SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Steering Team
Friday, March 12, 2021
8:30-10:00 A.M.
Zoom

Attendance

Present: Dale Robertson, Dave Merritt, Bob Wipperfurth, Eric Booth, Eric Vieth, Martye Griffin, Missy Nergard, Kelly Hilyard, Laura Good, Richard Lathrop, Kyle Minks, Carolyn Clow, Coreen Fallat, Greg Fries, Mark Riedel, Matt Diebel, Mike Rupiper, Renee Lauber, Sarah Dance, Todd Stuntebeck, Emily Lakeman, Tom Wilson, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn, Karin Swanson, Adam Sodersten, James Tye, Ruth Hackney, Kathy Lake

Anticipated Outcomes

- Feedback on the usefulness of the strategy evaluation criteria draft tool
- Shared understanding of:
  - State of the Science report (draft)
  - Assets and perspectives of member organizations

Welcome & Check In (Chaired by Missy Nergard)

Meeting convened at 8:30 a.m. Reminder that the next virtual meetings of the Steering Team and Executive Committee are scheduled for 4/9/21. There will be no meetings in August, and the September meetings were moved from 9/11 to 9/17. These changes are reflected in prior updates to the Google Calendar invites.

Summary notes of the February 12, 2021 Steering Team meeting were unanimously accepted as presented, and with no requested changes or edits. Meeting notes and other Compact documentation continue to get posted to the Yahara CLEAN webpage and the shared Google Drive folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1-BD-1Aup9SViTIXlxhyGadHoDVMmDB1N?usp=sharing. The folder, accessible to all official designees, also includes the latest updates to the Compact Decision Tracker, monthly financials, project schedule, and other relevant materials and handouts.

Working agreements and facilitator rules were reviewed. It was also announced that SmithGroup and Urban Assets are now into the process of interviewing Compact members and agricultural stakeholders. They plan to share their findings at next month's meeting. In addition, work is underway on how to fund, design, and outsource the adminstration of an online public survey (May target date), with results and recommendations by July.

Agenda overview:
- Introduce strategy-evaluation criteria developed from the work we did together in early 2020 to define desired Compact outcomes, outputs, strengths, and values.

- Review the state of the science and implications for strategy selection with P-Loading Subgroup members Matt Diebel, Dick Lathrop and Todd Stuntebeck. This builds on Diebel's presentation from last month. The focus will be on sharing what the P-Loading Subgroup has learned and developed during these 12+ months of collaboration on behalf of the Steering Team and what it means for the Compact.
- *Pecha kucha* presentation from the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission about its values, assets and ideas for the CLEAN 3.0 plan.

Strategy Evaluation Criteria (Paul Dearlove)

In early 2020, Dearlove reminded the Steering Team that it met for two consecutive months to address the question: "What does success look like?" This question was answered through in-person, facilitated exercises to reach agreement on priority objectives and outputs of Yahara CLEAN 3.0. The results of those exercises were used to create our "About the Yahara CLEAN Compact" document on vision, goals and project objectives.

Since that time, the P-Loading Subgroup has been meeting to understand the science in order to identify and evaluate the types of strategies that can best achieve those goals and objectives. We also went back to Yahara CLEAN 2.0 to examine some of the non-monetary issues and factors that were used at the time as evaluation criteria.

A proposed "Strategy Evaluation Criteria" tool was then presented to reflect the above work and guiding values. It was drafted to capture the input that the group has already provided up to this point, and to serve as a tool to help focus our strategy-evaluation discussions. As we look to weigh the pros and cons of different best management practices and recommendations, the tool is designed to encourage us to ask ourselves: How do these strategies support our goals, objectives, strengths and values criteria?

<u>Straw Poll</u>: Recommend using a tool like this to shape our conversations around strategies. (All in favor)

Strategy Evaluation Criteria

(Derived from 1/10/20 & 2/14/20 Steering Team values & goal-setting exercises)

Does it advance desired outcomes?

- Less algae
- Clean swimming beaches
- Clearer water
- Better ecosystem health
- Love of lake

Does it advance desired outputs?

- Outreach & culture change
- Reduced runoff
- Funding
- Reduced phosphorus

Does it honor our Compact strengths?

- Accounts for diverse perspectives
- Outcome of collaboration
- Advances common goals
- Builds on past success
- Supported by expertise
- Promotes shared responsibility

Does it support our values criteria?

Identified Attributes	Lens
Equitable	Fair and consistent in its application and expectation of affected stakeholders
Effective	Produces the desired outcome(s) or output(s)
Sustainable	Action and its effects are lasting or repeatable
Achievable	Can be readily implemented to meet desired outcome(s) or output(s)
Affordable	Acceptable cost to achieve desired outcome(s) or output(s)
Cost-effective	Offers a good "bang for the buck"
Inclusive & engaging	Broadly applicable to a wide range of stakeholders; offers a way for individuals to participate
Adaptability	Allows for adjustment as understandings, technologies, and situations evolve
Other Key Attributes	**Lens**
Public visibility	Provides educational value as a visible demonstration
Ancillary benefits	Contributes to multiple aspects of lake & watershed health (i.e., pollinator habitat, flood reduction, etc.)
Stakeholder acceptability	Likely willingness of applicable stakeholders to implement
Measurability	Adoption rates and impact can be tracked and quantified

State of the Science (Matt Diebel, Dick Lathrop, Todd Stuntebeck)

Introduction (Diebel, subgroup chair)

- Background was provided on the membership and intensive work of the technical subgroup. Membership consists of 10 experts from a wide range of scientific disciplines, backgrounds, and professional affiliations.

- One of group's main objectives was to provide recommendation-selection guidance that is based on and supported by the science.
- Subgroup members all agree that improving water quality in the lakes will take major changes, and not just refinements around the status quo. In addition, there is no one silver bullet to solve all our challenges. It is also recognized that while the subgroup can offer insights on what types of strategies might be most effective from a scientific-understanding standpoint, there are other important factors that the Steering Team will want to consider when making its recommendations (see Strategy Evaluation Criteria above).
- Recommended goal for the entire Steering Team: Once we agree to a set of strategy recommendations as a Compact, we all can and should help advocate for them in an informed way.

<u>State of the Science (Lathrop & Stuntebeck)</u>

- Effective watershed management requires understandings derived from long-term stream, river and storm sewer monitoring conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey. Much of the long-term monitoring data comes from the Lake Mendota watershed, an area that also has a long history of agricultural land use and implementation of best management practices.
    - The Pheasant Branch gaging (or monitoring) station at Middleton-Parmenter St. has had continuous flow monitoring since 1975. Pheasant Branch and the Yahara River at Windsor stations have had continuous monitoring of P and suspended sediment as well as flow since 1990. However, only P and sediment data for the Yahara River station can be used to evaluate long-term trends in rural land management practices because Pheasant Branch monitoring conditions changed after the 2002 construction of the "confluence pond" immediately upstream of the gaging station. The confluence pond since its construction and 2017 clean-out has produced significant reductions in P and sediment loads delivered to Lake Mendota.
- What is the issue? Excessive growth or "blooms" of cyanobacteria have long been a problem in the Yahara lakes. Such blooms can cause serious water quality problems, including the release of toxins that threaten public health.
- Why do we care about phosphorus (P)? P is generally the growth-limiting nutrient responsible for most algal blooms, and it is the principal cause of lake eutrophication (excessive production of algae casued by high levels of fertility in a waterbody).
- Most of the P loading to the lakes comes from overland storm runoff as opposed to "baseflow." Baseflow is dry-weather streamflow composed mosly from groundwater and subsurface flow, but also can have contributions from tile drainage and wetland seepage. Monitoring results from the Lake Mendota subwatershed show that stormflow volumes have generally been increasing over time. A summary handout was provided and discussed as part of the presentation.

    <u>Runoff</u>
    - Streamflow (includes baseflow and runoff components) in Pheasant Branch Creek more than doubled in recent years (2008-2020) compared to the previous three decades (1976-2007)
    - Runoff volumes increased 90% in the Yahara River (@Windsor), and 82% in Pheasant Branch Creek between the periods 1990-2007 and 2008-2020

    <u>Phosphorus & Sediment (Yahara River @ Windsor)</u>

    - Runoff (stormflow) contained 82% of the measured P load, while baseflow contributed 18% of the P load
    - P loads increased 57% between 1990-2007 and 2008-2020. Over the same time, in-stream P concentrations decreased 17%. Runoff water is getting cleaner, likely due to the implementation of best management practices that reduce soil erosion. Thus, the increase in P loads since 1990 can be attributed to a large increase in runoff volume. However, the P loading increase was dampened by a decrease in runoff P concentrations, likely due to the implementation of best management practices that help keep soil in place.
    - Sediment loads (mass) in runoff increased 38% from 1990-2007 to 2008-2020, while sediment concentrations decreased 28%, once again showing the positive impacts of management practices
- The seasonality of P loading is important. Most of it occurs as runoff during late winter when the ground is still frozen. Traditional practices that are designed to reduce soil erosion are less effective during this time period when the P is dissolved and less bound to soil particles. The following are results for the Yahara River @ Windsor during 1990-2020:
    - Runoff volumes were greatest during Jan-Mar storm events (41% of annual total), followed by events in Apr-Jun (32%), Jul-Sep (18%) and Oct-Dec (9%)
    - More than half (54%) of runoff P loads occurred during Jan-Mar, followed by 27% in Apr-Jun, 13% in Jul-Sep, and 6% in Oct-Dec
    - Runoff sediment loads were greatest in Apr-Jun (42%), followed by 36% in Jan-Mar, 19% in Jul-Sep, and 3% in Oct-Dec
    - More than three times as many runoff events with P loads >2000 lbs occurred in Jan-Mar (36) compared to Apr-Jun (11) during 1990-2020. Only five P-loading events >2000 lbs occurred in Jul-Sep, and two in Oct-Dec during the 31-year period.
    - P concentrations were generally much greater in medium to large runoff events during Jan-Mar as opposed to other months of the year
    - Take-home message: Jan-Mar represents the biggest challenge to reduce P loads since many conservation practices do not address these loads!

Phosphorus Reduction Strategy Recommendations (Diebel)

- Guiding principles: acknowledge failures and their causes; keep doing what works; do what will produce lasting benefits and be patient while it takes effect; focus on outcomes and allow flexible methods; use cost-effective methods and balance the burden through policy; and learn by doing. Recommendations are as follows:
- #1: Keep the average annual target phosphorus load to the lakes the same as what was recommended in CLEAN 2.0, but recognize that P loading has increased. This means that the amount of phosphorus reduction needed to reach the target has also increased.
- #2: Implement cost-effective urban actions and promote policies where urban areas help fund additional rural practices.
    - Reducing P loading from established urban areas is relatively expensive (per pound of P reduced) compared with rural areas
    - Agreements such as Yahara WINS, which allow urban areas to fund rural practices that reduce P loading, should be supported because they are potentially much more cost-effective
    - Urban actions recommended by CLEAN 2.0 should continue to be implemented

    - Leaf-free streets has the potential to greatly reduce urban P loading, but further work is needed on operational feasibility
- #3: Group rural actions that relate to agricultural operations as a Phosphorus Index performance target. *(Note: The Phosphorus Index, or PI, represents the pounds of P per acre per year that is estimated to be leaving a given farm field and reaching the nearest surface water, but not necessarily the lakes. It is based on SnapPlus modeling output specific to the farm operation. The statewide target is a PI = 6 or less, but that does not imply that some watersheds, like the Yahara, may need more aggressive targets to reach water quality goals. Average PI is about 3 in our watershed, and we would need to get down to an average of about 1.3 to reach our target. About 37% of fields in the watershed have a PI greater than 3.)*

- #4: Group other rural actions as "Practices to reduce P transport through the drainage network." Those practices include, but are not limited to, dredging legacy sediment from streams and ditches, stabilizing eroding stream banks, restoring wetlands, and constructing basins.

- #5: Emphasize rural actions that are most likely to reduce P loading during winter runoff events, increase net P export from the watershed, and retain runoff.
    - Limit total P applications based on UW Extension guidelines
    - Limit winter manure application
    - Transport manure (usually digested or composted solids) outside of the watershed
    - Transport manure within the watershed to replace commercial P fertilizer for non-livestock farms
    - Reduce imports of P-containing fertilizers and feed supplements
    - Site-specific changes to tillage, crop residue management, and cover crops
    - Convert some cropland to perennial vegetation
    - Retain runoff by constructing basins and preventing drainage of natural depressions

- #6: Focus rural actions on areas with the potential for high runoff delivery to the lakes (i.e., 60% of the watershed with direct flow paths to the lakes and that are not internally drained depressions).

- #7: Implement a pilot watershed project. This would be intended to test the performance of recommended actions within a smaller area so lessons learned can be adapted to the larger watershed. The Dorn Creek subwatershed is recommended for consideration.

- #8: Refine public messaging on progress and align with Yahara WINS. This would include progress messaging around watershed landscape actions, in-stream conditions, in-lake conditions, and lake-usability metrics.

Q&A feedback session:

Q: What makes the Jan-March months contribute so much phosphorus?

A: Causes are likely to include: 1) dead vegetation that releases dissolved P; 2) large amounts of raw manure sitting on the ground surface (as evidenced by high ammonia levels in the runoff); 3) frozen ground conditions that produce more runoff; and 4) higher volumes of runoff flowing over high-P soils during those months

Q: There were limited runoff events in Jan-Mar '21. Do you anticipate cleaner lakes this year?
A: We still have large amounts of P in the lakes from the previous few years, so it is difficult to predict if we will see any immediate impacts of low spring runoff in a single year.

Q: What processes are causing the in-stream phosphorus concentrations to be going lower even though we still get big pulses of phosphorus running off in the larger rain events that are trending up?
A: Most of the stream baseflow P is coming from the streambed sediment, while runoff P concentration is determined by what is coming off the landscape. Management practices are the likely cause of the decreased runoff P concentration even though the runoff volume has almost doubled. This increased runoff volume is resulting in more total phosphorus (loads) entering the lakes.

Q: Is there a trend toward increasing precipitation events in the fall? If so, do you anticipate that the watershed might see more events in the Oct - Dec time period after harvest as the climate continues to change?
A: While climate projections show a wetter climate in general, it does not necessarily mean that the fall will see more intense storm events.

Q: What are leaf-management strategies other than leaf collection and street cleaning?
A: Those are the main strategies, but the question is how to best implement them due to their expense and operational challenges. The issue is how to allocate limited municipal staff and equipment out doing leaf collections during a critical and short window of time.

Q: Does the Rock River Basin TMDL ("Total Maximum Daily Load") require a specific Phosphorus Index?
A: The TMDL percent reduction targets for the entire Rock River basin are relative to the state standard PI of 6. That value is an assumed, common starting point. The average PI for the watershed is around 3, but that is still not low enough for us to reach our phosphorus-load-reduction target. That value would have to be down closer to 1.3 on average across the watershed that drains directly to the lakes.

Q: In the context of a pilot project, don't we already know what it takes to hold back P? Isn't the challenge how to get it done on a larger scale?
A: We really need to address the late-winter runoff of dissolved P and the challenge of manure spreading. A pilot could help us evaluate manure-handing strategies, and to answer whether or not a reduction to a Phosphorus Index of 1.3 will produce the load reduction at the stream outlet that we would expect. Also, we do have examples and models from around the world that we can also learn from, including areas that use surface water for drinking. The question becomes what level of practice implementation will be needed in this watershed to maintain desired water quality conditions.

Q: A concern from a rural perspective will be the focus on farmland practices and that this is all the fault of farmers. We want them to work with the groups implementing practices and not run in fear. What can we do to educate the groups that service them and can promote soil-protection practices that will make them more money by protecting that asset? How can we also show a focus on urban practices so that the farmers and rural partners don't feel that urban blame?
A: We can start by drawing attention to all the progress made in reducing sediment and phosphorus concentrations, and emphasize those practices on the farm that promote water retention and infiltration. We can also communicate the successes of Yahara Pride Farms members and others who are using good practices to achieve low PI values.

Q: UW students did a project a few years ago to remove sediment at the bank of Dorn Creek at Meffert bridge as it was shown during high water that legacy sediment carried lots of P. Could more of that be added as we work on stream banks? Most of Dorn Creek is in Westport and we would be more than happy to do whatever can be done to assist, including working with the farm families in the area.
A: (Did not get to this question posed in Chat)

Q: How do you capture P in streams? How does P act in water in general- does it settle at a certain rate, stay suspended? I'm wondering if P moves through the chain of lakes, or if it mostly remains in whatever basin it enters and settles to the bottom.
A: (Did not get to this question posed in Chat)

Q: Do you think we can say management has been (17%) successful, or do you think this is just dilution of the manure input.
A: (Did not get to this question posed in Chat)

Q: This is great science! I feel like we have the tools to do what needs to be done. We have numerous examples of municipal working supply watersheds from not just the U.S., but around the world, and management actions are based on well established science. What are the barriers we have here to implementing these tools?
A: (Did not get to this question posed in Chat)

Chat comments:

- Very important analysis and message to share that the water is getting cleaner.
- We need focused terracing, contour farming, and strip-till in those high-runoff areas. These practices have been incredibly effective in Wisconsin's driftless area.
- The decline in suspended sediment concentration is a clear success story on erosion-control measures. If landscape changes were held constant while precipitation increased, we would definitely predict higher sediment concentrations. Sediment does not get diluted with more precipitation (unlike other contaminants) because the relationship between rainfall and erosion is exponential. So that's a key win!
- It would be great to discuss the difference between P-concentration trends and P-loading trends. P concentration is more relevant for stream ecosystems (particularly baseflow P concentrations), but P load seems to be more relevant for lake ecosystems.
- Municipal watershed pilot research project: There is a nice example from the Coweeta Hydrologic Lab of how to do this.

- We need clear communication about what everyone can do to keep our lakes clean (P, salt, sand, trash etc.). It all flows to the lakes and everyone can do something.
- Another urban-focused recommendation is to follow the MAMSWaP and Clean Lakes Alliance model of encouraging homeowners to use rain gardens, prairie/wildflower/butterfly gardens, and rain barrels since every drop counts.
- The current "standard" approaches are working for sediment, but they don't appear to be sufficient for P. I think we can't rely on practices that have been "proven" in other areas, which are mostly in areas with limited frozen ground. We need to think outside of this box, such as totally eliminating winter manure application.
- Most of the community will not understand this level of conversation. Most people don't even know how much water they use or where it comes from. How can we communicate this and make it a shared responsibility?

  Chat conversation thread:
  - Agreed. I think about taking these types of discussions into a municipal board meeting so we can make decisions about action and my head is spinning. We will need to create excellent resources for communicating these ideas into actions.
  - The Compact report is being designed for just that reason.
  - One suggestion is to focus messaging on the fact that the practices and actions presented today have the benefit of reducing runoff and phosphorus, thereby improving both water quality and flood risk.

Pecha Kucha Presentations: Compact member organizations' perspectives, assets & ideas

Member group presenting:
Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC)
(https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1N7eBikeQfJLrmEWZIQE7m8gm4N0FnLEw)

Big ideas for the Compact:
- Include a robust implementation framework by following EPA's "9 Key Element Plan" guidance that calls for the identification of funding, responsibility, schedule, milestones, and monitoring effectiveness of implementation efforts
- Continue to expand the partnership
- Have all the participants of the Compact formally adopt the final plan

Close

Nergard thanked the P-Loading Subgroup for all its amazing work.
Tye encouraged everyone to remove leftover road salt and leaves from their street gutters this weekend now that the snow has melted.

Meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Executive Committee
Friday, March 12, 2021
10:10-11:10 A.M.
Zoom

Attendance

Present: Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Coreen Fallat, Greg Fries, Matt Diebel, Kyle Minks, Mark Riedel, Dave Merritt, Missy Nergard, Janet Schmidt, Sarah Dance, James Tye

Anticipated Outcomes

- Decision on next steps for public engagement, including resourcing of public survey
- Feedback provided on:
  - Strategy evaluation criteria (draft) discussion from Steering Team
  - State of the Science discussion from Steering Team
  - Executive Work Plan

Welcome and Check In (Chaired by Missy Nergard)

Meeting was convened at 10:10 a.m. Members were asked for any comments or questions relating to the prior meeting notes, financials, and project timeline. There were no questions or comments.

Summary notes from the 2/12/20 Executive Committee meeting were approved unanimously.

Reflections: Steering Team Discussion

- The state-of-the-science presentations were very informative. Some of the terminology and concepts can be challenging for non-technical audiences to absorb and understand. When we take this out to the general public, we will want to package and present the information in ways that will be accessible to and resonate with different audiences. Story maps and infographics might be helpful in communicating these concepts.
- We will want to have roles and action requests for our urban dwellers, even if the potential impact and cost-effectivness does not compare favorably with what can be gained from rural areas.
- Reducing P from agriculture has a big potential price tag, especially when it comes to addressing manure challenges. Achieving an average Phosphorus Index (PI) of 1.3 is a tall order. It will be a huge lift to find resources necessary to achieve those PI goals.

Compact Member Engagement: Next steps

A proposal from Urban Assets was previously shared and summarized. The proposal identified specific public-engagement tasks and associated costs that were deemed necessary to fulfill the Compact's stated goals and objectives. It consisted of tasks

previously identified as priorities by the Compact, but that had to be removed from the original scope of work when it was learned that our group could not meet budget. Among those tasks was the actual promotion and administration of an online public survey.

Lebwohl: Public outreach and messaging is a perennial conversation topic, but this group has not identitified how all facets of that work are to get completed.

Dearlove: The Compact had to significantly scale back the public engagement and messaging work that was orginally going to be performed by SmithGroup and Urban Assets as part of the service contract. As a result, ownership over some of this work and how it gets paid for remain undefined. We've been hearing loud and clear that we need to be bringing the public along with us in developing a plan, and we have UW-Extension and subgroup guidance on how that can best be accomplished. When we had to pare down the consultant's scope of work to meet budget, we originally hoped that the Compact members might be able to take on this work themselves. However, a lack of ownership and bandwidth is keeping that from happening.

Tye: A broader community engagement is needed so that the public feels like its been heard. According to Urban Assets, the additional work it would take to meet those expectations was estimated to cost about $13,000. Proposes that Executive Committee members work to come up with those additional resources. Also suggests getting a more formal, scoped out proposal from SmithGroup and Urban Assets that lets us know exactly what we will get from the additional investment that is outside of their current contract.

Minks: It may not be worth the effort of fleshing out a more detailed proposal unless the partners will ultiimately be able to fund the work. This prompted the polling of members to gauge whether their organizations were prepared to help cost-share the shortfall.

<u>Unofficial polling results (Scale: 5 = sure thing, 1 = not happening)</u>
2, 2, 4, 4, 3, 1

- Clean Lakes Alliance (Tye): YES
- City of Madison (Fries): PROBABLY, as long as Madison and Clean Lakes Alliance are not the only ones footing the bill. A plurality of partners contributing would be ideal.
- Wisconsin DNR (Riedel): UNLIKELY – Made a high-level ask a couple months ago. The DNR has taken major financial hits a as result of Covid, and is still operating under emergency orders from the Governor. Any potential funding would have to come in the form of competitive grants for which this work might be eligible.
- Dane County (Kyle/Merritt): UNLIKELY – Would need a formal, written proposal to consider, but not aware of a budget item or pot of surplus funds we can tap into, especially during these difficult Covid times. Can provide in-kind but probably not cash.

<u>Decision</u>: Dearlove and others will work with SmithGroup/Urban Assets to develop a more formal, scoped out proposal regarding the outsourcing of needed public-

engagement tasks. That proposal is to include a clear articulation of additional outcomes not already covered by the contract. The topic will then be revisited at the next Executive Committee meeting. (All in favor, with UW-Madison and DATCP having to leave the meeting prior to the vote)

For the stakeholder focus groups, Schmidt asked what policy makers are included (i.e., mayors, municipal alders, county supervisors, etc.)? Dearlove replied that he has not yet seen a full stakeholder focus group list from SmithGroup. However, he noted they are looking for that type of input through the Compact member interviews so a list can be finalized.

Executive Work Plan

2021 work plans for the Steering Team and Executive Committee were shared but not discussed due to time limitations. Also shared were SmithGroup's initial observations from ongoing interviews with Compact members. At SmithGroup's request given her neutrality, Lebwohl summarized some of those observations on their behalf (see below). Highlighted sections are her follow-up questions and their replies for purposes of clarification. Lebwohl asked that Exec members consider these interview observations as they reflect on the proposed work plan for the coming months.

Initial observations from interviews of Compact Members

Two groups:

1. The Compact Members can be characterized by those that know and understand the significance of P-Loading on a technical level, and those that understand clean lakes are important but still don't understand why or how P-Loading is effecting the quality of the lakes.
2. Those that understand the technical aspects of P-Loading and the impact on the lakes need help messaging the information in non-technical jargon so that it can be easily understood by the lay-person.
3. That that don't understand the technical aspects need a way to better understand how P-Loading impacts the lakes. (They know it's bad, they don't know what it is doing or why it is bad).

struggling to talk about what's happening:

4. Many cannot explain how the lakes are getting dirtier and why. They understand the relationship to manure and manure runoff; but they don't understand why BMP's at the end of fields aren't working. What do we mean by "BMPs at the end of fields"? Best Management Practices that are being deployed and used by farmers where their fields discharge to capture or treat stormwater.

struggling to talk about why it matters:

5. Neither subgroup of the Compact Members (technical/non-technical) can easily articulate why unhealthy lakes is bad. They can't explain the ramifications if the lakes fail. Just to ensure I don't overstep here: What do we mean by failure? What kinds of ramifications do we mean here? Sense of place, health, economy, all of the above? I guess I would describe failure is the lakes can't be used. And there are probably tiers of failure. But if you can no longer swim in the lakes, for example, that seems like a failure to me.

struggling to talk about how the lakes impact them – and how they impact the lakes:

6. Many compact members are unsure of the role they may or may not play in P-Loading (They don't live in the watershed, or they live so far away from the lakes they don't understand how their home or business has any tie to the lakes). Is this in both directions? They don't understand how their behavior impacts the lakes AND they don't understand how the health of the lake impacts them? Yes, I think that is probably true.

Close:

We expect an updated engagement plan in the next 2-3 weeks. Next month, we will be voting on the P-Loading Subgroup's recommendations and next steps related to the potential outsourcing of public-engagement tasks. We will also be hearing the findings from Urban Assets regarding the interviews with Compact members and agricultural stakeholders. Members were once again encouraged to review and provide feedback to Lebwohl or Dearlove on the Executive Committee and Steering Team Work Plans.

Meeting ended at 11:14 a.m. Next meeting scheduled for April 9th with James Tye (Clean Lakes Alliance) chairing.