

SUMMARY NOTES

Yahara CLEAN Compact Steering Team

Friday, November 8, 2019

8:30-10:00 A.M.

3rd Floor "Isthmus" Conference Room, Verex Plaza (150 E. Gilman St.)

Yahara CLEAN Compact Purpose: *To align partner efforts around an ambitious but achievable action strategy for attaining shared water quality goals.*

Vision: *To restore the designated uses of our lakes and beaches under the Clean Water Act.*

Why a compact?

- *To unite around a common vision and updated action plan for achieving lake water quality goals.*
 - *To identify resources to implement the action plan.*
 - *To monitor progress through tracking metrics and benchmarks.*
 - *To communicate to the public the need, ongoing work, and progress toward goals.*
-

Meeting Objectives:

- (a) Agreement about Compact decision-making protocols
- (b) Approval of signing document
- (c) Approval of recommendations from "additional participants" subgroup

I. Introductions and Review of Group Agreements

Present: Anne Baranski, Eric Booth, Paul Dearlove, Coreen Fallat, Tricia Gorby, Martye Griffin, Dave Merritt, Kyle Minks, Mark Riedel, Mike Rupiper, Janet Schmidt, James Tye, Alison Lebwohl, Sharon Lezberg, Issis Macias

Meeting called to order by Dearlove at 8:30 a.m. Alison Lebwohl (Wisconsin Department of Transportation) and Eric Booth (UW Nelson Institute) were introduced. This was followed by a review of the meeting agenda, action items, and handout packets. Handouts included proposals from each of the two Compact subgroups, the latest version of the Compact signing document, Yahara Pride Farms letter, and a draft response to that letter.

Lezberg (facilitator) asked the steering team to reaffirm ground rules and working agreements. Designees are expected to always communicate their meeting-attendance plans upon receipt of the emailed agendas. Knowledge of who will be in the room is important for meeting planning purposes. Each designee is also expected to keep their fellow designee (if not in attendance) and leadership informed of major discussion outcomes and decisions.

II. Decision-making protocols

Subgroup Report - Anne Baranski

- A decision-making structure was proposed involving the executive committee (partners), steering team (partners and collaborators), and ad-hoc subgroups. A graphic was presented illustrating the multi-level relationships and where different decisions get made.
- At the steering team level, it was recommended that votes be taken by a showing of thumbs up, sideways or down. Three or more “thumbs-down” votes means the decision or proposal fails. If approval cannot be reached, the matter either gets referred back to the subgroup for proposal refinement, or gets elevated to the executive committee. Each group gets one vote.
- It was recommended that all steering team meetings continue to be professionally facilitated. This allows for full and equitable participation by all Compact participants while maximizing the use of limited time.
- A group that misses having representation at even one meeting is missing a lot. The expectation is that Compact members, through one or both designees, attend at least 75% of the scheduled meetings to remain a member in good standing.
- It was recommended that the steering team not expand beyond a maximum of 18-21 groups. If approved, this allows for an additional two to five groups to join the Compact.

Discussion highlights

- Consider increasing the approval threshold to only one “no” vote to avoid any potential fractures that arise during discussions. Caveat: If there is a no vote, then initiate a deliberate effort to achieve a consensus. If consensus cannot be reached, then it goes to the subgroup or executive level, depending on the issue, to keep things moving forward. When it goes to a subgroup, the representative casting a “no” vote should be part of it.
- When it comes to approval thresholds, it will be important to recognize that the number of groups represented in the room makes a difference. Does the threshold change accordingly?
- There are various levels of “no” when setting up a gradient of agreement (fist of five, colors, thumbs, etc.). This allows a group to register a “no” vote but still move forward. Gradients of agreement are useful for taking the temperature of the room. They can also be recorded in the minutes to capture the group’s level of acceptance. If using thumbs, need to understand the level of agreement that comes with a sideways thumb.
- Need to clarify when executive-level voting happens, and whether or not the vote occurs at the same meeting.
- Need to clarify if there is a time constraint associated with any decision-making, because reaching consensus can take time. The draft Compact document outlines an “estimated” timeline to complete the work. That is a good idea since imposing rigid time constraints can mean rushing decisions.
- Need a way to avoid the rehashing of ideas and discussion as an issue moves between the steering team and subgroup levels.
- Need to be clear when a vote is for purposes of taking the temperature of the room and when it is final.

Thumb votes were conducted to take a straw poll on voting method. Proposal #1: “Approval means no more than two thumbs down.” (Thumbs up: 4, Sideways: 5, Down: 1)

Proposal #2: “Approval means no more than one thumb down.” (Thumbs up: 4, Sideways: 6, Down: 0)

ACTION ITEM: Questions and issues regarding voting and decision-making were referred back to the subgroup. The subgroup will attempt to meet prior to the 12/6 steering team meeting.

III. Compact Signing Document

Full agreement was reached to postpone the signing, which was originally planned for 12/3. It was recognized that an approved decision-making structure and voting mechanism was needed first. In addition, postponement of the signing would make it easier to onboard other participants as approved by the steering team. Groups do best when individual members have buy-in from the beginning. It was agreed that the signing would move to an unspecified date in early 2020 while the steering team proceeds with other agreed upon tasks.

Discussion highlights

- Catch-up time will always be needed for groups that join late. It is important that we ensure new participants feel a part of this effort rather than just providing input later in the process. This takes time and suggests we may not want to leave invitations open ended.
- We can still use some form of voting today to move forward. We just need to work through any “no” votes.

A thumb vote was conducted on whether to postpone the signing. (Thumbs up: 9, Sideways: 2, Down: 0) Signing would be postponed to sometime in early 2020.

IV. Additional Compact Participants

Subgroup Report – Martye Griffin

The major crux of the discussion was making sure we had the right entities at the decision-making level. There was full agreement that Ho-chunk would be good to invite as a partner. A social justice group to speak for under-represented communities and lake users (i.e., subsistence anglers) was also recommended, at least at the collaborator level. Giving this type of group decision-making rights would foster greater support for the Compact. Other recommended groups to invite at the collaborator level included Yahara Pride Farms, Madison Area Builders Association, and the Towns/Villages Association. The subgroup also favored the recommendation of capping the total number of Compact members to 21.

Discussion Highlights

- We can ask invited groups at what level they’d like to be involved.
- Finding a social or environmental justice organization that checks every box will be difficult.
 - Disenfranchised user groups are difficult to reach. We need a mechanism to engage and represent their interests.
 - Can we get this input through focus groups?
 - Outreach is good, but it will be better to have them at the decision-making table.
 - Could there be a position to represent the public at-large?

A thumb vote was conducted on giving the subgroup the okay to make the invitations they are considering. (Thumbs up: 11, Sideways: 0, Down: 0)

ACTION ITEM: The subgroup will try to meet prior to the 12/6 steering team meeting. It was agreed that invitations could be extended to the groups recommended.

V. Next Steps & Closing

A pared down version of the Compact signing document was previously shared. The revisions were intended to make it more concise and easier to sign. Also, by removing mention of specific groups and efforts, it may help address comments received from Yahara Pride Farms.

Discussion Highlights

- In the Preface, we might want to recognize that we are on the ancestral land of the Ho-Chunk. Brenda Gonzales at UW was recommended as someone who might be willing to take the lead in crafting an acknowledgement and reaching out to Ho-Chunk.
- How can we engage Yahara Pride Farms when they don't have the staff/capacity to attend all of the meetings?

ACTION ITEM: The “additional participants” subgroup will address the above considerations. Everyone was asked to review the Compact signing document prior to the next meeting.

Next meeting:

December 6, 2019, 8:30 - 10:00 a.m. (3rd Floor Isthmus Room @ Verex Plaza)