Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR
A PROSPECTUS FOR A REGIONAL WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

DATE: November 13, 2026

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

Microsoft Teams meeting

Members Present

Laura Herrick, Secretary ..... Chief Environmental Engineer, SEWRPC
Alan Barrows..... Land Resources Manager, Waukesha County
Kevin Berg ..... Engineering Services Director, Walworth County Metropolitan Sewerage District
Tim Detzer ..... Principal Environmental Engineer/County Conservationist, Milwaukee County Environmental Services
Matt Diebel ..... Hydrologist, U.S. Geological Survey
Jacob Fincher ..... Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, Inc.
Elizabeth Hellman..... Water Quality Compliance and Lab Services Manager, WEC Energy Group
Kevin Kirsch ..... Water Resource Engineer, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Aliyah Kousheh ..... Water Engineer-in-Training, Kenosha Water Utility
Janette Marsh ..... Nonpoint Source Technical Program Manager States and Tribes, Water Division U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 5
Cheryl Nenn ..... Riverkeeper, Milwaukee Riverkeeper
Mark Riedel..... Total Maximum Daily Load Manager, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Chad Sampson ..... Land Resources Manager, Racine County Land and Water Conservation
Brett Schmidt ..... Wastewater Engineer, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Kevin Shafer ..... Executive Director, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District
Andrew Struck ..... Director, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department
Sue Swanson. ..... Director and State Geologist, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey
Katie Vogeler ..... Director, Land & Water Management, Ozaukee County

Staff Present

Benjamin McKay ..... Deputy Director, SEWRPC
Emily Porter ..... Planner, SEWRPC
Aaron Owens ..... Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Tom Slawski ..... Chief Specialist-Biologist, SEWRPC

[Secretary's Note: The agenda for this meeting is attached herein as Exhibit A.]

CALL TO ORDER

The November 13, 2026 meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for *A Prospectus for a Regional Water Quality Management Plan Update* (RWQMPU) was convened online at 10:03 a.m. The meeting was called to order by Committee Secretary Ms. Laura Herrick, Chief Environmental Engineer with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC). Attendance was taken using the online software.

INTRODUCTION AND SEPTEMBER SUMMARY NOTES

Ms. Herrick welcomed the attendees to the fifth and final TAC meeting for *A Prospectus for a Regional Water Quality Management Plan Update.* Ms. Herrick then introduced the agenda for the meeting. She explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss part two of Chapter 4, as well as Chapters 5 and 6 of the draft Prospectus. She reminded the TAC that the Commission plans to share to final Prospectus document with counties and communities when pursuing funding for the Regional Water Quality Management Plan Update (RWQMPU). She then shared where to find information about the Prospectus effort, directing the TAC to the Regional Planning tab on the Commission's website (www.sewrpc.org). Past meeting agendas, summary notes, and the committee member list can be viewed on the Water Quality page. This page will also house up-to-date information about the Prospectus effort and all draft documents.

Ms. Herrick next provided a brief review of the content discussed during the TAC meeting on September 11, 2026. During the previous meeting, members of the TAC recommended that the Prospectus better define "waters in need of improvement." Ms. Herrick noted that the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Healthy Watersheds Guide and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Wisconsin Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology (WisCALM) guidance document were recommended to help identify waterbodies that do not meet criteria for impairment but have declining water quality. She also noted that Commission staff recently identified high risk streams for the Regional Chloride Impact Study which had at least one sample within 10 percent of the State's chronic toxicity threshold and suggested that a similar approach be used for parameters included in the RWQMPU inventories. Ms. Marsh complimented this approach for defining waters in need of improvement.

Ms. Herrick then reviewed additional changes made to the Prospectus following the September TAC meeting. She explained that *E. coli* was added as a constituent to the proposed stream water quality inventories and that both *E. coli* and invasive species were added to the Lake Michigan inventories. Following a different recommendation from the previous meeting, Ms. Herrick also informed the TAC that Commission staff looked into the feasibility of mapping internally drained areas in the Region and decided that the effort would be too time intensive to include in the RWQMPU. She added that internally drained features in sensitive areas will be highlighted as areas in need of protection within the RWQMPU recommendations, but that these areas will not be mapped as part of the update.

Ms. Herrick then asked the committee for any comments or questions regarding the additions to the draft Prospectus or the September meeting Summary Notes. In the meeting chat, Mr. Riedel agreed that internally drained areas analysis is a big undertaking and that the suggested approach for the RWQMPU would be good enough. Also in the meeting chat, Mr. Diebel noted that he led the internal drainage project when at Dane County and agreed that it was very time intensive. He added that it may be worth pursuing outside of the RWQMPU effort and offered to provide more details if the Commission considers mapping internally drained areas in the future.

Ms. Herrick then reminded the committee that the proposed RWQMPU will include an inventory of agricultural practices in the Region. She noted that this inventory will include a review of the presence and concentration of controlled animal feeding operations (CAFOs) and will identify where farms are land

applying manure within the Region. Ms. Herrick explained that Commission staff would also like to identify smaller farms that do not meet the criteria of a CAFO that may also be land spreading manure. She asked if the counties in the Region maintain information on non-CAFO livestock operations and spreading locations, noting that Mr. Sampson with Racine County shared a list of larger livestock operations with parcel information for the County. Mr. Barrows replied that Waukesha County has mapped agricultural operations with about 800 farms represented as points. He added that the county only has one CAFO and all the other farms in their inventory were below CAFO level. Mr. Detzer commented that Milwaukee County does not have any CAFOs or manure spreading locations mapped. Mr. Struck replied that he will follow up with Katie Vogeler to see if Ozaukee County has mapped these locations and will follow up. Mr. Riedel noted that it should be assumed that all dairy farms are spreading manure.

The TAC offered no additional comments or questions about the recommendations or inventories discussed during the September meeting.

REVIEW OF CHAPTER 4 (PART 2), *WORK PROGRAM*

Section 4.4 Sources of Pollution

Ms. Porter introduced Chapter 4 part two and explained that the presentation would cover the remaining two sections of the chapter (4.4 and 4.5). She began by discussing Section 4.4, which describes how the proposed RWQMPU will address sources of pollution. She explained that the RWQMPU will include a comparison of point and nonpoint sources in the Region to the historical sources evaluated in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 30 (PR-30) and SEWRPC Planning Report No. 50 (PR-50). Ms. Porter noted that, as part of this inventory, Commission staff will identify general pollutant sources, determine best management practices (BMPs) and state-of-the art methods for pollution reduction, and evaluate what opportunities exist for optimizing the implementation of BMPs with the goal of improving regional water quality. She then explained that the review of pollutant sources will also utilize total maximum daily load (TMDL) calculations to estimate the total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS) contributions from various point and nonpoint sources within each of the 12 regional watersheds. In response, Mr. Riedel suggested that the RWQMPU differentiate between treatment practices and prevention-based efforts for pollution reduction. He noted that the focus has historically been on treatment while preventative practices are more effective and longer lasting.

Ms. Porter explained that nonpoint sources will be grouped into two main categories. Sources such as stormwater runoff from parking lots, streets, rooftops, lawns, and construction sites as well as leachate from landfills will be classified as urban nonpoint sources of pollution, while pollutants in runoff from sources such as livestock operations, cropland or agricultural lands, natural areas (woodlands, wetlands, prairies), and discharge from septic systems will be classified as rural nonpoint sources. She then noted that point sources will include discrete discharge locations that will be identified through a review of discharge permits, adding that point sources will be categorized as either public or private wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) discharge, separate or combined sanitary sewer overflow, or industrial discharge locations.

Ms. Porter next showed Map 4.4 from the draft Prospectus and reviewed the existing and proposed TMDLs in the Region. She then described how TMDL calculations as well as data from other watershed plans will be leveraged for the RWQMPU pollutant estimates. Ms. Porter noted that the RWQMPU will focus on TP and TSS, as these are the parameters uniformly included in the TMDLs throughout the Region. She explained that each of the TMDLs provides estimated loads for individual stream reaches and their contributing subbasins and that this data will be compiled to determine the annual load allocations for TP and TSS (in pounds per year) for nonpoint and point sources in each subbasin. Ms. Porter added that these allocations will then be used to estimate the proportion of the total annual load contributed by various sources. Proportions will be used as the load values differ significantly between the TMDL studies. She

explained that the RWQMPU will display these contributions as percentages for point and nonpoint sources by each subbasin and their larger watershed. Point sources identified using TMDLS will include WWTPs, MS4s, permitted industrial sites, and general permitted activities. Nonpoint sources will include agricultural lands, nonpermitted urban lands, and background contributions from natural sources. Ms. Porter clarified that general permits are issued to classes of industries or activities that are similar in nature. This would include activities such as nonmetallic mining, non-contact cooling water, and stormwater discharges. Ms. Porter then briefly shared an example of how annual load allocations are displayed in the TMDL reports and how this data will be used to calculate the contributions by different sources. In the meeting chat, Mr. Riedel indicated that he would be able to provide the TMDL GIS files if needed. Mr. Owens responded that these files were previously discussed with Aaron Fisch at the WDNR.

For areas of the Region that do not have a TMDL, Ms. Porter explained that load calculations for subbasin in the forthcoming Fox-Illinois TMDL will be paired with 2020 land use data to develop source contribution estimates for subbasins with similar land uses. These areas will include the Oak Creek, Root River, and Pike River watersheds as well as portions of the Lake Michigan direct drainage area that were not captured in the Northeast Lakeshore TMDLs. Ms. Porter added that Nine Key Element Plans such as the Oak Creek Watershed Restoration Plan, the Root River Watershed Restoration Plan, and the Pike River Watershed-based Plan will also be referenced to support pollutant source estimates and management recommendations for the watersheds without TMDLs. She then showed a 2015 land use map from the Regional Chloride Impact Study to illustrate similarities between portions of the Fox River and Des Plaines watersheds and the Pike River, Oak Creek and Root River watersheds and explained how land use will be used to help develop source contribution estimates within similar subbasins. In the meeting chat, Mr. Kirsch commented that the WDNR recently developed a TMDL for Lake Pepin using different methods rather than a SWAT watershed model. He offered to discuss the approach with Commission staff and noted that, along with relying on existing TMDLs, the WDNR may be able to help provide load estimates for the portion of the project area not covered by an existing TMDL.

Ms. Porter next described how the RWQMPU will assess sources of emerging contaminants in the Region. She reminded the TAC that there is minimal emerging contaminant data available for lakes, streams, and groundwater. She then explained that a comprehensive literature review of select contaminants will be used to supplement available data in the Region. Ms. Porter noted that this review will help identify the land uses associated with different contaminants and determine how they may be impacting surface water and groundwater in the Region. Ms. Porter added that the data and literature review will be combined with the Region's 2020 land use inventory to assess where in the Region emerging contaminants are likely to be present. She specified that the literature review will focus on the latest publications and water quality research available for 6PPD-quinone, PFAS, and pharmaceuticals. In addition, she explained that a regional crop type inventory will be conducted to determine the location of different crop types in the Region, identify where neonicotinoids and herbicides are likely applied in each watershed, and evaluate the potential for pollution from agricultural sources. Ms. Porter then reminded the TAC that more information about the RWQMPU agricultural practices inventory can be found in section 4.3 of the Prospectus.

In the meeting chat, Ms. Nenn informed the TAC that Milwaukee Riverkeeper has a significant amount of unpublished pharmaceutical and emerging contaminant data as part of a project with Todd Miller from University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. She will look into what data would be able to be shared from that effort.

To conclude, Ms. Porter asked the TAC for any questions or additional comments related to the sources of pollution portion of Chapter 4. Members of the Committee offered no additional comments.

Section 4.5 Outcomes and Recommendations

Next, Ms. Porter introduced Chapter 4 section 4.5 highlighting the specific outcomes and recommendations of the RWQMPU. She explained that the RWQMPU will be divided into four plan elements to best organize the inventories, analyses, and recommendations. These plan elements will include a Land Use Plan, a Surface Water Quality Management Plan, a Groundwater Quality Management Plan, and a Water Quality Monitoring Plan. Ms. Porter noted that, while this framework is similar the approach used for PR-30 and PR-50, considerable attention will be given to the interconnected nature of land use, surface water, and groundwater management planning in the RWQMPU. She then showed Figure 4.1 from the Prospectus, which serves as a visual representation of how the various plan elements are related.

Ms. Porter began by reviewing what would be included in the Land Use Plan element of the RWQMPU. She explained that the Land Use Plan will summarize population and land use trends as well as include recommendations for urban development and the preservation of natural areas and prime agricultural land in the Region. Ms. Porter noted that the plan will be based on the findings of the RWQMPU land use inventories as well as on both current and projected land use. She also added that the plan's recommendations would incorporate current climate projections for the Region and will be closely tied to both surface water and groundwater quality.

Mr. Detzer asked if Commission staff plan to identify progress towards meeting the stream TMDLs. Related to this, Mr. Kirsch noted that WDNR assesses data on progress toward wastewater and permitted MS4 related pollutants, but they do not necessarily have data on progress toward meeting nonpoint sources for TMDLs. Ms. Herrick added that the update will not be quantifying load reductions for practices (lbs/year) but could track sources in a qualitative way. Mr. Slawski asked if adaptive management programs, such as the Oconomowoc Watershed Protection Program, could be used as a case study to showcase progress toward TMDL reduction goals. Mr. Riedel responded that Oconomowoc offers an example of a successful case study with detailed sampling and compliance effluent monitoring data. He indicated that level of detail may not be available for other parts of the Region.

Ms. Porter next discussed the Surface Water Quality Management Plan element of the RWQMPU, which will include recommendations based on stream, inland lake, and Lake Michigan water quality inventories. She explained that this plan element will prioritize waterbodies and parameters of greatest concern based on impairment and water quality trends. Ms. Porter also noted that a review of current water quality standards would be conducted and that surface water quality recommendations may include suggestions for new or revised standards, if necessary. She added that other recommendations will focus on how TMDLs and Nine Key Element Plans can be better implemented to achieve water quality goals.

Ms. Porter also highlighted how strategies for addressing sources of pollution will be incorporated in the Surface Water Quality Management Plan. She mentioned that the plan may include recommended pollutant management strategies such as abandoning or combining WWTPs or upgrading wastewater treatment technologies, adopting stormwater measures for various nonpoint sources, or considering alternative nutrient management options like water quality trading, adaptive management, or multi-discharger variance programs. Ms. Porter then noted that the Surface Water Quality Management Plan will include opportunities to use modern platforms and tools that will facilitate better public understanding and smoother information exchange with the public and between various agencies. She also mentioned that the plan will incorporate regional success stories and projected land use and climate conditions into surface water quality management recommendations.

Next, Ms. Porter reviewed the Groundwater Quality Management Plan element. This plan will rely on the municipal well data assembled for the RWQMPU. She explained that the plan will prioritize specific locations or pollutants of greatest concern for groundwater quality as well as consider the impacts of future

climate and land use conditions on groundwater. She added that specific attention will also be given to connecting groundwater management decisions to surface water quality and to tying the two plan elements together. More specifically, Ms. Porter noted that the Groundwater Quality Management Plan will outline strategies for addressing nonpoint sources of pollution in the Region. For agricultural sources, she stated that these strategies may include precision techniques for fertilizer application, adoption of cover crops, or managing animal waste to prevent contaminant leaching. For urban or residential sources, she noted that the plan may include recommendations for minimizing lawn chemicals, implementing stormwater BMPs, or establishing wellhead protection zones. Ms. Porter then mentioned that groundwater recharge and depth to groundwater inventories will be used to help prioritize where these strategies should be implemented.

Finally, Ms. Porter introduced the Water Quality Monitoring Plan element of the RWQMPU. She explained that this plan element will be based on surface water and groundwater inventories and will identify locations and constituents lacking monitoring data in the Region. Ms. Porter then explained that the plan will establish a detailed regional strategy for collecting water quality data to help address current knowledge gaps. She noted that monitoring data will include both surface water and groundwater quality data as well as pollutant data from different point sources. Ms. Porter also mentioned that the plan will identify the specific data needed to monitor for the occurrence of certain global trends, such as the browning and acidification of lakes or the growing risk of harmful algal blooms with rising temperature projections.

To conclude the review of Chapter 4, Ms. Porter asked for any additional questions or comments from the TAC on the proposed outcomes and recommendations of the RWQMPU. Mr. Riedel complimented the work completed so far. Committee members offered no additional comments.

REVIEW OF CHAPTER 5, *ORGANIZATION*

Ms. Herrick introduced Chapter 5, reviewing the overall organization of the RWQMPU. She noted that the update will be carried out by Commission staff under her direction as the Chief Environmental Engineer. The majority of the work will be completed by staff within the Environmental Planning division with support from the Land Use and Surveying and GIS divisions. Ms. Herrick added that several agencies will also provide support for this effort, including the WDNR, county and municipal agencies, local environmental agencies, and WWTP operators. She then informed the TAC that the RWQMPU would also rely on the guidance and expertise from an Advisory Committee (AC). She explained that this is a standing committee maintained by the Commission and would be comprised of existing TAC members as well as additional members that will be added following the Prospectus effort.

Next, Ms. Herrick reviewed the deliverables and format of the RWQMPU, noting that the effort will be presented as three separate reports produced over an estimated five-year period. She explained that the effort will result in a water quality technical report that will be completed within the first three years of the project, a wastewater technical report that will be completed in two years, and a final planning report that will require an additional two years to complete when the first two efforts are done.

No comments or questions were provided by the TAC regarding the RWQMPU organization discussed in Chapter 5.

REVIEW OF CHAPTER 6, *COST ESTIMATE AND SCHEDULE*

Ms. Herrick introduced Chapter 6 of the Prospectus which provides a detailed cost estimate and work schedule for the RWQMPU. She first shared Table 6.1 showing the total cost associated with each work effort to be completed for the two technical reports and planning report. She highlighted that the total estimated cost of the proposed RWQMPU effort is $3.12 million. Ms. Herrick then reviewed the work schedule for each of the RWQMPU reports. These schedules are presented as timelines in Figures 6.1, 6.2,

and 6.3 in the draft Prospectus. Mr. Riedel asked if year one of the project is considered to be 2027. Ms. Herrick clarified that year one is assumed to be 2028 and that it is envisioned that Commission staff would be seeking funding for the project during 2027.

Next, Ms. Herrick showed Table 6.2 from the Prospectus displaying a potential funding strategy to complete the RWQMPU. She noted that the strategy proposes that the Commission funds one third of the project cost, the WDNR funds one third of the cost, and public WWTPs, MS4 communities, grants, and other partners would then be pursued to fund the remaining third of the total project cost.

Ms. Herrick asked the TAC for feedback on the funding strategy and budget. Mr. Riedel responded that grants are generally focused on implementation, adding that it is hard to find federal funding to support planning projects. He also noted that the USEPA will occasionally reach out to the WDNR to inquire about shovel-ready projects that could be supported with unallocated funds when they become available. Mr. Riedel explained that previous Nine Key Element Plans have utilized this funding. In response, Ms. Marsh informed the TAC that USEPA fund allocation processes have tightened up recently and that their ability to redirect funds has been constrained. She noted that they are currently working on a policy internally for how to address these funds in USEPA Region 5, adding that this does not mean these funds will not become available, but that they will be more difficult to be used for planning efforts. Ms. Marsh also mentioned that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has hazard mitigation funding opportunities.

Mr. Kirsch indicated that he circulated the proposed budget and funding strategy with WDNR management and will follow up with their response. He also noted that one option would be to try to request funding in the State budget, adding that this precedent was set by previous TMDL work. Mr. Kirsch then asked what funding streams were used to support the original RWQMP work and the 2007 RWQMU. Ms. Herrick explained that the original RWQMP was allocated $1.7 million (1970s dollars) in response to Clean Water Act directives. She then explained that the 2007 RWQMPU for the greater Milwaukee area watersheds was a joint effort supported by the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District for their 2020 Facility Plan. The majority of the modeling work for PR-50 was completed by consultants and other partners.

Ms. Herrick next provided a list of other possible funding sources, including the USEPA Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, Fund for Lake Michigan, and local lake and river-oriented groups. She then asked the TAC for additional suggestions for potential sources of funding. Mr. Riedel suggested the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), noting that this requires more time and it is not funded by every Congress but could provide funds for work completed with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Ms. Herrick responded that the Commission has not partnered much with the USACE Chicago District in past projects but added that it may be a good option to consider. Mr. Riedel noted that the WDNR would be happy to provide a letter of support if the Commission pursues WRDA funding.

Mr. Fincher asked if there will be a supplemental fact sheet that will provide key takeaways from the RWQMPU Prospectus. Ms. Herrick responded that the Commission can create a fact sheet and asked how Sweet Water would use the document if developed. Mr. Fincher noted that it would be helpful to take to communities so that they can better understand what the RWQMPU is about, how it relates to their work, and how it can be used to help prioritize their efforts. He also mentioned it would be helpful to bring to potential funders.

No further comments or questions were provided by the TAC for the Chapter 6 cost estimate and schedule.

NEXT STEPS

Finally, Ms. Herrick reviewed the next steps for the Prospectus effort. She explained that there will be no additional TAC meetings and that the final Prospectus document will be finished in December 2026. She then asked the TAC to provide any additional comments on the Prospectus draft by November 25, 2026. Ms. Herrick reminded the committee that meeting agendas, presentations, and summary notes along with

the draft prospectus text will be posted on the Water Quality page of the SEWRPC website at www.sewrpc.org/Regional-Planning/Water-Quality.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at 10:59 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Herrick
Recording Secretary

COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE MEETING

After the meeting, Ms. Kousheh asked if there has been any discussion on how to distribute the requested funding from WWTP operators and how this will be implemented. Ms. Herrick said Commission staff are developing a plan for this process but explained that it will include reaching out to operators individually.

Following the meeting, Commission staff also received an email from Mr. Fincher. He expressed that, if any of the work is ready to share or if the Commission is interested in getting a jumpstart on outreach, the RWQMPU could be a great topic for Sweet Water's annual Clean Rivers, Clean Lakes Conference in 2027. He also shared a list of potential funding sources for the project that he generated using Sweet Water's funding tool.

LINKS AND RESOURCES SHARED

Mr. Riedel provided a link in the meeting chat for the WRDA portal for the USACE:
https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Water-Resources-Development-Act/

00282487.DOCX– Summary Notes – RWQMPU Prospectus TAC Meeting – November 13, 2026
300-5100
EEP/LKH
11/16/2026, 11/18/26

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Notice of Meeting and Agenda

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR

A PROSPECTUS FOR A REGIONAL WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

DATE: Friday, November 13, 2026

TIME: 10 – 11:30 am

TEAMS LINK:

Join: https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/2946615415803754?p=e8QJl2suCGy45CMQKN

Meeting ID: 294 661 541 580 375 4

Passcode: 8cH3pp7P

AGENDA:

1. Review September 11, 2026 TAC Meeting Summary Notes
2. Prospectus Draft Chapter Review
    a. Chapter 4 – Work Program (Sources of Pollution and Recommendations)
    b. Chapter 5 – Organization for the Update
    c. Chapter 6 – Costs and Schedule
3. Next Steps
4. Adjourn

00282308.DOCX
LKH
300-5100
10/23/26