up and send through the Task Force. Review each as a committee, make the changes online and everyone else can see the changes. Terra walked the group through using One Drive and the Track Changes mode but if anyone has questions, please reach out to Terra. Keep in mind that you can always email your revisions or generate a table of suggested changes if One Drive does not work for you. Note: each section of the report is a separate word file at this time. Only the Task Force will have access to these shared files so each topic lead is to compile their committee's comments and post them.

Someone brought up they were not sure if University of Illinois uses Office365 or OneDrive. But Laura was willing to be the guinea pig for such an experiment.

Pictures

Terra mentioned if you have pictures that correlate with your section to send them to Terra/Wes. Include a location and who took/when. You can also attach a summary of what's happening and why it relates to the section. Having multiple interagency photographs would be great for this type of report. Pictures do not necessarily have to have been taken in Illinois.

Also covering pictures, CMS will need to review and approve any pictures being used that are taken from the internet. Please remember to reference any photos you send.

Introduction

Terra and Wes brought up the introduction and how extensive it is. The report itself is becoming rather lengthy, do we get rid of the preface and Underlying Plan Principles? Multiple members agreed. It was also suggested to move the references/links to an Appendix. Multiple people agreed.

Funding

The SWP mentions funding quite a bit. New funding. New staff. Terra suggested that if you are asking for a new program, you are asking for the associated new staff so it doesn't need to be brought up as a separate recommendation. An idea being broached was a "stamp" as a possible long term funding solution. This is clearly more DNR's wheelhouse but could be added to existing fees and licenses to earmark that money for that program you're trying to fund. Climate change is a harder one to fund and will likely need to be discussed on a case by case basis.

Lead Agency

Terra provided a table that shows which recommendation is assigned to which agency. In a few cases she selected a lead agency if there was more than one so each topic lead needs to verify (track changes shows where those changes were made). A few recommendations had "all" or more than one. Transparency was brought up again and it was suggested to have a lead agency and eventually lead individual for each recommendation. That lead will be responsible for the status reports and implementing the recommendation. A discussion was started to review the multiple lead agency recommendation but it was tabled for now to allow each group to revise where needed from multiple to single agency leads.

One of the long-term funding recommendations was to provide technology updates to streamline operations. That applies to many agencies but perhaps it is a DOIT activity. Gary will take this back to his group and think on it.

Laura brought up the point that while it was nice to have the list of which Agencies were involved in the support of this, it added a lot to the report, is it necessary for the report? It was decided that the Intro would outline that collaboration occurred for each of the topics but they won't all be listed in the individual recommendations table. That said, ISWS is a little different and those instances where an agency will fund and contract with ISWS to do the work can be noted.

Added Recommendations

After looking at all the recommendations, Terra felt that 3 new ones should be added. They were shared with the group to get consensus. One was for having the Integrated Management Section develop criteria for each group to use for generating Justice priorities. The second was to add a new item for data management related to a database for water data (including links when appropriate). The third item was to add license stamps to raise money for specific water resource goals.

General:

- Next month we'll talk about the public outreach meetings
- Terra will send the table about filling out 1 possible outcome and how you're going to measure it. Terra will send out an action list for all the topic leads when she sends the Table.
- Send any pictures to Terra
- Volunteers for cross cutting impact issue committee?
- Project Schedule:
 - Recommendations submitted to Terra for review and return, June 24
 - NGO/Stakeholder Review, July 4 to 22
 - Public outreach early August
 - Final report publish in October

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

Next Meeting: It was determined that the next meeting will be set for **July 11, 2022 at 9:00 A.M.** to be held via Web-Ex.

The meeting was concluded at 11:23 A.M.