

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Steering Team
Friday, May 14, 2021
8:30-10:00 A.M.
Zoom Meeting

Attendance

Present: Ruth Hackney, Jake Vander Zanden, Anita Thompson, Richard Lathrop, Tricia Gorby, Missy Nergard, Janet Schmidt, Eric Vieth, Martye Griffin, Kelly Hilyard, Kyle Minks, Carolyn Clow, Coreen Fallat, Greg Fries, Mark Riedel, Matt Diebel, Mike Rupiper, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn, James Tye, Kathy Lake

Anticipated Outcomes

- Feedback on the Strategies Table Framework
- Individual commitment plans to recruit people to take the public survey
- List of any red flags for draft public survey (offline)

Welcome & Check In (Chaired by Kyle Minks)

Meeting convened at 8:30 a.m. Next meeting will be held on June 11th. Reminder that 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 April 9, 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-1Aup9SViTIXlxyGadHoDVMmDB1N?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.

Vision, purpose, and values statements were reviewed. Agenda to include discussion and input on the proposed Strategy Table Framework. In the coming six months, the table will guide the development of content that goes into the Plan. Each of our organizations will also decide which specific recommendations it wants to champion. Additionally, preparations are underway to launch the public survey on May 26th. It will be live through early September. Our goal for today is for each of us to be ready to tap our networks so we can hear from as much of the community as possible. We will see *Pecha kucha* presentations from the City of Madison and Yahara Lakes Association to learn about their assets and ideas for the CLEAN 3.0 plan.

Strategies Table Framework (Paul Dearlove)

[https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1N_vlapOIEKSL7QDvp5ObeBksxEITYX8Z/edit - slide=id.p1](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1N_vlapOIEKSL7QDvp5ObeBksxEITYX8Z/edit-slide=id.p1)

The proposed table is meant as a framework that can be used to create the structure around what we would like the plan to look like, where accountability lies in filling out the different sections, and the relevant audiences. The information is also intended to help each Compact member organization determine the specific tactics it wants to champion, and for key stakeholder groups to have the necessary information to make good decisions. Our goal for today is to gather feedback on the proposed structure so the format can be finalized.

“High Level” section

Big-picture goals, objectives, implementation leads, and involved stakeholders of relevance to the general public

- *Sector:* Urban or rural
- *Focus:* Phosphorus or E. coli reduction
- *Goal:* Major action needed
- *Objective:* Actionable and measurable metric (amount needed)
- *Stakeholder Groups & Lead:* Who is responsible for the taking or leading the action

“Tactical” section

This information is more into the weeds and of relevance to those implementing or tracking progress

- *Impact:* What is the result we might see if the objective is fulfilled
- *Tracking Method & Metric:* Formula, model or measure used to evaluate progress
- *Tactics:* Activities proposed to achieve the objective
- *Completion Timing:* How long are the proposed tactical activities intended to take
- *Cost:* Level of resources needed (Question: what type of cost metric would be most useful or feasible?)

Note: SmithGroup is responsible for filling in all these boxes. The Steering Team would be seeing them and weighing in as they get fleshed out.

“Values Testing” section

Multi-category rankings for each tactic that match up with our Strategies Evaluation Criteria, and that are based on our identified values. As recommended tactics are brought forward by the consultant team, the Steering Team will be responsible for testing and screening each action/tactic. This section is designed to help our team evaluate how we should prioritize the objectives and tactics identified by SmithGroup. We want this portion to be Steering Team driven.

Clarifying questions and responses:

Q: Does the table capture things that are happening already and new objectives?

A: Yes, SmithGroup is in the process of updating and expanding upon the list of action goals and objectives based on the desired outcomes and progress to-date. Most of the actions identified in Yahara CLEAN 2.0 are still valid and will continue to be implemented and improved. There will also be new actions proposed as appropriate. For example, actions related to *E. coli* reduction will be new to the effort.

Q: Are we discussing whether or not the information would be sufficient for our groups to decide where they fit in?

A: We want to know two things from you: 1) if the strategies table framework includes the right information categories to be filled out and reflected in the final plan; and 2) if it provides the type and detail of information you will need to effectively understand and champion specific recommendations.

Questions presented for breakout room input:

- *What looks helpful to you?*
- *What else do you need?*
- *Anything else we should consider?*

See attached Menti Poll feedback (Attachment A)

Public Survey: Next Steps & Your Role (James Tye)

To inform our planning process, Clean Lakes Alliance felt it was important to have a more robust and inclusive community-engagement effort than was possible through the Compact budget. Therefore, Clean Lakes Alliance will take the lead in funding a SmithGroup & Urban Assets-led community engagement initiative this summer, and with an emphasis on getting a greater diversity of stakeholders to complete the survey. This will include bringing back public-engagement initiatives that had to be cut from the consultant contract due to Compact funding constraints. Those activities include having the consultant team conduct intercept interviews at lake-access points, perform tabling at community events, and take the lead in conducting and promoting the online survey.

May 26th, 2021– The online community survey will go live as part of the “State of Our Lakes” WKOW primetime television special at 6:30 p.m. It will then be kept open until early September.

Clean Lakes Alliance is also about to release this year’s *Greater Madison Lake Guide*. It contains articles featuring the Compact and a preview of the 2020 State of the Lakes Report, among other information about the lakes.

Steering Team member action items:

1. Draft survey questions were shared for high-level feedback. Email Paul Dearlove if you have any “red flag comments” pertaining to the draft public survey before the end of the day on Monday (5/17). All input received will be forwarded to the consulting team so the survey can be finalized.
2. A draft list of Madison-area community events was shared where the consulting team planned to do tabling to encourage people to take the survey. Email Paul Dearlove if there are any events that your organization is involved with that Urban Assets should consider including as a tabling opportunity this summer.

Note: Clean Lakes Alliance will work with the consulting team to draft some basic language inviting people to take the survey. Please be ready to activate your

communication and promotion channels. If you did not already provide your primary media/outreach contact to Adam Sodersten at Clean Lakes Alliance, please do so.

Questions presented for input:

- *As Compact members, how can we get the word out?*
- *What are you willing to do?*

See attached Menti Poll feedback (Attachment B)

Pecha kucha presentations: Compact member organizations' perspectives, assets & ideas

Member groups presenting:

[City of Madison](#)

(<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1N7eBikeQfjLrmEWZIQE7m8gm4N0FnLEw>)

[Yahara Lakes Association](#)

(<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1N7eBikeQfjLrmEWZIQE7m8gm4N0FnLEw>)

Chat comments:

- Wow! That "green & resilient" vision overlaps so strongly with the vision of this Compact!
- Having a governmental agency with the ability to create ordinances that can directly affect runoff and water quality is a great asset for the Compact.
- YLA has great reach. If all its members did shoreline activities to improve water quality, that is a lot of miles of shoreline!

Close

Remember to please review the survey questions and provide feedback to Paul by Monday. Meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.

Attachment A – Menti Poll Feedback

Strategies Table Framework

What looks helpful to you?

- The headers are understandable. Personally I would swap goals and objectives (you can meet your objective without meeting a specific goal you set out)
- The "values" has a lot of categories. Are they all necessary - for example, are the effective and achievable needed?
- Like format overall. Actual costs or range would be better. A lot of values - can some be combined?
- "Detailed costs. Maybe a range.
- Values may be hard to narrow down.
- Tracking method will be helpful. Measurable goals.
- Total costs. Cost per pound."
- Some of the items have funding components that need to be identified so there should be a category for "fundable" not just cost.
- Need ways to measure success - there is not always a linear translation that measures the total P (such as X feet of shoreline provide Y amount of P reduction).
- Spreadsheet could help identify where joint activities are
- Will help identify what should be included in the report
- Overall structure looks good, but a table structure isn't the most effective way to reach a specific stakeholder and encourage action.
- Stakeholder column is most helpful
- Return on investment may be an important column to identify actions
- Modeling will need to occur to make sure these practices accurately identify and correlate to the impact (make sure it's achievable).
- Clear structure
- Stakeholder Groups, shows that many orgs. will need to partner together get work done
- Table provides a useful structure for thinking about multiple aspects/dimensions for each goal. Structure forces you think about these other factors

What else do you need?

- I think an explanatory glossary or text about the different areas and what the titles/categories mean and how the information that is presented was created (e.g. the cost area), then that would be a good compliment to the table
- Definitions for values headings
- The overall ROI area in the values is confusing. Seems like all the yellow boxes contribute to some sort of overall ROI, or is that box some sort of evaluation of the other areas listed?
- Examples of what makes a value High, Medium, or Low
- Definitions in the values sections. Need some examples in order to work through the values section of the table.

- More clarification/consideration of the "values" columns
- More clear explanation of the use of the table
- Is there something else that can speak to funding opportunities? Are there grants available for particular items?
- A column to identify "who" can fund it. The costs are there, but is it a community investment, an individual investment, or a grant fund?
- Easier connection for the decision-making needed for the organization to commit and decide what works for them and fits their priorities. Can the table help answer: If xyz is your priority, here are the actions for you
- Nothing
- The table does a good job of organizing all the possible options and how well they address various criteria, but it doesn't provide a road map for how an individual stakeholder group should decide what to do.
- There needs to be an innovation piece as a part of this. There should be a way to capture tactics that will help us make progress.
- Seems quite complete
- Some type of scoring and weighting based in the different values criteria to help with decision making around which actions fit best for your organizations
- Some things need to be fleshed out more if there are multiple stakeholder groups. It's not enough information to take back to policymakers for them to understand what it really means
- This is a great tool but needs a bit more - complimentary / supplemental info to be able to really tell policymakers what this means.

Anything else we should consider?

- The only way this will be clear and understandable [to the public] is to use storyformscience. I believe they teach a class at UW. Each of the areas that an organization feels could help, we could use help then making our pieces understandable to our constituents. Develop a storyformscience for each of the organizations to help promote
- For the ag options on the table, treat as menu on the list, not that we want x,y,z off the list.
- The values area is good and helpful. The headers (yellow) area should include some definition of what was considered within the categories for the assessment.
- May need some additional language and details to support each goal /objective
- 1 or 2 page detailed explanation / description for each goal
- Will want assurance that the funding will be there to implement fully
- Chat comment: I question the steering team role in filling out the values area. I agree that the experts that we are paying should fill that in and organizations may decide to change, but the steering team expertise shouldn't be the only information driving how the values area is completed

Attachment B – Menti Poll Feedback

Public Survey: Next Steps & Your Role

As Compact members, how can we get the word out?

- Dane County Fair
- Builders and design shows at Alliant
- Individual member events
- City newsletters
- Lake recreation activities - Iron Man, etc.
- Monthly e-newsletter
- Nextdoor app
- Good Neighbor Festival in Middleton (August)
- Social media
- Open fishing events
- Garden sales
- Fishing competitions
- Mad-City Ski
- Neighborhood associations
- High schools
- Pitch article to university communications
- Breakfast on the Farm
- All Madison festivals (African fest, Greek fest, etc.)
- Madison forward soccer games
- Send Links via member communications & social media
- E-newsletters & social media, SASY Nextdoor App

What are you willing to do?

- Feature story in newsletter (3)
- Share information at public informational meetings
- Send to City of Monona
- Social media posts or reposts (4)
- Post to Nextdoor (2)
- Chat comment: Any kind of pre-written posts and text will be incredibly helpful. We will have consistent messaging and make it easy to post.

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Executive Committee
Friday, May 14, 2021
10:10-11:10 A.M.
Zoom Meeting

Attendance

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

Anticipated Outcomes

- Shared understanding of financials and current SmithGroup/Urban Assets plan
- Feedback and ideas for work and deliverables for the remainder of 2021

Welcome and Check In (Chaired by Kyle Minks)

Meeting was convened at 10:12 a.m. *Summary notes from the 4/9/21 Executive Committee meeting were approved unanimously.*

Dearlove reviewed the monthly financials. All financial commitments from collaborators are now accounted for. Also reviewed were the considerable in-kind contributions from Alison Lebwohl and Clean Lakes Alliance staff as part of planning and facilitating meetings and managing the overall project. In future reports, he noted that consultant expenses specific to “surveys, public meetings & outreach” will be separated out and shown under that line item.

Minks summarized the agenda, indicating it is focused on gathering feedback and direction on: 1) What the Executive Committee needs to see from the consulting team each month leading up to the draft plan release later in 2021; and 2) What else we need to do to be ready for a smooth rollout in the first half of 2022. To do that, we will discuss the Executive Work Plan, the Strategies Table, and the revised project timeline submitted by SmithGroup.

Strategies Table & Next Steps

The strategies table was produced as a framework for what would go into the Yahara CLEAN 3.0 plan, the sources and relevant audiences for the information, and to help Compact members identify specific elements they will want to champion. Good feedback was received from the Steering Team that will be used to further refine the table. It is a tool we are using to scope out the level of detail and timing of the work being done by the consultant.

Question #1: Is there particular table content that you want to be brought to the Executive Committee, and if so, when would you want to see it?

Question #2: Is the Executive Committee accepting of SmithGroup’s amended project timeline that moves the draft and final plan dates to slightly later in 2021? (Note: timeline adjustment was made to allow for the incorporation of larger public-engagement process. It moves the draft plan date to October, and the final plan date to December.)

Feedback on Strategies Table Framework:

- The table headers do a good job of hitting EPA’s 9-Key-Element planning criteria and setting us up to acquire funding and compete for high-level grants. Riedel and Andrew Craig (DNR) would be responsible for making a determination as to whether the plan and any of its components, like the public survey, meet the 9-Key-Element criteria. Something to keep in mind, however, is that grants cannot fund permit requirements.
- The content is important so that we can maximize our future success. In particular, having “SMART” (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, timely) goals is very valuable. It is important that when we use qualitative indicators, we avoid double counting the impacts of our efforts.
- Strategies and tactics that address the early spring runoff challenge and the *E. coli* contamination that causes beach closures will be especially important to see. There should also be tactics that involve capitalizing on funding opportunities.
- Having a quantitative objective might be premature at this point for some of the action goals. The tactics are likely to influence how some of the specific objectives are formulated. Propose having “preliminary” objectives that can then be revisited and finalized after the tactics are fleshed out.
- As the table gets filled out, we should not hesitate to acknowledge unknowns. When we think about the unknowns, however, we should not let current constraints or perceived limitations define what is possible. Today’s realities, such as funding sources and availability, will continue to evolve and change.
- With respect to the cost and timeline headers, what level of detail would be most helpful? Both can be challenging to estimate given the number of variables at play, like implementation partners involved and their capacities to complete the recommended work. (Question discussed but not resolved.)
- We need to be very clear about what everyone can do. For example, homeowners need to know what to do and what type of impact can be expected. We need the community to get behind it, especially from a funding opportunity perspective. The metrics need to be understandable by the general public. We will need to condense the larger plan into more digestible forms that can address different audiences and different times of the year.
- How and when will SmithGroup go about filling in the content of this table?
 - *Response: This is a conversation that the Leadership Team, which includes SmithGroup, will have following this meeting. The timing and strategy for executing this work will be discussed. The question is what expectation does Exec want to convey to SmithGroup about when draft work products should be produced and shared?*
- Can we ask SmithGroup to fill out the “High Level” section of the table so it can be reviewed and discussed at the June meeting? If we can at least get a full list of goals and objectives populated by June, that should allow us time to get Steering team input and be able to complete the other sections.
 - *Response: This Exec Committee request will be made to SmithGroup. Also, in addition to goals and objectives, having draft tactics to review by either June or July would be a good idea. Most of the focus will then be on those objectives and tactics that address E. coli and beach closures, and the Jan-Mar high dissolved P-loading period.*

Feedback on amended project timeline:

- The big unknown is what we will be seeing from SmithGroup and when. If we wait too long to involve the Steering Team, we run the risk of presenting something that will then need to be changed without having sufficient time. Concerned that there won't be enough time for the Steering Team to be able to digest and respond to the draft plan before a final is presented in December. We need to bring Steering Team members along as the plan gets built.
 - *Response: The plan is to work with SmithGroup as we design our monthly Compact meetings to ensure that there are no big surprises by the time we see a draft plan in October. This means hopefully having parts of the table filled out for feedback at each of our remaining meetings this summer. Because we are now adding public-engagement pieces back into SmithGroup's scope of work, they can use the extra time to complete those activities and incorporate that input into the plan.*
- Do we know if the resulting plan, including the public-engagement work and any proposed timelines, will meet EPA's 9-Key-Element-Plan criteria?
 - *Response: Those plans have 10-year shelf lives. After 10 years, it can be updated and renewed without starting from scratch. However, the CLEAN 3.0 plan will not meet all the EPA's criteria since it will not address Total Suspended Solids (TSS) as one of the impairments listed in the Rock River TMDL. While E. coli is a listed impairment, it does not have to be addressed to meet the 9-Key-Element criteria since it is not in the TMDL.)*
 - *ACTION ITEM: Riedel will work with Dearlove to set up a meeting (participants TBD) to discuss how to set up the table and future plan to maximize the potential for receiving Sec. 319 funding and other grants. This could include having a tactic that recommends ways to address the TSS requirement.*

Decision: Approval of the amended SmithGroup project timeline that postpones the draft and final plan-release dates to October and December, respectively. (All in favor)

Notes relating to decision:

1. Efforts should continue to be made to inform and involve the Steering Team over these remaining months as the plan gets developed.
2. SmithGroup should plan for at least two, longer, and in-person meetings to be held in October and November for the purpose of walking us through the draft plan and gathering feedback.

Close

Meeting ended at 11:12 a.m. Next meeting scheduled for June 11th with Coreen Fallat (Wisconsin DATCP) chairing.