

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Steering Team
Friday, October 8th, 2021
8:30-10:00 a.m. Zoom Meeting

Attendance

Present: Anne Baranski, Missy Nergard, Mark Riedel, Paul Dearlove, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), James Tye, Kyle Minks, Katie Hepler, Kelly Hilyard, Eric Vieth, Carolyn Clow, Kathy Lake, Renee Lauber, Mike Rupiper, Thomas Wilson, Coreen Fallat, Sarah Pasquesi (SmithGroup), J. Blue (SmithGroup), Melissa Huggins (Urban Assets), Samuel Pratsch, Scott Seymour

Clean Lakes Alliance meeting support: Luke Wynn, Allison Elli, Karin Swanson

Anticipated Outcomes

Shared understanding of:

- Stakeholder action prioritization structure, and initial recommendations for priority actions
- Main plan components and key takeaways
- Next steps

Welcome and Check In (Chaired by Missy Nergard, UW-Madison)

Nergard convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. The group was welcomed back to Zoom.

Announcements: Please join the Clean Lakes 101 Science Café on Wednesday, October 20th. SmithGroup will present on the Yahara CLEAN Compact and our ongoing planning work.

Meeting reminders: The Steering Team will next meet on November 12th on Zoom.

Summary notes from the September 17, 2021, Steering Team workshop were approved as presented. (NOTE: All Compact documentation continues 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>)

Financials: The latest income-expense report was shared. Actual and projected revenues and expenses are tracking as anticipated. Also noted was the significant in-kind support and cash donations from Clean Lakes Alliance and other members, as well as from our facilitator, Alison Lebwohl.

Operating agreements: Zoom basics and the Steering Team and facilitator ground rules were reviewed. Compact members are encouraged to make every effort to contribute comments, questions, and recommendations during the monthly meetings. This helps ensure that those thoughts are effectively communicated, discussed by the group, and documented.

Overview (Alison Lebwohl and Missy Nergard):

Including today, we have three more meetings in this phase of our work together. Given the evolving public health situation, the plan is to be on Zoom for the remainder of the year despite our

original hope to be able to meet in person. Today's agenda includes discussing the draft stakeholder actions and a proposed prioritization method, and to hear what we are learning from our public-engagement work.

The draft prioritization matrix, which is structured around previously identified evaluation criteria, is intended as a tool to provide transparency in discussion and decision-making across organizations. Evaluation-criteria scoring will influence which recommendations our group considers top priorities, and how we discuss those recommendations among ourselves and in the plan. The scoring is not meant to be the final or sole arbiter, and members do not need to agree on weightings for all actions. A straw poll will then be taken to ensure our group feels it is on track to end 2021 with a plan that, taken as a whole, is:

1. grounded in science and in our shared values;
2. reflects the work of this group; and
3. offers all of us within the watershed a role to play in cleaning up the lakes

SmithGroup will share a first draft of the full plan by the end of October! At the November 12th meeting, we will talk about the draft plan and the draft metrics that will be used to share progress and impact. Another straw poll will then be taken at that time to ensure we are still on track.

Between November and December, Compact members will be bringing the plan back to our organizations to keep them updated. This is the time to share back with the Steering Team information about what would be needed for each of our organizations to get to "I can live with it" (yellow) or even "I love it" (green). That information will be compiled for the December meeting so we know what changes (if any) are needed for all organizations to vote green (I love it) or yellow (I can live with it).

At the December 10th meeting, the objective is to finalize the contents of the plan and VOTE on whether the plan fairly represents the work of this group and to recommend approval to the Executive Committee.

Looking to 2022, our goal is to initiate a public rollout of the plan recommendations at Clean Lakes Alliance's May 18th Community Breakfast. Compact members will be invited to help think through how to message the plan's major findings and recommendations during the time leading up to the event.

Major question to answer today: What might need to change for our organizations to be able to get behind the prioritized actions?

Yahara CLEAN 3.0 Plan Elements (J. Blue, SmithGroup)

Action Prioritizations and Scoring

SmithGroup has begun prioritizing the actions for the five stakeholder groups that were the focus of Steering Team review and feedback these past months. This work included synthesizing feedback and applying a scoring tool to generate a prioritized list of actions for each stakeholder group using a weighted-criteria methodology. Narratives will eventually accompany the highest-priority actions

in the final CLEAN 3.0 report. The narratives are intended to be an approachable and digestible summary that gives the context behind top-scoring actions.

Five criteria were used to score the actions relative to each other: Impact, Cost Benefit, Achievability, Sustainability, and Engagement/Inclusivity. Each action was given a 1-3 score based on how effectively it meets the criteria. The score for each action is then multiplied by the criteria weight and the total is summed to provide the overall action score. Impact is preferentially weighted as the most important criteria. It was made clear that all scores are considered draft and do not yet represent a final prioritization list.

Clarifying questions from Steering Team:

- Q: Who did the scoring? A: SmithGroup did the scoring in consultation with the Leadership Team.
- Q: How were the 1-3 scores determined? A: Scores were based on SmithGroup's best judgement. If an action was believed to strongly meet the given criteria, it received a 3 (high). If an action was believed to be at the other end of the spectrum, it received a 1 (low).
- Q: How were co-benefits measured? A: Co-benefits, if applicable, were not included as part of the scoring. Instead, they would be identified and discussed as part of the narratives.

Public Engagement Report (Melissa Huggins, Urban Assets)

The Greater Madison Lakes Survey was open from May-September. Just under 1,400 respondents participated which was short of our goal of 2,000. Preliminary results were presented, with additional analysis planned to further evaluate important findings and conclusions.

Steering Team Feedback

Steering Team members were asked to consider the following questions for feedback purposes:

1. What is your opinion of the prioritized actions on a scale of LOVE IT to DEALBREAKER?
2. What recommendations do you have to IMPROVE how actions are prioritized?
3. What do you LIKE about how the actions were prioritized?

STRAW POLL: Overall, do you feel this draft set of actions is grounded in science, reflects the work of our group, and offers all of us within the watershed a role to play? Members voted overwhelmingly in the affirmative.

Feedback to SmithGroup:

- In the Agriculture table, some actions still seem directed at non-producers. In those cases, it should be noted who is being asked to complete the action to avoid confusion.
- The action prioritization looks good. However, would prefer to get reactions from the applicable stakeholders on the highest-priority actions.
- The additional structure to the tables is helpful. "Shared values" and "reflecting the work of the group" score high. When it comes to impact
- With respect to impact scores, the draft results for some actions are not 100% grounded in the science, meaning they should be moved higher or lower in the prioritizations. Minks invited SmithGroup to talk to him for specifics.

- Going through this process of action prioritization is what's important. The Compact has done a great job of reaching out to people. At the end of the day, the relative rankings are what is important in helping with implementation and applying for grants.
- Additional feedback from the stakeholders asked to complete the actions would be good.
- What actions are proposed to get completed through voluntary measures vs. regulatory means? Which apply to individuals vs. groups? It is sometimes hard to answer these questions by looking at the action listings alone. Great work overall though!
- There seems to be a disconnect. Where is our BIG idea? Also, the Steering Team could be more involved in the prioritization process. It is not entirely clear why some of these actions were awarded the ranks they received.
- The survey findings should prove useful for developing messaging strategies. How are the survey results going to be incorporated into the plan? What statistics are being used?
- Great job of being systematic. Even though there is a lot of subjectivity in doing the scoring, it offers useful information for making relative-importance distinctions within each stakeholder table.
- Disagree that the Steering Team needs to be involved in the scoring. It was important for SmithGroup to help the larger group prioritize and make the action lists more accessible. Love how we took a big amorphous issue and broke it down into small bites, making it easier for everyone to do their part. Nice work!
- The P-Loading Subgroup should take a close look at this scoring and weighting, especially related to impact and cost benefit. The cost-benefit and achievable criteria seem very similar. Consequently, it tends to overweight cost considerations. We may need another prioritization of the actions that spans all five stakeholder categories.
- Excited by the presentation of this material and the fact that it is not nearly as overwhelming. There will need to be support for people implementing this at different levels. Happy to see the prioritization done by the experts with experience. Suggest removing abbreviations and acronyms from the action descriptions, and especially from the highest-priority actions.
- This is a great start. There needs to be a sensitivity analysis done on the scoring. Agree that experts in these fields should be given the opportunity to provide feedback. May need some more vetting.
- For messaging plan recommendations, the co-benefits associated with certain actions will be very important to note in the narratives. If actions we recommend also help with flooding, carbon sequestration, or pollinator habitat, we'll get more support from municipalities and other groups.
- Agree with the idea of SmithGroup working with the P-Loading Subgroup to review the actions and prioritizations. Also agree that the bold idea is still missing. Finally, if we do all these things, where does that move the dial? What level of participation or completion is needed to get different levels of impact?
- POST-MEETING FEEDBACK:
 - Underwhelmed by the top five actions in the Ag table. The "100% nutrient management plans" and "runoff retention" actions make sense as high priorities, but the two about "participating in producer-led groups" and "engaging producers in problem solving around P loading" are fluff. Higher-priority actions would be the winter manure-collection pilot (which is actually a Government supporting action), or any direct action that would actually reduce the spreading of raw manure on ag fields, especially during frozen ground conditions. This includes the building of more manure digesters and other manure-processing facilities which will help get the watershed phosphorus budget to balance. Another higher-priority action is to

target practices to hot spots, like those areas that are the most hydrologically connected to the lakes.

- If the top 5 Ag actions as currently listed are the result of the Steering Team retreat last month, then the process was flawed. Those actions do not represent an advancement of CLEAN 2.0. The science from the P-Loading Subgroup tells us that 54% of the runoff P is delivered during Jan-Mar events, and that it is linked to the spreading of raw manure (confirmed by 84% of the annual NH4 runoff loading occurring during these 3 months). This is the gorilla in the room that needs to be directly addressed with aggressive actions.
- Co-benefits should somehow be addressed as part of the action prioritizations. In addition, it appears that some “impact” assessments are elevating certain actions to higher positions in the tables than warranted.
- On the Residential table, why is the septic systems testing action considered a high priority? Most watershed residents are on a sewerage system and not individual septic, and not many of those septic systems are likely to be failing.
- On the Residential/Commercial and Parks/Open Space tables, why is minimizing the use of phosphorus-based lawn fertilizers ranked so high when their use is already restricted by law? Did J say this is mainly aimed at developers for first-time lawn creation? If so, let's restrict it to the Builders & Developers table. (If the overuse of these fertilizers is a known problem despite the current ban, then it is ok to include as a higher-priority item.)
- On the Builders/Developers table, the second action item about restricting runoff should be the number one priority. However, because of State limits, can we even do it? Perhaps it should be reworded to add at the beginning “Work to eliminate State barriers to and....”
- On the Government table, we have regulatory issues with setting guidelines for public shoreline development in that it is regulated by State and County governments. If we can get around that regulatory barrier, then it could be a priority. But strict guidelines are already in place, and we probably would not want to go stricter. Seems like it is a priority that has already been accomplished and we need to move it way down the list.

SmithGroup/Urban Assets Responses:

- Neglected to mention that it is our intention to share this prioritization with the P-Loading Subgroup after our discussion today.
- We tried to score each action independently depending on how well it would meet each independent criterion. The actions were not scored/ranked across all five stakeholder tables, although that exercise could be done. Would now prefer to discuss with the Leadership Team how best to address your feedback.
- Survey responses can be used to better understand outreach and messaging needs. For example, everyone can pick up pet waste, so how can outreach more effectively target and influence those who are not currently picking up after their pets?
- We still have responses to some open-ended questions in the survey that have not been fully analyzed. Once analyzed, those findings will be included in the final report.

Themes from round robin & post-meeting feedback:

- Where is the big idea that is going to result in the big, transformative change we need? These ideas could include new or better ways to process manure or pay for practices.

- Degree of potential impact should be vetted by the P-Loading Subgroup, and with consideration given to likely co-benefits that would broaden the appeal of actions. Adding co-benefits as a weighted criterion could also be useful.
- Some of the actions would benefit from having more detailed explanations and guidance behind them.
- Another layer of feedback involving the affected stakeholders would be beneficial.
- Manure-related actions warrant being at the top of any prioritization list, and especially in relation to the Ag and Government tables.
- Getting materials earlier from SmithGroup would help the review and feedback process. Some members expressed interest in playing a larger role in the prioritizations.

Reminders & action requests:

- You don't need to agree on the exact rankings. You do need to agree with what your organization can live with as a whole package.
- The expectation is that a draft report will be made available at the end of the month that we can review together.
- If you have additional feedback, please be sure to email it to Dearlove by close of business hours on Monday.

Close

Summary highlights were presented by a spokesperson from each table. Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The Steering Team will next meet via Zoom on November 12th.

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Executive Committee
Friday, October 08, 2021
10:10-11:10 A.M. Zoom Meeting

Attendance

Present: Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Coreen Fallat, Kyle Minks, Mark Riedel, Missy Nergard, James Tye, Allison Elli, Mellissa Huggins, J Blue

Anticipated Outcomes

- Shared understanding of Steering Team response to draft prioritized action tables
- Shared, detailed understanding of Compact plan components, timing, owners & progress
- Decision on final punch list (deliverables & timing) for SmithGroup to satisfy contract obligations

Welcome and Check In (Chaired by Missy Nergard, UW-Madison)

Meeting was convened at 10:10 a.m. ***No approval of summary notes necessary as the last Compact meeting was a feedback workshop with the full Steering Team.***

Timeline

- Today: Confirm final deliverables for SmithGroup to meet its contract obligations
- November 12th: Check in on our expectations for a December vote on the plan; acceptance of metrics and progress-tracking method; talk about what we want this group to look like in 2022 and beyond
- December 10th: Exec is scheduled to vote on the plan

Financials

The latest income-expense report was shared. Tye explained that the financials reflect the available resources and expenses related to finishing the plan-creation phase. Doing any wordsmithing and packaging the plan so it can be effectively communicated to specific audiences and to the larger community fall outside our present budget. To execute this next phase of work, do we consider shifting to a committee structure that will allow for continued coordination among Compact members? Additionally, how do we continue to fund the Compact's work? Exec members were asked to consider these questions as we move forward. Following the completion of CLEAN 2.0, Clean Lakes Alliance hosted a monthly gathering of implementation partners called the Committee on Strategic Implementation.

Agenda Overview

- Brief check-in on Steering Team discussion
- SmithGroup walk-through of plan components with discussion
- Brief closed session vote on punch list for SmithGroup to meet all contractual requirements

Reflections on Steering Team Discussion

Open Discussion

- Comments from the Steering Team were not unexpected and typical for this type of planning effort. There is always the *potential* for a group to feel so strongly about something that they want to drastically change the way actions are prioritized.
- The comments we received about bringing recommended actions to agricultural stakeholders was a good idea and is likely something that needs to happen.
 - Tye and Dearlove are working with Katie Hepler to develop an approach for reaching back out to Yahara Pride Farms and other agriculture groups. Hepler has agreed to act as a communication lead beginning with YPF. YPF had previously requested that we come to them when draft recommendations were ready for consideration and input. They had previously made it clear that they do not want to be involved in the actual process of coming up with those actions. This could also be a good time for Clean Lakes Alliance to re-engage with its *Resilient Landscapes* partners to get additional feedback (Olbrich Botanical Gardens, Madison Audubon Society, UW-Arboretum, etc.).
 - J Blue: We plan to share our outcomes with ag consultant Michael Tiborius. He is currently looking at the action prioritizations. The issue with trying to expand beyond the Steering Team for additional feedback is the time factor. Feel ok about circling back to members of our group, but not with going back to get more input from people already interviewed. The Steering Team is already reflective of the different stakeholder groups. Trying to keep the process moving is now a priority.
 - Agree with J except when it comes to the Ag stakeholder group. The language we are proposing to use in the plan needs to be seen by producers. The top 5 Ag actions as they are currently written may not be well received by farmers.
 - Ag action language or accompanying narratives should attempt to appeal to a farmer's interests, such as positive impacts to operations and soil-health goals.
 - J Blue: In reference to Steering Team comments about the intended audience for ag-specific actions, we tried to fold in as many comments as possible. They represent a mix of actions directed at both agricultural producers and governmental supporting entities. The Leadership Team will need to decide the ultimate consumer or target audience of the Ag table. Is the table going to be JUST for producers, or also NGOs and Government-supporting entities?
 - Led by Hepler, we will proceed with reaching out to request a meeting with Yahara Pride Farms. We can assume that the timing of a meeting will be determined by YPF and may not align with deadlines for SmithGroup. Meanwhile, SmithGroup is advised to meet with Diebel and the P-Loading Subgroup to address any unanswered questions related to action impacts, prioritizations, and tracking metrics.

Action Item: SmithGroup will work with Dearlove, the Leadership Team, and the P-Loading Subgroup to address its questions and make any needed decisions. Dearlove asked that J Blue reach out directly to Matt Diebel and the P-Loading Subgroup so he can get what he needs in the most time-efficient manner possible.

SmithGroup Contract (Open Discussion)

- J Blue: Our intent is to turn in a draft by the end of the month, barring some incomplete sections like the State of the Science chapter. SmithGroup is currently working with Urban Assets to analyze and incorporate findings from the community survey. A meeting with Dearlove is planned for next week to address any lingering questions, especially as they relate to the wording, structure, and any prioritization adjustments of the action tables. SmithGroup is also currently writing the action table narratives and feels confident about the direction they are heading.
- There seems to be ongoing confusion regarding what falls under the P-Loading Subgroup's charge vs. SmithGroup's responsibility under the contract. For example, how the potential impact of the different actions will be quantified, tracked, and reported is one of the biggest remaining questions that this plan should be addressing, and particularly with respect to our highest-priority actions. SmithGroup is urged to ensure that this critical plan component is being addressed.
- J Blue: Our scope does not include modeling. The intent is to lean into the P-Loading Subgroup to get its direction on this point. We have and will continue to work closely with Diebel on tackling this aspect of the report.

SmithGroup Contract (Closed Discussion Outcomes)

Question to Exec: Based on what you have seen and heard today, do you feel sufficiently comfortable with allowing SmithGroup to continue in its current direction, and to revisit contract-deliverable performance once a draft plan is provided and can be reviewed?

Committee members noted that they do not have a complete punch list from SmithGroup on all the different plan-content expectations, and that it cannot vote on something it has yet to see. The draft report will serve as that punch list. Recommendation is to revisit contract expectations once a draft plan is delivered by the end of the month. At that time, the Executive Committee will have a good accounting of what is included and what might be missing. This will be added to the November 12th Executive Committee meeting agenda. On a side note, Diebel was recognized for all his work on behalf of the Compact in drafting the State of the Science chapter. He has shared an early draft that demonstrates significant progress.

Comments for SmithGroup:

1. Agricultural action recommendations and related narratives will be most effective if they speak to the interests and concerns of producers (i.e., actions that speak to being farmer-led, promote good soil health, provide co-benefits, etc.).
2. Currently, it is not clear how diverse agricultural voices are reflected in the action recommendations. This should be explained in the plan. It currently appears that only the Steering Team has provided feedback on ag actions to-date. Knowing how action deliverables were shaped by the agricultural outreach performed by Michael Tiborius will be important.

Action Item: Minks, Hepler, Fallat, Dearlove and Riedel will find a time to meet to wordsmith language in the ag table actions before it gets shared with Yahara Pride Farms for input. This group will also develop and implement an approach for communicating with YPF leadership. Proposed changes will be communicated to SmithGroup prior to sharing related action tables.

Next Steps for Compact

- Tye: Proposed inviting all groups associated with the Compact to continue their work as lake-improvement partners through membership in Clean Lakes Alliance's Community Board. Also recommended was the possibility of reactivating the former Committee on Strategic Implementation (a CLEAN 2.0 collaborative body) so partners can better coordinate on advancing plan recommendations. Right now, he is focused on finding ways to raise more money to help propel the needed work into 2022 and beyond. The game plan is to add these discussion items to the November and December meeting agendas.
- Scenario planning will be important as we look to get the full Compact's acceptance of the plan in December. For example: What if we get to December, the final report goes to vote, and we hit a roadblock for someone? How will we handle that situation?
 - Clarification: The December vote will be to accept the plan as a fair representation of our collaborative goals and efforts. It will not be a vote to formally adopt or commit to every individual action recommendation.

Close

Meeting ended at 11:03 a.m. Next meeting is scheduled for November 11th with Coreen Fallat chairing.