

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



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

Friday, May 11, 2018 at 12:30 pm
456 Fulton Street, Suite 401
Peoria, Illinois 61602

MEETING GOALS

Review and finalize Project Objectives
Review and finalize Conservation Alternatives

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes for April 19, 2018
4. Housekeeping
 - a. Meeting goals
5. Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan
 - a. Comprehensive Conservation Plan Objectives
 - i. Comments received regarding objectives
 - b. USACE Conservation Alternatives
6. Member Reports
 - a. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
 - b. The Nature Conservancy
 - c. Heartland Water Resources Council
7. Other
 - a. Next scheduled meeting(s)
 - i. Tuesday, June 5, 2018
8. Adjournment

PEORIA LAKES BASIN ALLIANCE
Thursday, April 19, 2018 at 12:00 pm
456 Fulton Street, Suite 401
Peoria, Illinois 61602

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Miller called the meeting to order at 12:00 pm

Attendees

The Nature Conservancy:	Jason Beverlin, and Doug Blodgett
Heartland Water Resources Council:	Wayne Ingram, and Tom Tincher
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission:	Reema Abi-Akar, Michael Bruner, Eric Miller and Ray Lees
US Army Corps of Engineers:	Chuck Thieling
Also present:	Eng Seng Loh

2. Public Comment

No public comment

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes for January 9, 2018 and January 23, 2018

Beverlin moved to approve January 9, 2018 and January 23, 2018 minutes and Crawford seconded. Motion carried.

4. Housekeeping

a. Meeting goals

Aki-Akar stated the purpose of today's meeting is to review and discuss the project objectives and Conservation Alternatives developed by the USACE.

5. Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan

a. Beneficial Use of Dredged Material Update

- Bruner/Thieling explained the USACE mandate of beneficial use of dredged material, and to have emphasis on inland waterways. The Central interest to have a Comprehensive Plan to try and deliver the product from the river to a profitable measure. Need to find some funding to do this, and create a commercial model of benefits.
- Miller said that IDOT SPR funds of \$20 million could possibly be used for research side of study. It is a possible source of funding.
- Seng Loh commented we need to reconstruct the lake and what it brings to Peoria, and this is a way to fund the environmental restoration.

- Tincher commented that as we develop this plan we also need to keep in mind the possibility and benefit of lakefront improvements.
 - Seng Loh said the whole project is to enable the project to benefit community and economic values.
 - Abi-Akar explained the fact sheets and recommended the studies by Chuck and Wayne.
 - Crawford questioned the Island Design workshop and Thieling explained the full study of the Island design workshop and that the Comprehensive Aquatic Ecosystem Model (CASM) is already complete.
 - Miller commented we need to have all the studies to get more complete benefits of what needs to be done.
- b. Comprehensive Conservation Plan Objectives
 Bruner explained the objectives and after a review of them these are the results and changes:

Objective 1: Reduce total sediment delivery to the Peoria Lakes (measured by reduction of annual tonnage of sediment ~~exiting~~entering the Peoria Pool).

Objective 2: Increase the acreage of ~~floating leaf emergent plants and submerged~~ aquatic vegetation.

Objective 3: ~~Achieve Illinois EPA nutrient standards by emphasizing urban green infrastructure and utilizing wetlands to naturally filter pollutants from runoff and lake water.~~ Improve Peoria Lakes water quality.

Objective 4: ~~Restore~~Improve and protect wetland acres, floodplain acres, and ~~riparian habitat~~ stream~~bank~~ miles in the ~~local watershed~~Peoria Lakes.

Objective 5: ~~Restore~~Improve and protect river bluff and steep slope areas ~~through local zoning and stormwater/erosion control BMPs.~~

- Blodgett stated that if we wanted to include this objective we would need to change the scope from waters edge to bluff to bluff.
- The PLBA unanimously agreed to this scope change.

Objective 6: ~~Redirect sediment accumulation to~~Improve and diversify deep-water habitat and ~~navigable channels~~increase numbers of native fish.

Objective 7: Identify environmentally ~~ly~~ and commercially ~~ly~~beneficial use of dredged material ~~to help spur regional growth.~~

Objective 8: Increase ~~numbers and biomass of native fishes, as well as increase~~ recreational use of the Peoria Lakes.

~~Objective 9: Reduce peak flows in the Lakes and local tributaries by reducing the volume of stormwater runoff.~~

~~Objective 10-9: Provide educational opportunities to the general public and stakeholders to ultimately i~~ Improve regional awareness and ~~buy in support.~~

6. Members Reports

- a. Heartland Water Resources Council
Tincher presented the 4 projects they are working on and a comprehensive map.
- b. The Nature Conservancy
Nothing to report
- c. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
Miller talked about the IDNR's C2000 program called " Spring Creek Preserve Forested Bluff Restoration"

Other

Next scheduled meeting

Bruner said next meeting is May 8, 2018

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm

Peoria Lakes Comprehensive Conservation Plan - Fact Sheet Objective and Benefit Matrix (Consolidated)

Objectives		1		2		3				4			5			6			7		8	9	
		Sediment Load Reduction (Local)	Sediment Management	Sediment Resuspension Reduction / Wave Blockage	Flow Reduction / Percolation	Nutrient Reduction	Bacteria / Pathogen Reduction	TMDL* / LRS* Compliance	Hydroperiod Restoration	River Bank Erosion Reduction	Rooted vegetation / Marsh Habitat Creation	Land Resource Protection	Upland Habitat Creation / Enhancement	Infrastructure Protection	Sediment Flushing	Deep Water Habitat Creation	Invasive Species Management	Habitat Diversity	Navigation	Sediment Placement	Financial / Funding	Recreation	Community Awareness
Fact Sheet	Benefits																						
Objective Impact		17		7		36			15				19		23				14		5	9	
Systemwide																							
Fact Sheets 4, 34	Beneficial Use of Sediment		•				•	•							•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fact Sheet 24	Educational Component				•																		•
In-Lake																							
Fact Sheet 1, 28	Backwater Restoration		•	•											•		•	•	•				
Fact Sheet 3, 9	Drawdowns		•	•			•	•	•						•		•	•	•				
Fact Sheet 2, 4, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34	Dredging and Sediment Placement (Deepwater creation)		•	•											•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fact Sheet 7, 8, 31	Island Creation		•	•					•					•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fact Sheet 11, 30	Secondary Channel		•	•										•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fact Sheet 13	Submersed Aquatic Vegetation (Breakwaters)		•	•	•	•			•				•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fact Sheet 6, 23	Invasive Fish Species														•		•			•			•
Adjacent																							
Fact Sheet 5, 28	Floodplain Recapture	•			•	•		•	•								•						
Fact Sheet 12, 20	Sediment Detention Basins	•				•		•															
Fact Sheet 30, 35, 36	Conservation / Recreation Corridor Anchors																			•	•	•	•
Watershed																							
Fact Sheet 10, 16	Prairie and Bluff Restoration & Management	•			•	•		•					•	•	•								•
Fact Sheet 15	Tributary Stream Stabilization	•				•		•	•				•										
Fact Sheet 17, 18	Erosion Control BMPs* (incl. River Bluff, Steep Slope, Ravine, & Gully Stabilization & Management)	•			•	•		•					•	•	•								•
Fact Sheet 19, 25, 26	Urban Stormwater Hydrologic Modification BMP* (incl. Rain Barrels, Rain Gardens)	•			•	•	•	•		•			•	•	•								•
Fact Sheet 22	Agricultural Water BMPs*	•			•	•	•	•		•			•	•	•								•
Fact Sheet 27	Water Quality BMPs*	•			•	•	•	•		•			•	•	•		•			•			•
Fact Sheet 28	Nutrient Farming	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•	•	•		•			•			•

Recommended Studies	
Fact Sheet 21	Hydrogeomorphic Study
	Lake sediment characterization
	Island design Workshop
	Sediment Market Transportation Optimization
	Commercial Sediment Market Economic Analysis
	Sediment Use Investigations/Specifications
	Water Utility Sediment Market Analysis (CASM)

Objectives	
Objective 1:	Reduce total sediment delivery to the Peoria Lakes (measured by reduction of annual tonnage of sediment entering the Peoria Pool).
Objective 2:	Increase the acreage of aquatic vegetation.
Objective 3:	Improve Peoria Lakes water quality.
Objective 4:	Improve and protect wetland acres, floodplain acres, and streambank miles in the Peoria Lakes.
Objective 5:	Improve and protect river bluff and steep slope areas.
Objective 6:	Improve and diversify deep-water habitat and increase numbers of native fish.
Objective 7:	Identify environmental and commercial use of dredged material.
Objective 8:	Increase recreational use of the Peoria Lakes.
Objective 9:	Improve regional awareness and support.

- Hydrology
- Geomorphology
- Biota
- Economic Development / Social

*BMP = Best Management Practices
 *TMDL = Total Maximum Daily Load
 *LRS = Load Reduction Strategies

Scope: Blufftop to Blufftop

Objective 1: Reduce total sediment delivery to the Peoria Lakes (measured by reduction of annual tonnage of sediment ~~exiting~~entering the Peoria Pool).

Objective 2: Increase the acreage of ~~floating leaf emergent plants and submerged~~ aquatic vegetation.

Objective 3: ~~Achieve Illinois EPA nutrient standards by emphasizing urban green infrastructure and utilizing wetlands to naturally filter pollutants from runoff and lake water.~~ Improve Peoria Lakes water quality.

Objective 4: ~~Restore~~Improve and protect wetland acres, floodplain acres, and ~~riparian habitat~~ streambank miles in the ~~local watershed~~Peoria Lakes.

Objective 5: ~~Restore~~Improve and protect river bluff and steep slope areas ~~through local zoning and stormwater/erosion control BMPs.~~

Objective 6: ~~Redirect sediment accumulation to~~Improve and diversify deep-water habitat and ~~navigable channels~~increase numbers of native fish.

Objective 7: Identify environmentally ~~ly~~ and commercially ~~beneficial~~ use of dredged material ~~to help spur regional growth.~~

Objective 8: Increase ~~numbers and biomass of native fishes, as well as increase~~ recreational use of the Peoria Lakes.

Objective 9: ~~Reduce peak flows in the Lakes and local tributaries by reducing the volume of stormwater runoff.~~

Objective 10-9: ~~Provide educational opportunities to the general public and stakeholders to ultimately~~Improve regional awareness and ~~buy in~~support.



Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>

Peoria Lakes Comp. Conservation Plan Objectives

Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>

Thu, Apr 19, 2018 at 4:17 PM

To: Doug Blodgett <dblodgett@tnc.org>, Jason Beverlin <jbeverlin@tnc.org>, Russ Crawford <russ@mtco.com>, Stephen Van Winkle <vw691@sbcglobal.net>, Tom Tincher <tincher@mtco.com>, Wayne Ingram <wayne.ingram2@amec.com>, E Loh <esloh888@yahoo.com>, "Theiling, Charles H ERD-MS" <Charles.H.Theiling@usace.army.mil>, "Frohlich, Wendy M CIV (US)" <Wendy.M.Frohlich@usace.army.mil>

Cc: Eric Miller <emiller@tricountyrpc.org>, Ray Lees <rlees@tricountyrpc.org>, Debbie Ulrich <dulrich@tricountyrpc.org>, Reema Abi-Akar <rabiakar@tricountyrpc.org>

Good afternoon,

Thank you for a great meeting this afternoon. I know it was a long, but it was very productive, and we got a lot done. Thank you, Chuck, for traveling all the way from Vicksburg, MS to be in the room during the meeting. It was very helpful to have you in person versus over the phone.

Below are the edited scope and objectives. I have attached two documents to this email. The first document shows the changes made to each objective. The second document is Chuck's conservation alternatives. Also, please be aware that after the meeting it came to our attention that Tuesday, May 8th is a conflict for some PLBA members. Would **Friday, May 11 at 12:30** work for everyone?

Thanks,

Michael & Reema

-

Scope: Blufftop to Blufftop

Objective 1: Reduce total sediment delivery to the Peoria Lakes (measured by reduction of annual tonnage of sediment entering the Peoria Pool).

Objective 2: Increase the acreage of aquatic vegetation.

Objective 3: Improve Peoria Lakes water quality.

Objective 4: Improve and protect wetland acres, floodplain acres, and streambank miles in the Peoria Lakes.

Objective 5: Improve and protect river bluff and steep slope areas.

Objective 6: Improve and diversify deep-water habitat and increase numbers of native fish.

Objective 7: Identify environmental and commercial use of dredged material.

Objective 8: Increase recreational use of the Peoria Lakes.

Objective 9: Improve regional awareness and support.



Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>

Peoria Lakes Comp. Conservation Plan Objectives

Doug Blodgett <dblodgett@tnc.org>

Thu, Apr 26, 2018 at 7:27 AM

To: Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>, Jason Beverlin <jbeverlin@tnc.org>, Russ Crawford <russ@mtco.com>, Stephen Van Winkle <vw691@sbcglobal.net>, Tom Tincher <tincher@mtco.com>, Wayne Ingram <wayne.ingram2@amec.com>, E Loh <esloh888@yahoo.com>, "Theiling, Charles H ERD-MS" <Charles.H.Theiling@usace.army.mil>, "Frohlich, Wendy M CIV (US)" <Wendy.M.Frohlich@usace.army.mil>, Eric Miller <emiller@tricountyrpc.org>, Ray Lees <rlees@tricountyrpc.org>, Debbie Ulrich <dulrich@tricountyrpc.org>, Reema Abi-Akar <rabiakar@tricountyrpc.org>

Sorry for the length of this email, but we think it beneficial if we in the PLBA can all be on the same page, and we feel it's especially important when we are bringing in folks from outside our group for this project.

From our perspective at The Nature Conservancy, we are not opposed to adding conservation objectives and in fact can see such could be very beneficial to the planning process if done well. It gives us a good way to evaluate projects. But we think if we are going to add conservation objectives, they need to be logical, well thought out, parallel with each other, and fit well into our planning process so they don't become an impediment-- to spring other on our stakeholders, the Project Review Committee and the planning process at this late date could cause additional challenges that outweigh the benefits.

As this is to be a conservation plan, we feel our main objectives would best be true conservation objectives (conservation outcomes or WHATs) and not be confounded by existing ideas of how we will go about achieving our objectives (i.e., actions/activities/projects/means or HOWs), regardless of how important those HOWs are.

Another way to describe conservation objectives is as desired conservation goals or endpoints—things that are important in and of their own accord and not because they are a means to some other endpoint. We suggest some form of the first 6 objectives could be good endpoints and true conservation objectives.

However, we don't believe those listed as objectives 7-9 are really conservation objectives even though they are certainly actions/activities/HOWs that are very important and could help us achieve true conservation objectives/outcomes. We worry mixing actions (HOWs) in with true end-point conservation objectives will lead to trying to compare apples and pizza, muddling the process and giving us less credibility and a less valuable product.

A couple of examples -- we agree public outreach and support are very important, but to us, they are important means (actions/HOWs) for achieving conservation objectives and not true conservation objectives. Support alone doesn't improve the conservation values of Peoria Lakes, like topographic diversity, aquatic vegetation, and improved water quality do. Support is a HOW and as such they should not be mixed in with true conservation objectives that will be used to evaluate and score other activities/projects/means.

Likewise, we think finding uses of dredged material is a critically important, high-priority activity—one that will contribute to several true conservation objectives such as creating topographic diversity, improving water quality, and restoring plant communities. And as part of a project/measure/alternative, it should score high and be a priority for how we achieve conservation objectives. But in our opinion, it's a HOW and not a conservation objective.

After identifying objectives, it seems a next logical step will be to see how well different actions/activities/measures/projects/alternatives (HOWs) help us achieve those conservation objectives—we may prioritize projects based on our

estimates of how well they will help achieve our conservation objectives. It will be confusing to have things like outreach to build support and identifying beneficial uses of dredged material as both objectives and actions/measures/projects/alternatives.

From our scope for the current planning process: The Army Corps of Engineers will develop a list of possible Peoria Lakes conservation projects and studies that would help achieve the following vision for the Peoria Lakes:

A vibrant body of clean water with mixed water depths to sustain healthy natural habitats supporting abundant and diverse native plants and animals which contributes to our quality of life by providing increased opportunity for safe recreation, education, compatible transportation and economic development, and enjoyment by divergent constituent interests.

We think the conservation objectives (WHATs) are clean water, mixed depths, healthy natural habitats supporting abundant and diverse native plant communities that collectively contribute to our quality of life. We believe collectively those conservation objectives will provide important opportunities for recreation, education, transportation, etc., but I don't think our conservation plan needs to plan all those, although certainly we need to be aware of them. Instead, our plan needs to identify the best HOWs (dredging, water level management, public outreach) for achieving the agreed to WHATs (objectives) using the WHATs to assess the effectiveness of the projects.

So, our suggestion is that we need to work on identifying and agreeing to a good set of true conservation objectives. If instead the group wants to accept what the Conservancy see as a mismatched list that includes both WHATs and HOWs as objectives, we can live with that, but we suggest something so important deserves a vote by PLBA members so that it is a clear decision of the group to continue that path.

We also still don't understand the use of geographical boundaries as alternatives.

We appreciate everyone's dedication to the Peoria Lakes and know we all want and intend the comprehensive conservation plan to have credibility and be useful. It's possible we at the Conservancy are overthinking this and these details of the planning process aren't that important, but our experience has been that clarity is extremely important in these efforts.

We should be available to meet at 12:30PM on Friday 11 May at Tri-County.

Doug and Jason

From: Michael Bruner [mailto:mbruner@tricountyrpc.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 4:17 PM

To: Doug Blodgett <dblodgett@TNC.ORG>; Jason Beverlin <jbeverlin@tnc.org>; Russ Crawford <russ@mtco.com>; Stephen Van Winkle <vw691@sbcglobal.net>; Tom Tincher <tincher@mtco.com>; Wayne Ingram <wayne.ingram2@amec.com>; E Loh <esloh888@yahoo.com>; Theiling, Charles H ERD-MS <Charles.H.Theiling@usace.army.mil>; Frohlich, Wendy M CIV (US) <Wendy.M.Frohlich@usace.army.mil>

Cc: Eric Miller <emiller@tricountyrpc.org>; Ray Lees <rlees@tricountyrpc.org>; Debbie Ulrich <dulrich@tricountyrpc.org>; Reema Abi-Akar <rabiakar@tricountyrpc.org>

Subject: Peoria Lakes Comp. Conservation Plan Objectives



Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>

Peoria Lakes Comp. Conservation Plan Objectives

russ@mtco.com <russ@mtco.com>

Thu, Apr 26, 2018 at 10:58 AM

To: Doug Blodgett <dblodgett@tnc.org>, Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>, Jason Beverlin <jbeverlin@tnc.org>, Stephen Van Winkle <vw691@sbcglobal.net>, Tom Tincher <tincher@mtco.com>, Wayne Ingram <wayne.ingram2@amec.com>, E Loh <esloh888@yahoo.com>, "Theiling, Charles H ERD-MS" <Charles.H.Theiling@usace.army.mil>, "Frohlich, Wendy M CIV (US)" <Wendy.M.Frohlich@usace.army.mil>, Eric Miller <emiller@tricountyrpc.org>, Ray Lees <rlees@tricountyrpc.org>, Debbie Ulrich <dulrich@tricountyrpc.org>, Reema Abi-Akar <rabiakar@tricountyrpc.org>

Doug/Jason.

I agree with this and am also available May 11 at 12:30p. My original inquiry remains however. Namely, since we initiated a Beneficial Sediment Use (BSU), what is the best method to integrate it into the Comprehensive Conservation Plan Project (CCPP). If we were going to simply ignore the BSU, we should have never invited Dr. Marlin to come present and invite many critical important stakeholders who want to finally move forward on this.

This horse has already left the barn. We cannot put the genie back in the bottle. So, how does PLBA integrate it into the CCPP. It requires endorsement and support from us.

I will agree to strip away all Hows but I cannot ignore the BSU issue at this point. Allow its inclusion, however you do so, and you have my full support.

Russ

Sent from my Verizon LG Smartphone

----- Original message-----

From: Doug Blodgett

Date: Thu, Apr 26, 2018 7:27 AM

To: Michael Bruner; Jason Beverlin; Russ Crawford; Stephen Van Winkle; Tom Tincher; Wayne Ingram; E Loh; Theiling, Charles H ERD-MS; Frohlich, Wendy M CIV (US); Eric Miller; Ray Lees; Debbie Ulrich; Reema Abi-Akar;

Cc:

Subject: RE: Peoria Lakes Comp. Conservation Plan Objectives

Sorry for the length of this email, but we think it beneficial if we in the PLBA can all be on the same page, and we feel it's especially important when we are bringing in folks from outside our group for this project.

From our perspective at The Nature Conservancy, we are not opposed to adding conservation objectives and in fact can see such could be very beneficial to the planning process if done well. It gives us a good way to evaluate projects. But we think if we are going to add conservation objectives, they need to be logical, well thought out, parallel with each other, and fit well into our planning process so they don't become an impediment-- to spring other on our stakeholders, the Project Review Committee and the planning process at this late date could cause additional challenges that outweigh the benefits.

As this is to be a conservation plan, we feel our main objectives would best be true conservation objectives (conservation outcomes or WHATs) and not be confounded by existing ideas of how we will go about achieving our objectives (i.e., actions/activities/projects/means or HOWs), regardless of how important those HOWs are.

Another way to describe conservation objectives is as desired conservation goals or endpoints—things that are important in and of their own accord and not because they are a means to some other endpoint. We suggest some form of the first 6 objectives could be good endpoints and true conservation objectives.



Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>

Peoria Lakes Comp. Conservation Plan Objectives

Theiling, Charles H ERD-MS <Charles.H.Theiling@usace.army.mil>

Thu, Apr 26, 2018 at 9:32 AM

To: Doug Blodgett <dblodgett@tnc.org>, Michael Bruner <mbruner@tricountyrpc.org>, Jason Beverlin <jbeverlin@tnc.org>, Russ Crawford <russ@mtco.com>, Stephen Van Winkle <vw691@sbcglobal.net>, Tom Tincher <tincher@mtco.com>, Wayne Ingram <wayne.ingram2@amec.com>, E Loh <esloh888@yahoo.com>, "Frohlich, Wendy M CIV (US)" <Wendy.M.Frohlich@usace.army.mil>, Eric Miller <emiller@tricountyrpc.org>, Ray Lees <rlees@tricountyrpc.org>, Debbie Ulrich <dulrich@tricountyrpc.org>, Reema Abi-Akar <rabiakar@tricountyrpc.org>

Thank you for the comprehensive thoughts Doug.

TNC is a great conservation planning organization as your attention to details in this note illustrates. You were absolutely correct at our meeting last week and below; objectives are not actions. Planning details and process are important and this partner review of the draft objective will certainly improve them.

I think most folks will concur with your comments also. I suspect my participation May 11 will be by phone. In the meantime Michael and Reema will work on updating the language in the objectives.

We can discuss the structure of the proposed alternatives also. I'll quickly remind everyone that my thought was that each alternative needs to be "complete" and include: Source-Pathway-Sink considerations. That is each alternative had to address the watershed, adjacent, and in-lake issues or else in-lake restoration alone will fail. The Corps then typically creates alternatives of different size or objectives. With each alternative being "complete" I thought the geographic partitioning was a way to scale the size/effort of alternatives. The parts of the lake have different impacts and objectives that can create fairly unique alternatives I thought. Several smaller alternatives are frequently combined to a single large alternative for the largest cost/effort.

These are all evaluated in a cost:benefit in a feasibility study, but we won't get there in a PAS project.

Take Good Care of Yourself and Have a Wonderful Time Ahead,

Chuck

Chuck Theiling PhD
Research Ecologist
US Army Corps of Engineers
Engineer Research and Development Center
Environmental Lab
Vicksburg, MS
Charles.h.theiling@usace.army.mil
O 601-634-3684
C 563-210-4350

[Quoted text hidden]

Website: tricountyrpc.org <Blockedhttp://tricountyrpc.org>

Categories	Fact Sheets	Measures	Alternatives				Comments
			Lower Peoria Lake	Middle Peoria Lake	Upper Peoria Lake	Entire Peoria Lake	
Hydrology	Fact Sheets 3, 9	Drawdowns	1	5	2	8	Entire lake drawdowns are unlikely because of infrastructure conflicts. Barrier island management areas can be created to periodically isolate coves/bays and draw them down.
	Fact Sheets 11, 30	Secondary Channel	1		1	2	
	Fact Sheet 19	Urban Stormwater Hydrologic Modification BMP (incl. rain barrels, rain gardens)	CSO				
	Fact Sheet 22	Agricultural Water Best Management Practices	Few	Some	Many	Many	
Geo-morphology	Fact Sheets 1, 28	Backwater Restoration	2 - 3	5 - 8	2 - 3	9 - 14	Could be established as experimental units
	Fact Sheets 2, 4, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34	Deepwater Area Creation, Dredging and Sediment Placement	X	X	X	X	See Backwater
	Fact Sheets 7, 8, 31	Island Creation	X	X	X	X	See Backwater
	Fact Sheets 12, 20	Sediment Detention Basins	Uncertain	10	5	>15	Requires survey work or new spatial analyses
	Fact Sheet 15	Tributary Stream Stabilization	Few	Most	Few		
Fact Sheets 17, 18	Erosion Control BMPs (incl. River Bluff, Steep Slope, Ravine, & Gully Stabilization & Management)	Uncertain	10	5	>15		
Habitat	Fact Sheets 10, 16	Prairie and Bluff Restoration & Management	X	X	X	X	These could be mapped and measured
	Fact Sheet 13	Submersed Aquatic Vegetation (Breakwaters)	X	X	X	X	See Backwater, can replace islands to some extent
	Fact Sheets 5, 28	Floodplain Recapture	None	Most	Some	Lots	These could be mapped and measured
	Fact Sheets 30, 35, 36	Conservation / Recreation Corridor Anchors	None	Most	Some	Lots	These could be mapped and measured
Biota	Fact Sheets 6, 23	Invasive Fish Species	X	X	X	X	
Social	Fact Sheet 24	Educational Component	X	X	X	X	
Economic	Fact Sheets 4, 34	Beneficial Use of Sediment	X	X	X	X	
	Fact Sheets 25, 26, 27, 28	Nutrient Farming (Water Utility)	X				
Recommended Studies	Fact Sheet 21	Hydrogeomorphic Study Lake sediment characterization Island design Workshop Sediment Market Transportation Optimization Commercial Sediment Market Economic Analysis Sediment Use Investigations/Specifications Water Utility Sediment Market Analysis (CASM)					