

**ROCK RIVER WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING MINUTES
ROCK RIVER WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT
MARCH 10, 2021**

Greg Cassaro called the Rock River Watershed Group to order at 9:56AM. The meeting was held both via Webex and in the Board Room at the Graceffa Administration Building, 3501 Kishwaukee Street, Rockford, Illinois. Non-voting members attended through Webex, voting members and officers attended in person.

Attendees responded to roll call for voting members of the board.

Voting Board members present: Jeff Reininger, South Beloit; Dan Barber, Rockton; Adam Lanning, Rochelle; Greg Cassaro, RRWRD; Michael Christensen, RRWRD; Anne George, Woodstock; Brent Anderson, Belvidere; Josh McNitt, Dixon; Rob Boyer, Freeport; Ed Cox, Rockfalls.

Cassaro opened the floor for discussion of last month's meeting minutes.
Cassaro asked that a motion be made to approve the minutes.
Barber made the motion.
Christensen seconded.
Cassaro called for a vote.
All AYES were declared.
Minutes from last month's meeting are approved.

Cassaro turned the floor over to Barber for the Treasurer's Report. Barber stated that the bank account is now officially open. He has received the last of the seed money provided by the agency members and will be getting everything deposited shortly.
Barber asked that a motion be made to approve of the reimbursement to Rock River Water Reclamation District for their payment to set up the 501(c)(3) and the Articles of Incorporation.
Cassaro made the motion.
Anderson seconded.
Cassaro called for a vote.
All AYES were declared.
The RRWG will reimburse the Rock River Water Reclamation District for fees incurred in setting up the Group.

Cassaro then gave the floor over to the visiting consulting firm for their presentation. Deuchler/Geosyntec/Black & Veatch discussed with the Group the variety of their team across

the separate consulting agencies, their varying levels of expertise in developing a NARP workplan, and the timeline to which the Group can expect to work within. Outlined were four main tasks to be completed in this process;

1. Review the NARP special conditions, as the language is not always consistent, and determine the minimally required components.
2. The bulk of the work will come from here in the actual gathering of background data, and comparing the information from end to end of the watershed.
3. Identifying the data, and determining if the data provides a complete picture. Questioning if there is enough data to supply to the IEPA and how can this data be forecasted in the future.
4. Documenting everything in a way that's easily comprehensible. From here, using the information available to determine objectives and costs and communicate this material to the IEPA.

In the Q&A portion of the presentation, Cassaro asked the firm if any of the NARPs they have completed for watershed groups in the past have been formally submitted to the IEPA. The firm responded that no NARPs have been submitted in its end stage yet as the process in creating a NARP workplan is a multi-year project that requires time, meetings, and many discussions on how to budget out expense costs over the process. Cassaro also asked if our NARP due date, currently set at the end of 2023, is an obtainable goal. The firm responded that it may be able to meet the deadline, however recommended that the RRWG remain in contact with the IEPA about our progress and they may be able to extend the deadline. The firm also told the Group that they are unable to commit to a formal cost estimate for their services. The firm would only be able to present a price for their services once the scope of the work has been finalized.

Hearing no other questions or comments, Cassaro thanked Deuchler/Geosyntec/Black & Veatch for coming in and having this discussion. Once the firm left, the Group discussed their thoughts on the presentation. Barber noted that the Group needs to make a choice and get moving if they'd like to stay on target for the 2023/2024 deadline of the NARP. Cox agreed, stating that everything is contingent on the data, how much they need to collect and analyze, and the Group needs to get started on that as soon as possible. Cassaro responded that the Group is welcome to continue discussing the firm if there is more to go over, but said he liked and would want to move forward with them. Reininger, Anderson, and George expressed similar sentiments.

Cassaro asked that a motion be made to accept the Deuchler proposal and request them to provide a scope of work to determine future costs.

Barber made the motion.

Cox seconded.

Cassaro called for a vote.

All AYES were declared.

Motion carries for Deuchler to help the RRWG in the building of a NARP workplan. Lanning will reach back out to them to let them know our decision.

At this point, Cassaro moved the Group onto Old Business to further discuss ideas on the dues structure. Original discussions on this matter included a \$4/active account from each agency. While Cassaro noted that \$4/account will provide the Group some extra wiggle room financially, Anderson posed the question if \$4 is too much to ask for right off the bat. George responded that it's easier to complete the big ask first of \$4/account and then readjust to a lower amount later if the costs necessary to complete the workplan turn out to be less burdensome. It was determined at Anderson's suggestion that the Group should wait to finalize the dues structure until after Deuchler provides a scope for the work and the estimated costs.

On a note to New Business, Cassaro asked the Group to keep in mind the dues structure cost for associate members. It's worth mentioning that these two associate members, the City of Rockford and Winnebago County, are not obligated to be a part of the Group and should not be held to the same financial obligations as are required from agency members.

Cassaro asked the Group if there were any other reports from officers or committees. Action items for next meeting includes Lanning reaching out to Deuchler for the scope, as the Group is looking to have an approved contract as soon as possible. The Group also needs to keep the dues structure cost per active account in mind for both agency and associate members. Additionally, Reininger asked that the Group consider his proposal: each year, the agency members should resubmit their listing of active accounts in order to verify that each agency is being charged accurately. The Group should be ready to discuss this at the next meeting, and determine required dates for serviceable accounts submittal by agency. If dues are to be submitted by June 1st, service account submittals should be due before that. Cassaro asked the group if there were any additional comments or concerns before the meeting adjourned, to which no member responded. The next meeting will be scheduled **Wednesday, April 14th at 10:00AM.**

Cassaro asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Anderson made the motion.

Barber seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05AM.