

# Peoria Lakes Basin Alliance

*“A Unified Voice for the Restoration and Preservation of the Peoria Lakes”*

*For further information regarding the Alliance, please contact the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission 309-673-9330*

## Heartland Water Resources Council of Central Illinois

416 Main St. Ste 828  
Peoria, IL 61602  
(309) 637-5253

### Representatives

Executive Director:  
Tom Tincher

Board Members:  
Steve Van Winkle  
Wayne Ingram

## The Nature Conservancy

Protecting nature. Preserving life.™

301 S.W. Adams St.  
Ste. 1007  
Peoria, IL 61602  
(309) 673-6689

### Representatives

State Director:  
Michelle Carr

Board Members:  
Chris Ryan  
Ken Katch

## Tri-County Regional Planning Commission

456 Fulton St., Suite 401  
Peoria, IL 61602  
(309) 673-9330

### Representatives

Executive Director:  
Eric Miller

Board Members:  
Darrell Meisinger  
Russ Crawford

## PEORIA LAKES BASIN ALLIANCE

### AGENDA

Tuesday, December 12, 2017 at 12:00 pm  
456 Fulton Street, Suite 401  
Peoria, Illinois 61602

### MEETING GOALS

*Start the planning process for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Open House*

*Start the prioritization tool and criteria discussion*

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes for October 10, 2017, October 24, 2017, and November 14, 2017
4. Housekeeping
  - a. Meeting goals
  - b. McClugage Bridge (U.S. 150) Project
5. Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan
  - a. Update on Subject Matter Expert Meeting
  - b. Public Open House
  - c. Prioritization Criteria
6. Member Reports
  - a. Heartland Water Resources Council
  - b. The Nature Conservancy
  - c. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
7. Other
  - a. Next scheduled meeting is
    - i. Tuesday, January 9, 2018
    - ii. Tuesday, January 23, 2018
8. Adjournment

**Peoria Lakes Basin Alliance  
Tuesday October 10, 2017  
TCRPC Offices**

**MINUTES**

**ATTENDEES:**

The Nature Conservancy:	Jason Beverlin, Doug Blodgett
Heartland Water Resources Council:	Tom Tincher, and Wayne Ingram
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission:	Michael Bruner, Reema Abi-Akar, Eric Miller, Ray Lees, Russ Crawford, and Army Corps of Engineers: Marshall Plumley, and Jackie Veninger via phone

**I. Call to Order**

Van Winkle called meeting to order at 12:00

**II. Public Comment**

No public comment

**III. Approval of Meeting Minutes for September 19, 2017**

- Beverlin moved to approve the September 19, 2017 minutes and Ingram seconded. Motion carried.

**IV. Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan.**

1. Project Review Committee member list (Handout)
  - Bruner explained the PRC member list updates. He mentioned that Dr. Boddu is interested being on the committee and can help in any technical or advisory way. Ingram said this is a reasonable addition.
  - Blodgett said to not have duplicate persons of knowledge on PRC and we should not pursue Mike Demissie.
  - Tincher said we need to find someone to replace Goff and to switch retail to landowner and suggested, Altorfer, Kristy or Par-a-dice
  - Ingram asked if we contacted the Coast Guard and Bruner said that USACE was going to contact them. Marshall said they will get back with us.
2. Discussion of PRC Prioritization Tool  
Bruner asked Marshall to present the tool, and framework of USACE criteria.

- Blodgett asked about the independent measures. Should we go forward with 20 to 30? Marshall responded you can have as many as you want.
- Crawford said the criteria should be tailored with 4 objectives and the PRC cannot alter the criteria or weights. We should review with PRC committee and explain their roles and responsibilities and to have a handout of all definitions ahead of time before reviewing the tool. The results need to go back to PLBA and then someone from ACOE or PLAB contact the owner of border of water to accept the changes from the ACOE, then give a handout of the things we will be evaluating.
- Marshall said this is a collaboration effort and should be well defined of what the PRC needs to do. Need to keep scientific and Professional support but define their responsibilities.
- Blodgett needs a better explanation of tools, measures, and weights.
- Beverlin feels we need to postpone Nov. 1 meeting until we understand the process.
- Veninger said we will be tracking all input for PLBA, public, and projects for PLBA. Everyone needs to give all ideas.
- Miller said to have a list of projects and see if there is anything else to add. Go by measurers and tool to rate projects at home then bring back to next meeting.
- Crawford disagreed on taking and doing at home. Needs to be within the group.
- Beverlin said we need sub-steps for the process.
- Crawford said all measures can be sent to Bruner of ACOE. We need to quality control of same projects.
- Bruner said to email measures to him within 48 hours so he can forward onto ACEO.
- Miller said you should not close off ideas at table.
- Miller suggested to have Bruner develop what tool is (worksheet)
- Blodgett said we need to prioritize all pieces.
- Miller said to make sure and not side step cost.
- Tincher added that these projects can create outside funding also pay for another project. Crawford said to have cost effectiveness to cost criteria and Miller seconded. Motion carried.

### 3. Discussion of PRC agenda

### 4. Discussion of submitting additional projects to USACE for the development of factsheets

**V. Member Reports**

1. Heartland Water Resources Council- nothing to report
2. The Nature Conservancy- nothing to report
3. Tri County Regional Planning Commission- nothing to report

**VI. Other**

Next regular scheduled meeting is Tuesday, November 14<sup>th</sup> cancelled.

Crawford said the next meeting will be Nov. 1 and 2<sup>nd</sup> on Jan. 30<sup>th</sup> Miller seconded. Motion carried.

**VII. Adjournment**

Adjourned at 3:30 pm

DRAFT

**Peoria Lakes Basin Alliance  
Tuesday October 24, 2017  
TCRPC Offices**

**MINUTES**

**ATTENDEES:**

The Nature Conservancy:	Jason Beverlin, and Doug Blodgett
Heartland Water Resources Council:	Steve Van Winkle, and Wayne Ingram
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission:	Michael Bruner, Reema Abi-Akar, Eric Miller, Ray Lees, and Russ Crawford
Army Corps of Engineers:	Marshall Plumley, and Jackie Veninger via phone

**I. Call to Order**

Van Winkle called meeting to order at 12:00

**II. Public Comment**

No public comment

**III. Housekeeping**

Abi-Akar stated this meeting structure will be different from others—it serves as a test run for the PRC meeting on November 1<sup>st</sup>. Reason: Efficiency, timeliness, make sure everyone feels like their voice is heard in a positive environment. Abi-Akar also stated it ensures that we stay closer to the schedule. This is done by using a facilitator—Reema. Abi-Akar stated the facilitator regulates the flow of the conversation, like a traffic cop and generally keeps the conversation on track and on time. In addition, Abi-Akar stated the facilitator will write notes on a large piece of paper as needed. This serves as a “group memory”—helps attendees visualize the discussions. Abi-Aka noted that this was a practice round and asked that attendees to be patient with the new meeting structure (may feel forced)—we are giving it a try. Abi-Akar also noted that everyone received a pad of paper and a pen, so they can write their thoughts as they come, then bring them up during the discussion.

**1. Operational Procedures**

Abi-Akar introduced the operational procedures and asked the PLBA if they agreed with these procedures or if they wanted to make any changes. Abi-Akar also noted that the procedures were printed out and located on an easel in the front of the room. Blodgett stated the Operational Procedures were good and there was a consensus in the room.

## 2. Meeting Goals

Abi-Akar presented a set of goals we wanted to accomplish by the end of the meeting. Abi-Akar asked if they agreed with the goals or if they wanted to make changes. Beverlin stated he agreed with the goals and there was a consensus in the room.

## 3. Weekly Steering Committee Calls

Abi-Akar stated the weekly call-in meetings will continue, but solely as a logistics check for TCRPC and USACE. Wider involvement isn't expected but individuals are free to call in if they wish.

# IV. Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan

## 1. Definition of Terms

Bruner presented the four (4) terms that staff developed to keep everyone on the same page. Those terms were Project Element, Conservation Alternative, Comprehensive Conservation Plan, and Fact Sheet.

Bruner stated there has been confusion in previous meetings regarding the difference between measures, features, and projects. Staff recommended simplifying the term to Project Element and defined it has a *component that serves as the foundation of a project. Project elements can be implemented individually or combined to formulate a project.*

Bruner stated the Scope of Work defines a Conservation Alternative as a *grouping or sequence of individual projects that will together promote conservation of the Peoria Lakes.*

Comprehensive Conservation Plan was defined to demonstrate the need for public and PRC involvement.

Bruner stated Fact Sheet was defined so the PRC would have a firm understanding of the format and what goes into the fact sheet.

To further explain the difference between Project Elements and Conservation Alternatives Bruner presented a flow chart that compared these terms to a coffee shop. There was confusion of what a project was. It was recommended to develop a working definition of project. Veninger recommended using the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence in the Project Element definition as the working definition of Project: *Project elements can be implemented individually or combined to formulate a project.*

Ingram stated to him a project is a grouping of related elements (synergy). Blodgett agreed with adding related. Veninger thought adding the word related limited us in developing projects. The group agreed to add related

in parenthesis and reworded the definition as follows: *a project is made up of one or more (related) elements.*

## **2. Presentation of Scope of Work**

Veninger went through a flow chart of the Scope of Work and detailed the process and how it related to the scope. Veninger first reviewed what has been accomplished and where we are at this point (Task 5). Veninger stated that the USACE fact sheets will be presented to the PRC. A strawman of criteria will be given to the PRC for their comments. Once the criteria is fully developed the PRC will use the criteria/tool to qualify project elements.

Veninger further explained that once the PRC qualify project elements, the USACE will develop an array of projects. The PRC will then host a Public Meeting to present the USACE array of projects/conservation alternatives and receive input. After the public meeting the PRC will use a second set of criteria/tool to rate/rank conservation alternatives. Once the PRC has ranked the alternatives, they will then develop a newsletter to inform the public of the outcome.

Van Winkle asked if the PRC would be allowed to submit feedback/fact sheets. In addition, Van Winkle stated that if they can submit feedback/fact sheets it should be clarified in the Scope of Work presentation. Veninger noted that project elements can still be submitted, and this will be highlighted more under agenda item "PRC Agenda." Beverlin agreed we should clarify the PRC ability to submit fact sheets. Ingram stated he notices some of the new terms, such as Project Element, are not included on the Scope of Work flow chart. Beverlin stated the flowchart is hard to read and recommended making it larger and possibly limiting the number of words.

## **3. Criteria Overview**

Bruner presented the suggested reframed criteria. It was noted that from staffs review of the scope of work, it was revealed that there will be two separate tools the PRC will use. The first tool will be used to evaluate the project elements (step 5) and the second tool will be used to evaluate conservation alternatives (step 8).

Staff then reviewed the previously presented criteria and simplified it for evaluating Project Elements. Bruner stated that many previously presented criteria will be used in evaluating the conservation alternatives, not the project elements. Further explanation of this will be presented in the following slides.

Bruner presented that staff is proposing six criteria questions and one data gathering question for evaluating Project Elements. Bruner went on to go over each suggested criteria. They are as follows: scientific and professional support potential, government support potential, public support potential, environmental sustainability, require investment outside the lakes, and address the problem. Bruner noted that staff used the problems outlined in the survey the PLBA developed. The data gathering questions is asking the PRC where they think the project element might best go.

To come up with the suggested reframed criteria, staff reviewed the previous two version that both Russ and Marshall have presented in previous meetings. From that review, Bruner outlined staff's suggestions for removing criteria for evaluating Project Elements. In that outline Bruner noted which criteria will be used to evaluate conservation alternatives, renamed, or deleted altogether and the reason for that recommendation. Bruner noted that yes, we are suggesting to removing the Illinois River Comprehensive Plan Objectives, but these objectives will be given to the PRC as a resource and it located in the PLBA packet on page 20.

Veninger clarified that this is one of two screening tools. The current tool is a simplified version for qualifying Project Elements and the second tool will occur later and will be more advanced for ranking conservation alternatives. Veninger also mentioned the "homework" the PRC will be given at the PRC meeting. The homework will be discussed more under agenda item "PRC Agenda."

Beverlin asked what government support means. Beverlin went on to explain that it is too broad. Bruner stated that we are reviewing the "ingredients" of projects; therefore, the criteria was simplified and meant to be vague. Bruner noted that there is comment section for each question for PRC members to use to further clarify their answers. Blodgett asked if it would be better to ask "oppose" instead of "support." The PLBA went on to discuss the wording and ultimately decided to stay with "support," add "In your opinion..." to each question, to better explain the comment field is to be used to further explain why or why not, and to add a space for PRC members to include their names.

Van Winkle asked why access and use of the Lakes in terms of recreation was not included in the criteria. Bruner explained that he was taking this planning process as the conservation efforts will ultimately benefit the recreation side. Van Winkle was worried that some conservation efforts

might not benefit the recreation side. It was pointed out that public support is a criteria and any Project Element that hinders lakefront access or recreational use will most likely not have public support. Miller pointed out the project vision statement includes recreation. Bruner suggested the Mission Statement to be provided to the PRC and felt that would probably fit best under PRC agenda item 6, roles and responsibilities during the scope presentation.

It was recommended to move the current question number 6 that asks if the project element addresses the problem to the first question. There was consensus on moving question number six to the first question. Blodgett asked if it would be better to separate the problem sedimentation to "existing sedimentation" and "future or slowing down sedimentation." Miller stated if we do this for sedimentation then we should do it for all five problems. Veninger stated adding "existing and future" to all the problems wouldn't make sense. For example, how would we know what future invasive species would look like. It was then suggested that we change sedimentation to just sediment. Blodgett was okay with that change. Abi-Akar asked if everyone was okay with the suggested criteria with all the changes discussed. Abi-Akar then asked if anyone had strong feelings against the suggested criteria with the discussed changes. No one had any addition issue/comment regarding the criteria.

#### **4. PRC Agenda**

Bruner explained that in the meeting packet there was an official PRC draft agenda (page 11) and a more detailed draft agenda on page 12. Bruner went on to state Abi-Akar will talk about the format of the meeting.

Abi-Akar reiterated the topics she covered under item III, housekeeping, covered under this meeting's agenda. Abi-Akar also presented the PRC meeting goal: *Attendees understand the Peoria Lakes planning process and homework.*

Bruner then explained that staff would call the meeting to order and start the process of PRC member introducing themselves. Bruner went on to explain he would cover PRC agenda items 4 through 8 and Abi-Akar would cover item 9 and 10.

Bruner explained that agenda item 4, introduction to PRC, will be used to explain how important it is that they are at the table and how they represent the larger stakeholder group. Each PRC member represents a different stakeholder group category.

Bruner went on to explain that agenda item 5, introduction to the planning process, will be a trimmed down version of the Open House presentation. The purpose of this item will be to give the PRC a high-level overview of the planning process and science aspect.

Agenda item 6, roles and responsibilities, will be used to present the scope of work and a more detail overview of how the PRC fits in the planning process. Bruner noted that the handout, a Sankey Diagram, will be used to help visually show how the PRC and other groups fit in the planning process.

For agenda item 7, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers fact sheets, Bruner explained that TCRPC staff will first present the public and stakeholder input received to date. The USACE will go on to present a high-level overview of the factsheets provided to the PRC.

Lastly, Bruner stated that agenda item 8, Next Steps, will be where staff reviews the PRC homework and due dates. Bruner noted there are a total of four due dates, three for the PRC and one for staff.

The first assignment to be discuss was be the criteria/tool buy-in. Bruner stated that the PRC will be given a straw-man of the criteria and ask for feedback. The criteria feedback is due to staff by November 10<sup>th</sup>.

The second assignment to be discussed was fact sheet submissions. Bruner stated that all PRC members will have the opportunity to submit additional fact sheets that were not prepared by the USACE. However, all fact sheets must follow the same format the USACE uses. The additional fact sheets are due back to staff by November 22<sup>nd</sup>. Bruner noted that November 22<sup>nd</sup> is the day before Thanksgiving, but given the holiday season this is unavoidable.

Bruner stated that once staff has all the criteria feedback and additional fact sheets, staff will work to finalize the first tool. The tool and fact sheets are due to the PRC by December 4<sup>th</sup>. This is the assignment for the staff.

The third assignment for the PRC is qualifying the submitted fact sheets with the provided tool. PRC members are to evaluate all submitted fact sheets and submit them to staff by December 15<sup>th</sup>.

Bruner explained that once staff receive the results of the PRC evaluation of fact sheets, the USACE will start to formulate project array and conservation alternatives to be presented at the next Public Open House.

Abi-Akar stated that agenda item 9, other, will be used for public comment, detailing next meetings dates, and reviewing the meeting goals and format. PRC meetings are treated as a working session; therefore, all public comments are held until the end of the meeting. Abi-Akar revealed that the next meeting will be the second public open house on February 15<sup>th</sup>. Lastly, Abi-Akar stated she will use this time to go over the meeting goal and see if we accomplished the goal.

Under agenda item 10, adjournment, Abi-Akar stated TCRPC staff will close the meeting once all questions and comments have been heard.

#### **5. Discussion of new meeting structure**

Abi-Akar started the discussion of the new meeting structure asking if we achieved the three meeting goals. Furthermore, Abi-Akar asked how the PLBA felt about the new meeting structure.

It was recommended to staff to share the USACE project array and conservation alternatives developed from the first screening tool results to the PRC before the February 15<sup>th</sup> Public Open House meeting. It was also recommended to frame the Open House as sponsored by the PRC to encourage attendance by the PRC.

Beverlin stated that it would be a good idea to understand the PRC schedule before the meeting and to regularly engage the PRC. The group agreed to tentatively schedule the next two PRC meetings. Based from the scope of work the PLBA determined the next PRC meeting will be 15 March 2018 and 19 April 2018.

#### **V. Other**

1. Next regular scheduled meeting is Tuesday, November 14<sup>th</sup>

Blodgett wanted to give a quick update before adjournment. The Nature Conservancy is working with the Greater Peoria Sanitary District (GPSD) to install one or more weir structure (rock piles) in Kickapoo Creek along GPSD property in the Horseshoe Bottoms area. The purpose of this project is to demonstrate nutrient farming and wetland restoration. The project will provide multiple benefits including water quality improvements, fish and wildlife habitat, and opportunities for education and recreation.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

Adjourned at 1:46 pm

**Peoria Lakes Basin Alliance  
Tuesday November 14, 2017  
TCRPC Offices**

**MINUTES**

**ATTENDEES:**

<b>The Nature Conservancy:</b>	Jason Beverlin, and Doug Blodgett
<b>Heartland Water Resources Council:</b>	Steve Van Winkle, and Wayne Ingram
<b>Tri-County Regional Planning Commission:</b>	Michael Bruner, Reema Abi-Akar, Eric Miller, Ray Lees
<b>Army Corps of Engineers:</b>	Jackie Veninger via phone

**1. Call to Order**

Van Winkle called meeting to order at 12:00

**2. Public Comment**

No public comment

**3. Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan**

**a. Screening Criteria: Presentation of Feedback (Michael-5 minutes)**

- Bruner summarized the feedback on the screening criteria and suggested format changes.
- Reviewed the rewording on 3,4,5, and 6 and additional questions.

**b. Screening Criteria: Discussion and Finalization (Reema- 15 minutes)**

- Abi-Akar talked about the suggested format changes and they were all approved.
- Discussed the questions and will edit Question #1 "Is the project element economical sustainable?"
- Discussed and will eliminate Questions #2,3, and 4.

**c. Fact Sheets: Discussion and Recommendation (Staff- 15 minutes)**

- Bruner explained the fact sheets created.
- Tincher handed out some additional fact sheets.
- Ingram mentioned the in-lake structure- Chevron, street bank and station location. Miller talked about Mossville Bluff.

**d. Project Schedule: Presentation and Discussion (Michael- 10 minutes)**

- Bruner discussed and updated the schedule and dates.

#### **4. Member Reports (PLBA- Minutes)**

##### **a. Heartland Water Resources Council**

Tincher updated he is working with 4 cities to save the lake, East Peoria, Chillicothe Mayor, City of Peoria staff and the Sanitary District.

##### **b. The Nature Conservancy**

Blodgett reported on the Kickapoo project and braid base support, public waterway at Emoquin, building is underway, and the Gold leaf qualification, and redo of website.

##### **c. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission**

Miller reported that Reema Abi-Akar went to the Horseshoe Bottom, Regional Water Supply Planning.

#### **5. Other**

##### **a. Next regular scheduled meeting is Tuesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>- OK**

Bruner discussed the UIUC subject matter expert meeting

#### **6. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 1:45 pm

**Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan - Fact Sheet Benefit Matrix**

Benefits	Fact Sheet	Sediment Load Reduction (Local)	Sediment Flushing	Sediment Management	Sediment Placement	Sediment Resuspension	Blockage	River Bank Erosion	Deep Water Habitat	Nutrient Reduction	Bacteria / Pathogen Reduction	Rooftop Vegetation / Marsh Habitat Creation	Invasive Species	Habitat Diversity	Upland Habitat Creation / Enhancement	Economic Development	Navigation	Recreation	Land Resource Protection	Infrastructure Protection	Reliability of Design / Optimization	TMDL / LRS Compliance	Hydroperiod Restoration	Financial / Funding	Community Awareness
Fact Sheet 21 Hydrogeomorphic Study Fact Sheet 24 Educational Component		Systemwide																							
Fact Sheet 1 Backwater Restoration Fact Sheet 2 Deepwater Area Creation Fact Sheet 3 Drawdowns Fact Sheet 4 Dredging and Sediment Placement Fact Sheet 6 Invasive Species-Asian Carp Fact Sheet 7 Island Creation Fact Sheet 8 Lower Lake Islands Fact Sheet 9 Pool Level Drawdown Fact Sheet 11 Secondary Channel Fact Sheet 13 Submersed Aquatic Vegetation (Breakwaters) Fact Sheet 14 Chevrons Fact Sheet 23 Invasive Fish Species Fact Sheet 28 Nutrient Farming, Backwater Restoration & Floodplain Recapture Fact Sheet 29 Lower Lake Deepwater Creation Fact Sheet 30 Secondary Channels & Lakefront Sediment Placement & Conservation / Recreation Corridors Establishment Fact Sheet 31 Navigation Channel Dredging & Barrier Island Construction Fact Sheet 32 Eastside Marinas / Docks & Deepwater Dredging Fact Sheet 33 Westside Marinas / Docks & Deepwater Dredging Fact Sheet 34 Mud to Jobs		In-Lake																							
Fact Sheet 5 Floodplain Recapture Fact Sheet 12 Sediment Detention Basins Fact Sheet 20 Farm Creek Flood Control Sediment Retention Fact Sheet 35 Conservation / Recreation Corridor Anchors Fact Sheet 36 Rivertowns USA		Adjacent																							
Fact Sheet 10 Prairie Restoration Fact Sheet 15 Tributary Stream Stabilization Fact Sheet 16 Bluff Area Woodland Management Fact Sheet 17 River Bluff / Steep Slope Stormwater Management Fact Sheet 18 Ravine and Gully Stabilization Fact Sheet 19 Urban Stormwater Hydrologic Modification BMP Fact Sheet 22 Agricultural Water Best Management Practices Fact Sheet 25 Rain Barrels Fact Sheet 26 Rain Gardens Fact Sheet 27 Water Quality BMPs		Watershed																							

## Public Open House Logistic Questions

1. Is Thursday, March 1<sup>st</sup> okay with everyone for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Open House.
  - a. We originally told the PRC Thursday, February 15<sup>th</sup>, but felt we need the extra time to properly prepare for the meeting.
2. Where would we like to hold the 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Open House? The number in parentheses () is the quote received for the 1<sup>st</sup> Public Open House.
  - a. IVY Club (\$100)
  - b. Gateway Building (\$175)
  - c. East Port (\$400)
  - d. Embassy Suites (\$500 plus service fee)
  - e. River Front Museum (was unavailable last time)
3. What time would you like to hold the meeting?
  - a. Last time we held two separate meetings. One from 2-4 and the second one from 6-8. The 2-4 meeting had the largest number of attendees.
4. Should there be more than one slot for USACE presentation?

Previously reviewed criteria determined more appropriate for the prioritization tool:

- Timeliness
- Environmental Impact
- Funding Potential
- Habitat Structure, Funding & Process
  - Adjacent to existing floodplain habitat
  - Adjacent to existing overwintering habitat
  - Does it create habitat that currently does not exist?
  - Does it increase quantity of habitat that currently exists?
  - Does it increase the quality of habitat that currently exists?
  - Potential to reduce sediment impacts to the Lakes
  - Potential to improve sediment quality
  - Potential to reduce harmful bacteria in the lakes
  - Restore a more natural hydrology
- Potential for floodplain impacts require mitigation or offset
- Should the criteria include provisions to assess the long-term impact of implementation, and future use of the Lakes (for recreational or otherwise)?
- Include a monitoring matrix (project subject to EPA or other regulatory monitoring (of the receiving waters))
- Rate the importance of this project as it relates to the other projects
- In addition to localized benefits, would the implementation of this project also have the potential to provide systemwide benefits to the Illinois River Valley as a whole?
- Completeness - "Completeness is the extent to which a given alternative plan provides and accounts for all necessary investments or other actions to ensure the realization of the planned effects. This may require relating the plan to other types of public or private plans if the other plans are crucial to realization of the contributions to the objective."
  - Does the Plan/Alternative require investments outside of the Lakes to be effective (i.e. Plan A assumes a 10% reduction in sediment delivery from the Ten Mile Creek Watershed over the next 25 years) or does it stand alone in addressing objectives and problems. – Qualitative
  - Resiliency and Robustness (Sustainability) – How will the Plan respond to changes in the river and/or climate over time beyond the planning area? For example, if the Middle Illinois River Basin experiences a significant increase in frequency of flood events over the next 25 years. Will the plan continue to function and provide the benefits envision? If not, can the plan be adaptively managed to accommodate those larger system changes. Qualitative

- Efficiency - Efficiency is the extent to which an alternative plan is the most cost-effective means of alleviating the specified problems and realizing the specified opportunities, consistent with protecting the Nation's environment."
  - Construction Cost – Rough Order of Magnitude based on previous projects and best available information)
  - Operations and Maintenance Cost - Rough Order of Magnitude based on previous projects and best available information
  - Monitoring and Adaptive Management Cost - Rough Order of Magnitude based on previous projects and best available information
  - Cost Effectiveness & Incremental Cost Analysis
- Effective - "Effectiveness is the extent to which an alternative plan alleviates the specified problems and achieves the specified opportunities."
  - Habitat Benefits (Average Annual Habitat Benefits) – We would not develop specific models for this planning exercise but would use existing order of magnitude benefits from other similar types of projects that have been built. For example, we know the habitat benefits of islands and moist soil management (local drawdowns) on the Illinois River. We can scale those numbers to our alternatives for a relative comparison. This is also a qualitative description of benefits. – Quasi Quantitative
  - Recreation Benefits – Qualitative
- Acceptability - "Acceptability is the workability and viability of the alternative plan with respect to acceptance by State and local entities and the public and compatibility with existing laws, regulations, and public policies."