

Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan Public Comment Response Document for Comments Received as of 03/19/26

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
1	Error which currently reads: "Table 3-34Error! Reference source not found. contains a summary of h"	Susan Pribyl	3/7/2025	Page 3-77	Corrected.
2	Correction: LLISA - Long Lake Sanitation Association should read as: LLISA - Long Lake Improvement and Sanitation Association	Susan Pribyl	3/7/2025	Page 6-4	Corrected.
3	Thanks for all the information you've put out on this effort. I won't be attending an information meeting but wanted to express my appreciation at the work you are doing to keep Lake County working!	Laura De Spain	3/27/2025	Not Provided	Noted. Thank you!
4	On page 3-42 in the first paragraph, it looks like the phrase about the footpaths, gravel, concrete, and asphalt trails" is kind of repeated in the first and second sentences.	Sharene Gould Dulabaum	3/31/2025	Page 3-42	Corrected.
5	On page 4-53 in the fourth paragraph, it looks like the word watershed" is not capitalized in "watershed Development Ordinance" in the first sentence.	Sharene Gould Dulabaum	3/31/2025	Page 4-53	Corrected.
6	On page 7-16, in the description for Table 7-9, it mentions Year 1 (adoption) as 2024, Year 2 as 2025, and Year 7 as 2030. I wasn't sure if this should be updated.	Sharene Gould Dulabaum	3/31/2025	Page 7-16	Corrected.
7	We met recently with James Fitzgerald from the LCHD (copied here) regarding the possibility of carp reduction projects for both Long Lake and Round Lake since both lakes have public access, Long Lake via the Lake County Forest Preserves and Round Lake via the Village of Round Lake Beach, and the Village of Round Lake Park. As you may be aware, the LCHD (along the LCFPD) have utilized electrofishing to reduce carp populations in eight local lakes. James outlined for us the success they've had with their project entitled "Removal of Carp to Reduce Nutrient Enrichment in Impaired Lakes in Lake County." James has mentioned the possibility of our volunteer groups working jointly with LCHD and IDNR in the future to utilize electrofishing for carp reduction.	Susan Pribyl	4/1/2025	Table 6-19	Added to plan. See LK150 and LK151.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
	Thus, we would like to request that in the updated Manitou Creek Watershed Plan Table 6-19 Recommended Lake Actions, "Reduce carp populations" be added for both Long Lake and Round Lake. Lead partners for Long Lake would be LCHD, HOA (LLISA), IDNR. For Round Lake, partners would be LCHD, Round Lake Management Commission, IDNR.				
8	On page 3-85 the Table 3-37 states that Round Lake has 100% no erosion. This should not be the case. In the 2019 Water Quality Lake Report LCHD found about 50% slight, 14% Moderate, and 0.6% with Severe erosion.	James Fitzgerald	4/15/2025	Table 3-37	Corrected.
9	First, what does "ND" mean? Is it data that was non-detect, or was it not a parameter that was taken, or something else? I see that DO is considered ND for many of the lakes, LCHD has DO numbers for all these lakes. This is also true for South Churchill Lake; most parameters are ND, but LCHD has numbers that I can share.	James Fitzgerald	4/15/2025	Table 3-47.	ND means Not Detected. NA means Not Analyzed. These notes have been included in the revised Chapter 3 document. The LCHD spreadsheet data was reviewed, and NA was reported within the table instead of ND, where appropriate. DO data has been removed from the table because most results previously provided by LCHD are reported as oxic versus anoxic (instead of quantitatively), and because it is not appropriate to summarize data collected at different depths as one reading.
10	What I believe to be the biggest issue with this table is that it appears that TP, TSS, and COND are all averages of epilimnion data only, but the rest of the parameters appear to average both the epilimnion and hypolimnion data. This does not give a representative data point, nor is it how this data is generally interpreted for use by the LCHD and other entities. For example, Cranberry Lake states DO at 3.77, but it should use only the epilimnion values and be 7.17 (and it had no readings under the 5.0 threshold). This data analysis will go on to affect both results and conclusions in the rest of the plan.	James Fitzgerald	4/15/2025	Table 3-47.	The table was updated to reflect epilimnion data only, and a note was included to reflect this in the text. The figures were also updated to reflect the epilimnion data only. Hey also included a note directing readers to view LCHD Lake reports for detailed water quality data for each individual lake, given that the average annual values do not tell a detailed story for the water quality data collected at each lake.
11	On page 3-105 the discussion of TP, and P in general it may be helpful to discuss the P bans that were put in place around 2010 and how that positively affected lakes (and how this could change P values for current day data vs pre-2010 data).	James Fitzgerald	4/15/2025	Page 3-105	Added to plan. See section 3.16.3.3.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
12	<p>Also on this page, the discussion of ranges is confusing to me. It may be clearer to say that SRP ranged from less than 0.005-0.472, instead of 0.005-0.472. This would accurately report when the SRP was below the detection limit at Hook Lake for example. This same observation holds true for the reporting of the range of results for all parameters with results below detection limits (i.e. NH3-N, and NO3 on this particular page). This lack of treating non-detects as data is not just in the ranges. The Figures also don't consider when parameters were collected but were below detection limits. For example, Figure 3-59 states that "Lakes without monitoring data for this parameter are not included in the figure", but data was collected and provided for lakes not in the Figure; the values were below detection limits. It is important that these values are included and represented as they show the lack of some nutrients at sample collection.</p>	James Fitzgerald	4/15/2025	Page 3-105	<p>The language has been revised to state "less than" the detection limit throughout this section, where appropriate. The figure captions have been revised to state "Lakes without monitoring data above laboratory detection limits for this parameter are not included in the figure" when non-detects were included in the data. The figures have been updated to include epilimnion data only, as summarized in Table 3-47. The figures do not include non-detects due to the lack of a value to represent each corresponding lake. Individual lakes should be assessed using the appropriate LCHD lake reports, as this watershed-based plan only provides a summary.</p>
13	<p>Request consideration of a separate table of programmatic lake actions for all lakes in the watershed.</p>	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Table 6-19	<p>Added to plan. See Table 6-20.</p>
14	<p>What was the process for soliciting input from specific lake associations including their preferred recommended actions and past monitoring efforts?</p>	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Table 6-19	<p>Input was solicited through public information meetings on 03/06/24, 03/11/24, 04/24/24, 06/12/24, 07/24/24, 09/11/24, 12/11/24, 04/09/25, and 04/10/25. Meeting notification emails were sent through GovDelivery using SMC's contact database. The number of recipients for each email ranged from 3,491 - 3,784. Meeting notifications were also posted in SMC's April 2024, June 2024, August 2024, September 2024, December 2024, and April 2025 Mainstream newsletters. SMC did social media posts for this watershed plan on 04/29/25, 04/07/25, 03/12/25, 12/10/24, 12/02/24, 08/23/24, 08/09/24, 07/11/24, 06/11/24, 06/07/24, 04/23/24, 04/19/24, 04/17/24, 04/10/24. There were notifications in</p>

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
					the Daily Herald. Information was also posted to SMC's Fox River Webpage (https://www.lakecountyil.gov/2401/Fox-River-Watershed).
15	Long Lake recommended actions - Long Lake receives most of the watershed runoff, should be considered a watershed "sentinel" lake.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Table 6-19	Sentinel was a term for a 10-year study that the Lake County Health Department did where they monitored select lakes for 10 years in a row to try and determine long term trends. It's not a term used for more frequent monitoring, but more it was part of that pilot study. Lake action LK83 has been updated to "Increase frequency of Lake Report and monitoring data updates." to address this comment.
16	Long Lake volunteer monitoring work not included (LLISA, MCWA)	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 3, p.107	Table updated.
17	Need to include 2024 LCFP fish / native plant survey	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Table 3-45	This data was collected outside of the data gathering period for the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan.
18	Error in storm sewered areas- Long Lake does have storm sewers.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Table 3-38, Figure 3-51	Corrected.
19	Summary of Problem Hydraulic Structures. Where is the precise info on the four that are problems? Not found on the mapping app. The four are marked on the general map (Figure 3-45) but resolution too broad to identify exactly where those are and what they are (not clearly identified in stream inventory).	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Table 3-34	There are 7 problem hydraulic structures identified in the stream inventory. They can be accessed in the stream inventory Web-Application: (https://lakecountyil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=83d1ad117dd74e91bb2fb54898a63852).

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
					Email jjozefowski@lakecountyiil.gov if you would like assistance navigating the stream inventory Web-Application.
20	Manitou Creek drainage district needs to add a problem hydraulic structure currently not listed in Chapter 3, not shown in map app nor listed in actions: Culvert small bridge on private property crossing Lake Helen Drain (known as "Antonio's bridge"), shown in stream inventory in reach SC-26, Object ID 1127. In February, volunteer professional surveyors confirmed water level change across bridge, indicating a significant obstruction to flow. This may also need to be included in Chapter 6, site specific actions (Table 6.16). Appendix A and/or the map app.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	3.12.2.7, Chapter 3, pg 86 – 88	Added to Site-Specific Action Plan. See Plan ID: SIP_1.
21	Manitou Creek drainage district needs to add a problem hydraulic structure currently not listed in Chapter 3, not shown in map app nor listed in actions: IL-120 box culvert on Manitou Creek mainstem (stream inventory reach SC-09, Object ID 1143)-currently, a major debris jam obstruction. Submitted to SMC for WMB funding in 2024, was recommended for new SMC maintenance funding program. This may also need to be included in Chapter 6, site specific actions (Table 6.16). Appendix A and/or the map app.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	3.12.2.7, Chapter 3, pg 86 – 88	Added to Site-Specific Action Plan. See Plan ID: SIP_2.
22	We would like to request a category for pollution/garbage pick-up along streams and in lakes (stream/lake clean-ups).	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 6, page 28, Table 6-8	Programmatic Action Plan Goal #2 Action 6 was updated to include garbage pick-up.
23	Stream Inventory found instances of dumping, ie: thousands of plastic pellets by North brook Sports Club (SC-08, 09, 10,11). Eagle Creek (EX 07)- many large kitchen and home appliances. In the past what has been done with this information?	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 6, page 28, Table 6-8	The information is presented in the publicly available stream inventory. (https://lakecountyiil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=83d1ad117dd74e91bb2fb54898a63852).

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
24	Would the Highway Dept and LCDH would likely be lead partners for pollution/garbage pick-up?	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 6, page 28, Table 6-8	The property owner where the garbage is located would be the lead partner for clean-up efforts.
25	Chapter 3, p. 127 states there are five active WWTPs, however tables 3-49 & 3-50 only list four . Also Figure 3-71 on page 128 (wastewater discharge permits) also identifies four map locations. We understand there are a total of six active WWTPs. We request that two facilities, Saddlebrook Farms & Ivanhoe Club/ Thorngate Country Club, also be identified as WWTPs. We understand that both facilities utilize spray irrigation "land application" treatment. Although they don't require an NPDES permit, they are still permitted and inspected by IEPA and are major nonpoint sources of pollution.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 3, p. 127	Saddlebrook, Ivanhoe identified, narrative modified to reflect accurate number of NPDES permitted active dischargers.
26	Request that section 3.17.1 include all WWTPs.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Section 3.17.1	See response to #25 above
27	Request that Figure 3-71 be titled WWTPs in watershed, with different color points for NPDES permitted and IL-EPA permitted.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Figure 3-71	Figure and section updated.
28	Chapter 4, pg 27 states there are four permitted point source WWTPs, but also should identify the two IL-EPA permitted non-point source WWTPs.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 4, pg 27	Section updated to reference both NPDES-permitted facilities and other permitted onsite treatment systems, including land application.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
29	Drain Tiles - mentioned at public meeting as uniquely important to this watershed. 2004 plan made a cursory attempt to map them, "Historic Farm Tiles" (Figure No 4-31). Can a map of current drain tile inventory be included in this plan? And also a layer in the map app?	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Not Provided	The limited drain tile data SMC has access to does not meet Lake County's GIS accuracy standards for public release. Programmatic Action Plan Goal #2 Action 12 addresses the need to create a drain tile GIS database. The priority of this action has been increased from medium to high.
30	Chapter 3, pg 85, Table 3-30 - # of stream reaches with streambank erosion . Which one streambank reach has severe erosion? Mapp app doesn't show "severe".	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 3, pg 85, Table 3-30	Reach SC-07. This can be accessed in the stream inventory Web-Application: (https://lakecountyil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=83d1ad117dd74e91bb2fb54898a63852). Email jjozefowski@lakecountyil.gov if you would like assistance navigating the stream inventory Web-Application.
31	On map app what does critical areas: streambank versus erosion: left/right streambank mean?	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Web Application	Critical areas are defined as areas in the watershed best suited to focus implementation efforts to help achieve the goals and objectives of the watershed-based plan. See section 4.2.6 Critical Areas analysis for more information. Erosion: Left/Right Streambank displays the streambank erosion data that was collected during the stream inventory.
32	Chapter 3, pg 85, Table 3-31- # of stream reaches with sediment accumulation Four of 72 reaches have high sediment accumulation – where are these?	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 3, pg 85, Table 3-31	Reach SC34, EC03, RL05, EC14. This can be accessed in the stream inventory Web-Application: (https://lakecountyil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=83d1ad117dd74e91bb2fb54898a63852).

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
					Email jjozefowski@lakecountyil.gov if you would like assistance navigating the stream inventory Web-Application.
33	Lowest elevation error- correct to 739 feet (elevation of Long Lake dam) or 728 feet (elevation of Fox Lake)?	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Chapter 3, pg 21 & 22	Map and section updated using the Lake County 2017 LiDAR Digital Terrain Model (DTM) which indicates the lowest elevation is 736 ft amsl.
34	We are very concerned with removal of wetland polygons (both "Restoration" and "Enhancement" polygons) in multiple areas seen in Mapping Application compared to WRAPP tool. What has been the decision process to remove these polygons?	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Not Provided	<p>The Wetland Restoration and Preservation Plan (WRAPP) was utilized to identify potentially restorable wetlands and existing wetlands in the watershed. Wetland restoration recommendations in the site-specific and basin-wide action plan were derived from the potentially restorable wetlands in the WRAPP. Wetland enhancement recommendations in the site-specific and basin wide action plan were derived from the existing wetlands in the WRAPP. Actions are removed from the action plan at the request of jurisdictional partners or private property owners as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Please ensure you are viewing both the site-specific and basin-wide action plans as there are wetland actions in both.</p>
35	Were any of the 39 ADID high-functioning wetlands in our watershed removed from the potentially restorable category by villages? Or are these generally safe due to 3:1 mitigation requirement.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/16/2025	Not Provided	No ADID wetlands were removed from the potentially restorable category by villages.
36	Addition of Programmatic BMP Statement regarding non-lethal beaver management Non-lethal management of this keystone species that can effectively slow flow and restore wetland function, as low-cost "green" action.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek	4/16/2025	Not Provided	SMC received stakeholder feedback during the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan public meetings requesting both lethal and non-lethal beaver management

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
	Management involves moving beavers out of unwanted human "conflict" areas into preferred areas of watershed, then minimizing human "conflict" impacts around those preferred areas. Could include in Chapter 3 section 3.11.2 (approaches to and tools for Wetland Management)	Watershed Alliance			recommendations. Beaver management is addressed in Goal #3 Action 30 of the programmatic action plan.
37	Change Mud Lake name to prevent confusion with the other waterbody named Mud Lake in the watershed.	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Figure 3-51	Figure updated.
38	Add programmatic action "Consider ecological, habitat, and water quality impacts before performing stream management."	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Chapter 6	Section updated. See Goal #3 Action 31 in the programmatic action plan.
39	Add chapter title to document links on webpage	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Website	Links have been updated to include chapter title on webpage.
40	LLISA VLMP, MCWA have watershed monitoring and HAB data. MCWA will send data	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Chapter 3	Noted.
41	Remove problem hydraulic structure near Long Lake	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Chapter 3	Section updated.
42	Update maps in stream inventory report to reflect stream name change to Manitou Creek	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Appendices	Appendix updated.
43	Add a summary of creek's name change to Chapter 1	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Chapter 1	Chapter updated. See page 1-2.
44	Add map of potentially restorable wetlands to Chapter 3.	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Chapter 3	Chapter updated. See Figure 3-39.
45	Add a callout box to Chapter 3 explaining the importance and benefits of wetland mitigation banking in Lake County	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Chapter 3	Section 3.11.2 includes narrative within the text as well as a call-out box describing the rationale and benefits of wetland mitigation/banks.
46	Update nature preserve maps to include newly designated nature preserves.	Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/17/2025	Chapter 3	Chapter updated.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
47	We recommend adding a table of "Programmatic" Lake Actions for all lakes in watershed for plan section 6.5 Lake Actions, in addition to specific actions for individual lakes identified in Table 6-19. These actions would be "as applicable" for each lake.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Chapter updated. See Table 6-20.
48	Add watershed-wide lake action: Update LCHD Lake Report and monitoring data.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #1.
49	Add watershed-wide lake action: Develop, implement and periodically update a lake management plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #2.
50	Add watershed-wide lake action: Conduct periodic aquatic plant survey.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #2.
51	Add watershed-wide lake action: Develop, implement and update an aquatic plant management plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #2.
52	Add watershed-wide lake action: Conduct periodic fish survey, update stocking recommendations.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #4.
53	Add watershed-wide lake action: Develop, implement and update a fisheries management plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #4.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
54	Add watershed-wide lake action: Reduce carp populations.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Fish management recommendations are specific to a waterbody and should be done in accordance with a fisheries management plan. See the Lake Programmatic Action Plan, Action #4.
55	Add watershed-wide lake action: Reduce road salt.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #15.
56	Add watershed-wide lake action: Remove invasive vegetation from riparian buffer.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #5.
57	Add watershed-wide lake action: Minimize fertilizer use	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	This action is in the programmatic action plan and is a watershed-wide recommendation that is not specific only to lakes. See regulatory action plan RP-6, section 6.2.6.2, and programmatic action plan Goal #1 Action #11.
58	Add watershed-wide lake action: Encourage homeowners to incorporate native plants in their landscaping through raingardens or riparian buffers.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #6.
59	Add watershed-wide lake action: Monitor lake for HAB's, notify the LCHD when HABs are identified.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #8.
60	Add watershed-wide lake action: Install signs to raise awareness to reduce the spread of aquatic invasive species.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #9.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
61	Add watershed-wide lake action: Establish/maintain a voluntary lake monitoring program (modeled after the I-EPA VLMP)	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #10.
62	Add watershed-wide lake action: Stabilize shoreline erosion using naturalized buffer strips or other soft stabilization BMPs where feasible, and targeted hard stabilization BMPs where needed.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #11.
63	Add watershed-wide lake action: Conduct zebra mussel monitoring.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #12.
64	Add watershed-wide lake action: Organize periodic trash/litter clean-up days	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #7.
65	Add watershed-wide lake action: Develop an inventory of all public and private lake outfalls and identify BMP improvement options for each outfall where possible.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #13.
66	Add watershed-wide lake action: Increase lake habitat and structure for aquatic wildlife	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #2.
67	We request that as the primary collection basin within the watershed, Long Lake should be considered a watershed "sentinel" lake and have priority for water quality monitoring and efforts to mitigate nutrient pollution and harmful algal blooms.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Sentinel was a term for a 10-year study that the Lake County Health Department did where they monitored select lakes for 10 years in a row to try and determine long term trends. It is not a term used for more frequent monitoring, but more it was part of that pilot study. Lake action LK83 has been updated to

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
					"Increase frequency of Lake Report and monitoring data updates." to address this comment.
68	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Update LCHD Lake Report and monitoring data. Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	See Lake Action LK83.
69	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Develop, implement and update a lake management plan.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #2.
70	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Conduct periodic aquatic plant survey.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #2.
71	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Develop, implement and update an aquatic plant management plan.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	See Lake Action LK87.
72	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Conduct periodic fish survey, update stocking recommendations.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Actions #3 and 4.
73	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Develop, implement and update a fisheries management plan.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #4.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
74	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Reduce carp populations</u> . Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to plan. See LK150
75	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Reduce road salt. Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	See Lake Action LK85.
76	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Monitor lake for harmful algal blooms and test for toxins. Develop a community notification process for unhealthy conditions. Notify the LCHD when HABs are identified</u> . Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #8.
77	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Remove invasive vegetation from riparian buffer</u> . Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #5.
78	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Minimize fertilizer use</u> . Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	See Lake Action LK84.
79	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Encourage property owners to incorporate native plants in their landscaping through raingardens or riparian buffers</u> . Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #6.
80	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Organize periodic trash/litter clean-up days</u> . Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #7.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
		Watershed Alliance			
81	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Stabilize shoreline erosion using naturalized buffer strips or other soft stabilization BMPs where feasible, and targeted hard stabilization BMPs where needed.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #11.
82	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Conduct zebra mussel monitoring.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #12.
83	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Install signs to raise awareness to reduce the spread of aquatic invasive species.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #9.
84	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Establish/maintain a voluntary lake monitoring program (modeled after the I-EPA VLMP).</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #10.
85	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Develop an inventory of all public and private lake outfalls and identify BMP improvement options for each outfall where possible.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #13.
86	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: <u>Increase lake habitat and structure for aquatic wildlife.</u> Do not add to Long Lake Site-Specific action plan if a programmatic lake action plan is incorporated into the watershed plan.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See Lake Programmatic Action #2.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
87	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Provide in-lake sediment testing to understand legacy nutrient pollution and internal phosphorus loading that contributes to harmful algal blooms.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Combined with comment 93 below.
88	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Install flow meters on Manitou, Eagle and Round Lake creeks to understand flow through the watershed into Long Lake and mitigate flood impacts	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to action plan. See LK900.
89	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Periodically update bathymetric map to identify areas of sedimentation that may be reducing lake depth.	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to lake programmatic action plan. See action #14.
90	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Reduce internal phosphorus loading through mechanical removal/dredging of in-lake sediment	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Combined with comment 93 below.
91	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Research options to replace steel seawalls with alternate structures that reduce wave energy and help limit turbidity	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to plan. See action LK152.
92	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Reduce external nutrient pollution coming in from the watershed via Manitou Creek, Eagle Creek and Round Lake Drain	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Site specific, basin wide, and programmatic actions to reduce nutrient loading upstream of Long Lake are identified elsewhere in this watershed plan.
93	Add Long Lake Site-Specific Lake Action: Develop and implement a nutrient management plan	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	Added to plan. See action LK151.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
94	<p>Below you will see the email from Nick Huber from the LCFP and the information from the fish sampling that was done on Long Lake on 9/4/24. (Note: I provided you with this printed email on April 17 but realized that I should also send it to you electronically).</p> <p>Hope things are well with you. My apology for not getting back to you sooner on this...I'm still working on data entry from last summer's fish sampling. We only had time to sample the LCFPD part of Long Lake on 09/04/24. In 74 minutes of boat electrofishing time, here's what we found:</p> <p>9 Yellow Bullhead, 7 Brown Bullhead, 2 Eyespot Bowfin, 3 Freshwater Drum, 22 White Sucker, 6 Common Carp (removed from lake), 3 Gizzard Shad, 1 Northern Pike, 5 Blackstripe Topminnow, 1 Brook Silverside, 5 Green Sunfish, 1 Pumpkinseed, 116+ Bluegill (stopped dipping them after a while - extremely abundant), 39 Largemouth Bass, 15 Golden Shiner, 16 Spottail Shiner, 88 Yellow Perch, 1 Black Crappie, 1 Walleye</p> <p>19 species in all, which is pretty good for this region. With connectivity to the Fox River/Chain O Lakes, Long lake has decent diversity with both "lake" and "river" fishes. Nothing terribly unique or rare, however. The Brown Bullhead is perhaps the least common of these, it's listed as an IL Conservation Priority fish. We also don't see Freshwater Drum (except in Fox/COL), Brook Silverside, or Spottail Shiner (except in L. Michigan & Fox/COL) very often.</p> <p>We also found Rusty Crayfish and 7 aquatic plants (2 invasives): Common Coontail, Water Stargrass, Eurasian Watermilfoil, White Water Lily, Curlyleaf Pondweed, Sago Pondweed, and Small Pondweed.</p> <p>There was a planktonic Blue-Green algal bloom at that time, which made the water in some areas the "pea</p>	Susan Pribyl, on behalf of the Manitou Creek Watershed Alliance	4/28/2025	Chapter 6	This data was collected outside of the data gathering period for the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
	soup" I'm sure you're familiar with and made for less-than-ideal sampling.				
95	The text/arrow box on the map of the Fox River Basin, it says "The entire Lake Fox River Basin"; believe the word "Lake" should be deleted.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Executive Summary pdf p.3	Section updated.
96	On the inset map, should be "Grayslake" (one word) to identify the Village of Grayslake.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Executive Summary pdf p. 3	Section updated.
97	For action number 5, recommend expanding the titling of this action to "Preserve and restore wetlands" in bold type.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Executive Summary "10 in 10" list; pdf p. 5	Intent of this action in the top ten priorities is to begin wetland restoration efforts based on results outlined in the Lake County WRAPP. The watershed plan also encourages wetland preservation.
98	On "Name - Organization" table, for Ron Gurak, add Long Lake Improvement and Sanitation Association (LLISA)	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Acknowledgments; pdf p. 4	Section updated.
99	Correction: Should be 5 townships (not 4 townships)	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 1: Section 1.2; pdf p. 5	Section updated.
100	Correction: Last sentence on this page ends with "...Manitou Creek Watershed Plan (2012)", should be 2004.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 1: Section 1.2; pdf p. 5	Section updated.
101	Add the following to previous studies and plans: Round Lake Beach Wetland Management Plan (2019)	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 1: Table 1-2; pdf p. 10	Section updated.
102	Add to the final sentence of first paragraph, in the listing of stakeholders with whom SMC has worked: "...and volunteer lake and watershed organizations".	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 1: Section 1.4; pdf p. 8	Section updated.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
103	Correction: "complied" should be "compiled".	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 1: Section 1.5; pdf p. 9	Section updated.
104	<p>First paragraph of this section is ambiguous. Could be written as follows: "Goals from the previous (and separate) 2004 Manitou Creek Watershed Plan and the 2009 Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan were reviewed prior to the development of this updated and combined Manitou Creek and Fish Lake Drain Watershed-based Plan. Section 1.3 of Chapter 1 of the 2004 Manitou Creek Watershed Plan described that the stakeholders identified the following 10 specific most important issues for the watershed:"</p> <p>Also, the bulleted list has only 9 items; it omits "Pursue and develop sources for funding Plan implementation" which is in the 2004 list.</p>	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 2: Section 2.1; pdf p. 3	Section updated.
105	Note that the 2004 plan section 1-3 did not describe these ten items as "goals" but rather as the stakeholder group's ten most important "issues".	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 2: Section 2.1; pdf p. 3	Section updated.
106	Second paragraph, change: "These issues are specific..." (not goals, issues)	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 2: 2.1; pdf p. 3	Section updated.
107	Second paragraph, change: Add year - "...in Chapter 6 of the 2004 Manitou Creek Watershed Plan:"	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 2: 2.1; pdf p. 3	Section updated.
108	Third paragraph: Add year - "The 2009 Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan..." as well as correct spelling for "Objectives".	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 2: 2.1; pdf p. 3	Section updated.
109	Add 2004 Manitou Creek and 2009 Fish Lake Drain watershed plans as references.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 2: References	Section updated.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
110	Correction: Should be "three nature preserves" (not "two nature preserves"). Next sentence should be "all nature preserves" (rather than "both")	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.10.1; pdf page 69	Section updated.
111	Addition: LCFPD nature preserves should include Schreiber Lake Bog in Lakewood Forest Preserve (as of Aug 2021).	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Table 3-21; pdf p. 70	Section updated.
112	Typo: Should be "fire" not "fir" in 2nd to last sentence.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.1.2; pdf p. 12	Section updated.
113	Correction: "US Geologic Survey" should be "US Geological Survey" (2 entries)	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: pdf p. 7 Table	Section updated.
114	Corrections: - Lowest elevation of watershed is stated to be 779'; but the mouth of Manitou Creek flows into Fox Lake, which has an official elevation of 728'. - Highest elevation in watershed is stated to be 808'; however, looking at elevation contours and marks on Lake County Maps Online, I note elevations of 871' or more in Lakewood Forest Preserves just west of Schreiber Lake, near the south boundary of the watershed.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.2; pdf p. 21	Map and section updated using 2017 LIDAR DTM which indicates the lowest elevation is 736 ft amsl and highest elevation is 919 ft amsl.
115	Future land use projection shows the "Wirtz" property in Mundelein (along the eastern edge of the watershed) colored green, which is "Agriculture"; but the Village of Mundelein has publicly stated that this was annexed for a massive residential / commercial development.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Figure 3-27; pdf p. 49	Future land use (FLU) projections were based on a review of county FLU GIS data. FLU data for Lake County is compiled by the Lake County Department of Planning, Building, and Development (PB&D) from municipal/county comprehensive land use plans. The most recent FLU update was 2010. SMC does not update FLU data during the watershed planning process. The FLU section was updated to include this clarification.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
116	<p>Table 3-16 claims that 62% (16,003 acres) of the Manitou Creek subwatershed is "Protected and Managed Land". However, visually, looking at the map shown in Figure 3-33, the green areas do not appear to cover 62% (almost 2/3rds) of the area of the Manitou Creek subwatershed. Having walked, biked, driven around most of the accessible areas of the watershed, in addition to studying property ownership and land types within the watershed, it is hard to believe that over 16,000 acres are "protected & managed". To allow readers to better understand this acreage statement, I recommend providing a more detailed table of what adds up to the 16,003 acres considered "protected and managed".</p>	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Table 3-16 & Figure 3-33; pdf pp. 61 & 62	Section updated.
117	<p>Addition: As we discussed in our April 17th meeting, we request that a figure be added to chapter 3 indicating all potentially restorable wetland polygons within the watershed that are shown in the WRAPP tool (that is, a figure that does not exclude potentially restorable wetlands that have been removed from other figures based on requests from villages, townships, and/or individual land owners).</p>	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Chapter 3 - additional figure	Section updated.
118	<p>In last paragraph on p. 74, indicates "48% of the pre-settlement wetlands remain...", but then states "The estimated rate of historic wetland loss in the watershed (48%)..." If 48% of wetlands remain, then 52% have been lost. I also don't understand using the phrase "...rate of historic wetland loss..." because a percentage is not a "rate" unless there is a time denominator (i.e. - % per year).</p>	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.11; pdf p. 74	The term "rate" has been removed. The values have been corrected to indicate an estimate of 52% wetland loss within the planning area.
119	<p>Figure 3-47: Would like to have the "problem discharge points" shown in this figure also identified in the Watershed Plan Map Application with detail regarding precise location and description of each "problem" discharge point. We do not see a "discharge points" layer, or color-coded symbol within a layer, in the Map App, so</p>	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.12.2.8; pdf p. 90	This can be accessed in the stream inventory Web-Application: (https://lakecountyil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=83d1ad117dd74e91bb2fb54898a63852).

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
	we have not been able to find the "problem discharge points" identified by relatively large dots on Figure 3-47.				Email jjozefowski@lakecountyiil.gov if you would like assistance navigating the stream inventory Web-Application.
120	Figure 3-53, as well as the last sentence of the second paragraph which refers to Figure 3-53 and 303(d) listed waterbodies, would be much clearer to follow and understand if they were moved to the end of section 3.16.1 which explains 303(d) listed waterbodies.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.16, pdf p. 99	Section updated.
121	Not familiar with "Cotton Creek" in the watershed. This reference may be for the Cotton Creek in the Fox River watershed, and thus not applicable to Manitou Creek.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.16.3, pdf p. 105	Watershed boundaries were updated as part of the planning process. Portions of the updated Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain watershed boundary overlap the Cotton Creek watershed in United States Environmental Protection Agency data. The information as presented is applicable to the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan. See Figure 3-8 to see difference between the watershed plan boundary and HUC 12 boundary.
122	In this table, for Long Lake the data needs to be updated to reflect LCFPD's 9/4/24 fish and aquatic plants survey. Note that I sent the LCFPD survey information separately in an email dated April 28, 2025.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Table 3-45; pdf p. 112	This data was collected outside of the data gathering period for the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan.
123	Edit: Flip paragraphs 1 & 2, so the first sentence would be "This report focuses on the Manitou Creek...." Then the second paragraph would describe the Fox River larger context for the watershed.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.1; pdf p. 11	Section updated.
124	The red dot on this figure does not appear to be in the correct location - it appears to be in Wisconsin and east of the "Lake Border" glacial ridge.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Figure 3-3; pdf p. 12	Figure updated.
125	Consider using blue color for lakes (or "Open Water", as appears in many other figures), and adding "Lakes" or "Open Water" to the legend, to distinguish those surfaces from "wetlands".	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Figure 3-9; pdf p. 20	Figure updated.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
126	I suggest the table be organized by percent of watershed or acreage rather than alphabetical.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Table 3-7; pdf p. 35	This is contrary to comments received during previous watershed plans that requested alphabetized arrangement. In order to be consistent across watershed plans, the list will remain alphabetized.
127	I suggest the table be organized by percent of watershed or acreage rather than alphabetical.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Table 3-18; pdf p. 55	This is contrary to comments received during previous watershed plans that requested alphabetized arrangement. In order to be consistent across watershed plans, the list will remain alphabetized.
128	"visible banks to they can see..." should be "visible banks so they can see..."	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: pdf p. 69 - last bullet point	Section updated.
129	Bold text "Error - Reference source not found" needs to be connected or eliminated; also, the word "hydraulic" is split across two lines	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.12.2.7; pdf p. 87	Section updated.
130	Last sentence of second paragraph refers to "Section 0" - not sure what this references.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.13.1; pdf p. 93	Paragraph updated.
131	Correction: "contaminates" should be "contaminants".	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Section 3.13.2; pdf p. 93	Section updated.
132	In second paragraph, third sentence, the word "depauperate" should be defined or a synonym used.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: pdf p. 100	Noted.
133	Please add alternating line shading across the table for easier readability.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: Table 3-47; pdf p. 114	Table updated.
134	"Within the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain watershed, there are five active WWTPs of varying capacity" but Table 3-49 lists only four.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: pdf p. 127	The text has been corrected to "four active WWTPs..."

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
135	There are a LOT of problem discharge points that seem like good targets for projects. Is there a list?	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 3: pdf p. 90	<p>See the "Water Infrastructure" BMP Type in the site-specific action plan for action recommendations for discharge points. The site-specific action plan can be viewed in the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan Web-Application: (https://lakecountyil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b134b3429e934ec28fb80a1146021ca7)</p> <p>All discharge points can be accessed in the stream inventory Web-Application: (https://lakecountyil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=83d1ad117dd74e91bb2fb54898a63852).</p>
136	Correction: Should be "Eagle Creek" rather than "Eagle Lake".	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 4: Section 4.1.6.1; pdf page 16	Section updated.
137	Figure 4-2 is unclear, & magnifying / zooming in does not bring clarity / ease of reading text / numbers.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 4: Section 4.1.1; pdf p. 7	Figure updated.
138	Typo: should be Illinois Department of Transportation (not "Deportment")	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 4: Section 4.3.2.1; pdf p. 53	Section updated.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
139	Not sure if this map is accurate, because it shows high levels of "fecal coliform loading" all around the shoreline of Long Lake. However, all houses on Long Lake are on the Lake County sanitary sewer system, NOT individual septic systems. Not clear why Long Lake houses would contribute to "fecal coliform loading" in the watershed.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 4: Figure 4-21; pdf p. 41	The model used to estimate pollutant loads incorporates the land use described in Chapter 3. Runoff volumes are based on the impervious area associated with a given land use and annual rainfall. Event mean concentrations (EMCs) were applied to the runoff volumes based on land use mapping. The EMCs are established based on literature sources, water quality studies, and professional experience (Appendix F). Formulas and EMCs incorporated into the model are derived from Unit Area Pollutant Load Estimates for Lake County, Illinois Lake Michigan Watersheds (NIPC, 1993) as modified and applied in the Dead River and Kellogg Creek watershed plans (SMC, 2008a; SMC, 2008b).
140	Correction for list item #5: "Ligh" should be "Light"	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 5: pdf p. 9	Section updated.
141	Correction: for LLISA - should be described as "Long Lake Improvement and Sanitation Association"	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Acronyms /Abbreviations; pdf p. 4	Section updated.
142	Edit to Table 6-3 Action #7: remove the word "and" between "capture" and "stormwater"	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Section 6.2.2; pdf p. 13	Section updated.
143	Both tables indicate acres of wetland enhancement recommendations by priority. There is an apparent discrepancy: Table 6-10 shows 298 acres of high priority, whereas Table 6-13 shows zero (0) acres of high priority.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Table 6-10; pdf p. 30 & Table 6-13; pdf p. 34	Section 6.3.3.1 and Table 6-13 updated.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
144	It would be visually helpful if wetland enhancement and wetland restoration areas were color-coded by high - medium - low priorities in these figures.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Figure 6-2; pdf p. 35 & Figure 6-3; pdf p. 37	You can view actions by priority using the Manitou Creek-Fish Lake Drain Watershed-Based Plan Web-Application: https://lakecountyil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b134b3429e934ec28fb80a1146021ca7
145	Both tables indicate acres of wetland restoration recommendations by priority. There is an apparent discrepancy: Table 6-10 shows 0 acres of high priority, whereas Table 6-14 shows 200 acres of high priority.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Table 6-10; pdf p. 30 & Table 6-14; pdf p. 36	Table 6-10 is a summary of Basin-Wide Site-Specific wetland restoration actions. Table 6-14 is a summary of all wetland restoration actions, both Basin-Wide Site-Specific (BWSS) and Site-Specific Action Plan (SSAP) recommendations.
146	Section 6.4 title (in green text) the word "Jurisdiction" is misspelled.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Section 6.4; pdf p. 38	Section updated.
147	Add action: Educate landscapers / yard maintenance companies to avoid blowing or pushing leaves or other yard debris into streams, lakes, roadways, or ditches.	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Section 6.2.4; pdf pp. 19 - 20	See programmatic action plan Goal #3 Action #13 and Goal #4 Action #11.
148	In general, table should list actual "responsibility" related to watershed actions for each listed party. Some specific examples: - For "Property Owner", should have more responsibility than just "The owner on record...". Perhaps indicate responsibility of property owners is to follow federal & state laws as well as county and local ordinances regarding stormwater, dumping, water pollution. - Similarly for "Schools and Institutions", identify "responsibility" related to the watershed, not just that they have large properties. Perhaps could include educating about watersheds.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: "Responsibility" Table 6-1; pdf pp. 7-9	Table headers updated to more accurately reflect intention of the table, which is limited to the general roles each would have in implementing recommended actions.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
149	<p>Consider adding a separate, simple table / list of 5 to 10 "programmatic" actions individual homeowners can do to improve the watershed (with a reference to the goals for each action). Example actions could be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove invasive species (Goals 1, 3, 4) - Plant native trees, shrubs and flowers (Goal 3) - Don't dump in streams, lakes or on roadways or ditches (Goal 1, 4) - Install rain barrels on downspouts (Goal 2, 4) - Create a native raingarden where you have driveway, yard, sump pump runoff (Goal 2, 3) - Reduce use of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides (Goal 1) - Reduce use of salt in winter (Goal 1) <p>Having a specific homeowner list (vs actions for "PO" distributed under each of the Goals tables) will provide a tool for community education.</p>	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Section 6.2	Noted. If a specific homeowner list to use as a tool for community education is desired, SMC encourages implementation partners to use the programmatic action plan to develop such a list subsequent to plan adoption.
150	Item 7: Have additional (layperson) detail / description / sidebar for what are "Stormwater Treatment Train concepts".	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Table 6-2; pdf p.10	Action updated to include definition of Stormwater Treatment Train concepts.
151	For this action item, the action of "monitor" is very different than "perform remedial actions" for HABS, and some of the responsible and supporting partners for monitoring will be different from the entities partnering for remedial actions. Thus, recommend separating item #22 into two actions. For monitoring, lead partners could be HOA, LCHD, EIG, USGS, IDNR. For remedial actions, lead partners could be HOA, PO.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Chapter 6: Action #22, pdf p. 12	The action was moved to the stakeholder requested Lake Programmatic Action Plan and split into two actions. The lead partner for both actions is the property owner.
152	Typo: In title "Evaluation" (written as "Eveluation")	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 7: Title; pdf page 1	Section updated.
153	We noted that this section was taken verbatim from Fox River watershed plan. It needs to be re-written / updated to Manitou Creek watershed specifics.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Chapter 7: Section 7.3.2; pdf page 11	Section updated.

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
154	In second paragraph, "complimentary" should be "complementary".	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 7: pdf p. 9	Section updated.
155	"topics land look" should be "topics and look"	Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 8: Section 8.6, pdf page 7	Section updated.
156	Confusing Appendix identifications: Appendix section has appendicies A through J. But then Appendix C has sub-appendicies A - E; very confusing to have two levels of appendicies both using capital lettering. Recommend using a different nomenclature for the sub-appendicies in Appendix C.	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Appendix C: Stream Inventory; pdf page 52 ff.	Done.
157	Correction: 2nd paragraph indicates area of Long Lake as "335 acres", but Lake County Health Department Lakes Management Unit 2008 Lake Report for Long Lake indicates an area of "392.6" acres.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Appendix C: pdf p. 55	Section updated.
158	As we previously discussed with SMC staff, please update the titles of stream maps in the stream inventory to reflect the current name of Manitou Creek.	Susan Pribyl	5/5/2025	Appendix C stream maps; pdf pp. 91-94	Done.
159	Corrections: First paragraph refers incorrectly to Cook County sites including "Dead River" and "Kellogg Creek". Need to be changed / updated to Lake County and Manitou Creek watershed references	Grant Benjamin	5/5/2025	Appendix G pdf page 112	Corrected.
160	We request adding the following action (or an action with similar intent / wording): Where identified as appropriate along stream reaches, install rock riffles and/or other artificial hydraulic structures to restore riffle-pool stream dynamics and reduce streambank erosion and sediment conveyance. Lead partners could be PO, DD, FPD, PD, SMC; supporting partners could be EIG, HOA	Grant Benjamin and Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	In section 6.2.1 - Programmatic actions for Goal 1	See programmatic action plan Goal #3 Action #9.
161	We request the addition of a site-specific action for wetland enhancement of the Mud Lake basin, which has the potential to significantly improve both the water quality and the storm event flood surge characteristics of	Grant Benjamin and Ron Gurak	5/5/2025	Chapter 6	Stakeholder action has been added; however, no specific BMP was recommended to allow for the evaluation of all potential BMP alternatives that property owners and

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
	<p>the watershed. As Mike knows, our volunteer group has been (slowly) working on this for several years, aiming to build consensus with the property owners across the basin (HOA's, ComEd, Metra, Round Lake Area Park District, Township roadways, IL-DOT, and several private landowners) and determine the technical and regulatory requirements of a project of this scope. We have noted that the Mud Lake basin is already identified / color-coded for site-specific wetland enhancement in Figure 6-2, but given the central location of the Mud Lake basin in the watershed, we request adding text description of an action for this site-specific enhancement. Mud Lake basin enhancements were described previously in the 2004 Manitou Creek Watershed Plan as well as the much-earlier 1982 Long Lake Report (prepared by LCHD, copy attached). - The 2004 plan described Mud Lake functional enhancements in section 7.3.4 (p. 228) and on p. 235 - Objective 1C, Actions 7 & 8. - The 1982 lake report, on pp. 174-175, described and illustrated the creation of a riffle-type zig-zag meandering flow at the output of the Mud Lake basin. I've also attached a 2017 report/proposal from Wetland Research, Inc (WRI) describing a low-head riffle dam project concept for the Mud Lake basin. The site-specific action text could be similar to the wording in the 2004 plan: "Evaluate the feasibility of enhancing wetland function of the Mud Lake basin, including flood storage capacity and water quality treatment capacity. This may include evaluation of riffle or weir structures to re-meander flows through this basin and/or addition of a low-head riffle structure at the outflow of this basin to attenuate storm event flow through the basin."</p>				<p>stakeholders propose during the planning process.</p>
162	<p>Please add the proposed Manitou Creek Restoration Project (project description attached to email).</p>	<p>Ted Gray on behalf of the Round Lake</p>	<p>5/5/2025</p>	<p>Chapter 6</p>	<p>See actions WR_1060, WE_243, WE_244, WE_433, WE_737, SS_77, and SS_78.</p>

Comment #	Comment	Commenter Name	Comment Date	Relevant Section or Page	Response
		Area Park District			
163	We noticed in Table 3-46 in the watershed plan, it says Hidden Lake was not assessed for FQI. It was assessed but the value was zero. Are changes still being accepted to the plan?	Alana Bartolai	3/4/2026	Table 3-46	Section updated.
164	For the Manitou Creek Watershed Plan Update, in Chapter 3, Table 3-43 (pdf 109), the 2nd to the last entry for Long Lake in the far right column says "unknown" - it should read "physical parameters". We have all the data from testing during 2019 - 2023. LLISA (RJ Ringa) continued monitoring all physical parameters as he did in previous years as part of the VLMP. I had understood that this information had been shared with you previously; I apologize if it was not.	Susan Pribyl	3/8/2026	Chapter 3, Table 3-43 (pdf 109)	Section updated.
165	We would like to have the name(s) & / or affiliation(s)/source(s) of each public comment. We would find this helpful to know who / what organization submitted each comment. We recall that the names / affiliations of each public commenter were provided during the North Branch & Des Plaines River watershed plan development processes.	Susan Pribyl	3/10/2026	N/A	Public comment document updated.
166	Please note we are interested in hard copies of the plan when they are available.	Susan Pribyl	3/10/2026	N/A	Noted.