

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Steering Team
Friday, November 12th, 2021
8:30-10:00 a.m. Zoom Meeting

Present: Missy Nergard, Mark Riedel, Paul Dearlove, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), James Tye, Kyle Minks, Katie Hepler, Kelly Hilyard, Kathy Lake, Renee Lauber, Mike Rupiper, Tom Wilson, Coreen Fallat, Cassie Goodwin (SmithGroup), Chad Lawler, Emily Reynolds, Greg Fries, Janet Schmidt, Josh Bendorf, Laura Good, Martye Griffin, Matt Diebel, Richard Lathrop, Rory Rhinesmith, Ruth Hackney, Tricia Gorby, Luke Wynn, Allison Elli, Karin Swanson, Jessica Ross

Anticipated Outcomes

- Shared understanding of:
 - Group members' initial responses to the draft plan as a whole
 - Next steps, including how to provide feedback on the plan
- Partial list of plan aspects that may require additional context or development

Welcome and Check In (Chaired by James Tye)

Tye convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. Members were directed to refamiliarize themselves with the Compact's vision, purpose, values, and planned deliverables were reviewed from the top of the agenda. The group was next asked for any requested changes to the October summary notes. Hearing none, the **October 8, 2021, summary notes were approved as presented.**

*(NOTE: Meeting notes and other Compact-related documentation continues to get posted to the Yahara CLEAN webpage and the "members only" shared Google Drive folder:
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1-BD-1Aup9SViTIXhyGadHoDVMmDB1N?usp=sharing>.)*

Zoom protocols, facilitator ground rules, and Steering Team operating agreements were reviewed. Agreements included members making every effort to contribute comments, questions, and recommendations during the scheduled meetings and through provided input-gathering tools. This helps ensure that thoughts or concerns are effectively communicated, discussed, and addressed.

Including today, the Steering Team has two more scheduled meetings to complete this phase of our work together. Given the continuing public health situation, it is expected that business will be conducted via Zoom for the remainder of the year. An overview of the agenda and timeline were provided.

Feedback Process & Survey

Now that everyone has had a chance to independently review the draft Yahara CLEAN 3.0 plan, Cassie Goodwin from SmithGroup will briefly summarize how input was incorporated before listening to some of the bigger likes and dislikes people have with the first draft. Time is then reserved for the sharing of initial reactions as a full Steering Team to help prime the pump for the more extensive feedback that a follow-up survey is designed to collect. An online survey tool will then be made available after the meeting to gather that additional and more detailed input. Lebwohl walked the group through the survey and strongly encouraged everyone to participate to help get us across the finish line.

Timeline

November 12th – November 24th (online feedback survey)

- Continue reviewing the draft plan and bringing the work of this group back to your organizations. By 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 24th, use the provided survey link to offer any additional feedback to the draft plan. The link will go live following this meeting.

December 1st (Leadership Team editing workshop with SmithGroup)

- Interested members of the Executive Committee will meet with the SmithGroup team to discuss and determine next steps with respect to incorporating recommended edits and content requests. These editing decisions will then get shared back with you at or prior to our December 10th Steering Team meeting.

December 10th (Steering Team & Executive Committee meetings)

- The Steering Team will reconvene to discuss and agree upon any proposed changes or additions needed to finalize the plan. Members will then vote on whether it is believed the plan—with the agreed upon changes and additions—fairly represents the work of this group and should be recommended for approval to the Executive Committee.

January 2022 & Beyond

- It is currently estimated that a revised plan will be produced and shared by January 7th. There will then be a final Executive Committee meeting on January 14th to ensure all requested edits and content additions were faithfully executed. The Executive Committee will vote to accept the Yahara CLEAN 3.0 plan at this meeting, marking the end of the plan-development phase of the Compact.
- Currently, we aim to meet again in February as a full Steering Team to take a final vote and celebrate all our work.
- It is hoped that a working committee of interested Compact members would be willing to continue meeting on a regular basis to advise and coordinate on the public rollout, implementation of action recommendations, and progress tracking/messaging.
- The work of the Compact and its high-level findings and recommendations will be publicly announced at a May 18th Community Breakfast hosted by Clean Lakes Alliance at the Monona Terrace Convention Center.

Tye thanked Compact members for all their dedication, participation, and hard work over the last couple years on behalf of cleaner, healthier lakes. As the effort begins to shift to a new phase under a reformulated cleanup plan, he hoped our strengthened and expanded partnership under the Compact would continue in some form going forward. Meanwhile, he encouraged everyone to take advantage of this moment to steer the completion of the plan so it ends up being something we can all feel good about.

Compact Plan

Steering Team feedback heard at this meeting and gathered through the online survey will be summarized by Clean Lakes Alliance staff to present to both SmithGroup and the Executive Committee. Before hearing from the group, Leibold conducted a straw poll to see how members were feeling about the plan as currently drafted.

Straw Poll: Taken as a whole, is this draft plan grounded in science; reflecting the purpose, vision, values, and work of the group; and offering all of us within the watershed a role to play in cleaning up the lakes? And would you be prepared to recommend it to the Executive Committee for approval in its current form?

Result: As expected, the straw poll showed a mix of reactions, and was followed by discussion on both the plan's positive aspects and needed changes.

Brief Presentation (SmithGroup)

Cassie Goodwin, representing SmithGroup, thanked those who contributed to the first draft of the plan, saying it was a team effort with multiple authors and content providers. Contributors included Clean Lakes Alliance (Acknowledgements, A Case for Action, Background), and Matt Diebel and the P-Loading Subgroup (State of the Science). SmithGroup is continuing to work with Urban Assets on the Public Engagement section. The Priority Actions section is the direct result of working with the Steering Team, and it hopefully reflects your comments and guidance to-date.

Goodwin noted that some last-minute calls and adjustments were made in consultation with the Leadership Team after receiving input on the initial scoring. This led to an increased emphasis on certain actions over others based on what was being heard. An effort was also made to strike a balance between ambitious versus more easily achievable action recommendations. The plan is meant to be a flexible stakeholder guide and does not try to solve every question related to how things might get implemented. Goodwin said she now looks forward to hearing Steering Team reactions and comments so any final edits or additions can be made.

Round Robin Reactions

After a couple minutes of silent reflection and notetaking, each meeting participant was asked to provide a brief response to each of the following two questions:

QUESTION #1: What is one thing you particularly liked about the draft plan and why?

Minks: Well organized given the massive scope. Accessible format containing lots of information.

Fallat: The State of the Science chapter was excellent. The content was accessible and really helped provide context and explain some of the recommendations.

Lawler: Well organized. Nice to see a cost impact included. Good detail.

Wilson: Happy to see several alternative actions, including some that are easier to achieve among the top priorities. This reflected the input we provided.

Lathrop: The science section prepared by Diebel and the P-Loading Subgroup was very well prepared. Good job analyzing the newer science which is very important to this plan.

Fries: The State of the Science was excellent. Thank you to Diebel for doing most of section write-up himself on behalf of the subgroup.

Hilyard: Also appreciated the science section. The action priorities broken down in more depth was great to see later in the document.

Riedel: Impressed with the science section. Much has been learned about loadings and trends since CLEAN 2.0, providing the basis going forward for things we should do more of and where adaptations are needed.

Lauber: Nice layout and formatting that makes it easy to read. Good use of pictures.

Griffin: Good overall organization and structure. Offers clear roles for people to play.

Schmidt: The science section was excellent. Important for action recommendations to be well grounded in scientific reality. The public engagement was good given all the challenges involved. Appreciated all the work that went into that.

Diebel: Well organized given the large amount of information on the Yahara watershed system and the relevant strategies. The document has the potential to be used as a reference for years to come.

Good: Appreciated the attempt at inclusiveness of different audiences. Found it useful to look at the information collected from the survey, especially from ag producers.

Reynolds: Liked the Executive Summary. Thought it provided a good overview.

Rupiper: Liked the format and tone. Document is understandable and concise given size of effort.

Gorby: Felt the plan was holistic in covering lots of information and different focus areas. Well organized with the important information up front. Good level of depth and background, making it accessible for readers.

Bendorf: Well organized with good scientific grounding. Liked the top priority actions that involved working more with producer-led groups and increasing perennial cover on ag land.

Seymour: Liked the historical background which really demonstrates why we needed to recalibrate. Specific metrics will really be important to emphasize as we bring more groups and people onboard. What gets measured gets done.

Lake: Pulls together lots of diverse opinions and speaks well to the complexity of the challenges.

Hackney: The plan comes across as being very respectful and inclusive of many voices.

Dearlove: Organization, formatting, and science section were big pluses. Easy for people to find their roles in the plan. Does not overwhelm the reader with unnecessary information or jargon.

Rhinesmith: Liked the science and background sections. Will be interested to see how this gets rolled out to the public in an understandable way so it can be implemented. Good information here for people to take ownership of the actions.

Tye: Liked the focus on five, distinct stakeholder groups. Avoids setting up a dynamic that would pit urban vs. rural, or one stakeholder group against another. Appreciates Lebwohl's work to ensure that everyone's voices are heard so they can be represented in the plan.

QUESTION #2: What is one significant thing you would like to see changed about the plan (added, removed, edited) and why?

Hackney: Passed

Lake: Passed

Rhinesmith: How do we make this plan actionable? Need to make sure this doesn't turn into just another reference document.

Seymour: Agrees with Rhinesmith. A shorter version of the plan that concisely presents the most important information might be helpful in making it accessible to more people. This calls for a partnership approach which could be further emphasized.

Bendorf: The plan could use a timeline for the rollout and when things are supposed to happen, particularly over the next 3-5 years.

Gorby: Making this digestible to the public is important. Some of the raw data might be better to include as an appendix or in a separate, referenced document. A couple of the tables can be moved or reworked to make them easier to access and interpret. Will provide those details and suggestions related to the public-engagement sections in the survey.

Rupiper: Wants to see more specifics in terms of implementation guidance, such as cost and who is expected to lead, especially with respect to high-priority actions. Many priority actions fall to government, but this is a broad stakeholder category to leave undefined.

Reynolds: The plan can be difficult to navigate. As a particular stakeholder, how do I quickly find where to go to get to my specific actions? This could potentially be addressed through refinements to the Table of Contents and Executive Summary.

Good: It is overly optimistic on the impact of the manure-collection pilot. Seems to imply that if all the manure is collected in the winter it would eliminate the winter runoff and phosphorus-loading problem, which is not true. It also relies too heavily on digesters and their recycling of phosphorus without including the component on tracking what happens to the product of the digester. The product still needs to get exported or replace inputs, but that fact was left out entirely.

Diebel: The term “plan” implies everything is mapped out. However, not all details are included which is not the fault of anyone. It currently serves more as a reference document than an implementation plan. It would be a huge undertaking to tackle plan development at this scale. Ongoing collaboration among smaller working groups will need to flesh out a full action plan.

Schmidt: Agrees with Rhinesmith. A lot of stuff is in here, but there is not a clear path forward on how to execute these actions. Needs to go to the people making budgetary decisions.

Griffin: Great call to action, but it’s hard to figure out where to plug in. Needs to be made more accessible to those being asked to do something, and with details that answer “how.”

Lauber: There was a lack of guidance on who specifically should take the lead for the high-priority government actions, and how those action recommendations were supposed to get accomplished.

Riedel: Progress and past successes need to be celebrated more. Frustrated that current recommendations did not always incorporate earlier Steering Team feedback, especially those related to government (i.e., nutrient trading and setting a Phosphorus Index target).

Hilyard: Agrees with Griffin. The plan is a lot to absorb, so the process for rolling it out to the public in an understandable and meaningful way is critical. Spending some time thinking about what comes next is going to be important. More detail around the top actions should be incorporated so those who are being asked to implement them have some direction.

Fries: Agrees with Good’s comments on digesters, and Rupiper’s and Schmidt’s comments about differentiating between different government roles. Government is not a monolith, so leadership roles need to be assigned. In addition, buy-in is needed from the decision makers within the different spheres of government to make sure the actions can be advanced and funded.

Lathrop: Priority actions under Government are sometimes too general, such as the very top action being to “maintain ongoing meetings.” The science section did a good job of setting the stage for focused action targeting the biggest problems. For example, while it is a fact that most of the phosphorus loading is happening between January to March, a coherent strategy for addressing this issue seemed to be missing. Most of the action must occur on agricultural land if we are going to really move the dial, and the money to pay for it will probably have to come from society. Did not like breaking up the actions by stakeholder group. Suggests dividing the actions up by region, like agriculture and urban. Still a lot of good things about the draft document. Just concerned we created a plan that will not do as much as needed to address the larger issues.

Wilson: Ag actions (starting on page 62) should be refined to draw more attention to farmer-support aspects. Concerned about relying on having to ask producers to do things. Producers need to work with government and know what those support mechanisms are and how to access them.

Lawler: Likes the plan overall. Biggest issue is with the Dane County Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) action to address runoff. Changes have already been made in the city of Madison since those recommendations came out. There are also serious impediments to achieving the recommended infiltration standards that are not reflected in the single-dollar-sign cost assessment. Changing a state or local policy and implementing that change is expensive to both the implementing entity and the affected stakeholder or the end consumer. Where is the analysis on where we are now versus what might still be needed (if anything), and what consequences might result?

Fallat: Agrees with Gorby’s comments. There are some areas where details can be simplified or moved to an appendix. Also, the action recommendations should be capturing the needs that were identified and discussed in other plan sections. That’s not always the case. For example, the ag engagement comments about what producers are most concerned about. It should be made clear

how recommendations reflect those concerns. In addition, the government section is comparatively big and overwhelming.

Minks: Overall tone can still use some work. Some of the language still conveys an urban vs. rural dichotomy. The more we can show value to farmers by emphasizing soil health and other benefits, the more buy-in we will get.

Lake: Agrees with Riedel and Lawler. The plan, as currently written, overlooks or fails to recognize a lot of what is already happening in the watershed through groups such as MAMSWaP.

Dearlove: Ultimately, much of the plan's success will come down to how well we track and communicate our progress over time to the larger community. How will public know or understand what is happening if we haven't established updated guidance for how to measure and message overall progress, such as through a community dashboard? Discussions are ongoing with respect to this piece. The State of the Science chapter offers a good starting point and foundation for doing this, but it should be more prominently addressed and featured in the plan.

Tye: Agrees with Dearlove that it's hard to move forward without a method to track and report progress to the community. The public will care most about how the lakes are doing, and whether our collective work is making them cleaner and healthier. Also, wonders if we need to create a plan section or separate document that covers what has happened more specifically in the last decade, and that recognizes the good work of various groups and efforts. This would help memorialize the accomplishments and progress of partners who have been working on these issues. A few comments in Chat expressed support for the idea.

Next Steps & Close (James Tye)

Feedback from Yahara Pride Farms: Initial feedback was obtained from Yahara Pride Farms on all the draft actions related to agriculture. Hepler, Minks, and Riedel were thanked for meeting with YPF leadership and asked to provide a summary. They reported going through all the Ag-related actions and getting a lot of good input from Jeff Endres and Laura Herschleb. None of the recommended actions presented any potential deal breakers. Most of the discussion was around tweaks and clarifications. It was noted that Endres and Herschleb seemed very engaged and eager to find ways to improve land-conservation efforts as willing partners.

Tye expressed appreciation for everyone's continued collaboration and good work. Special thanks were extended to the P-Loading Subgroup for its summary of the science and related guidance. The idea of summarizing and celebrating the positive progress that has happened over the last 10 years will be brought to the Executive Committee for further discussion and consideration.

Members were reminded to please fill out the online survey to provide additional feedback on the draft plan. Surveys should be completed before noon on Wednesday, November 17th. Clean Lakes Alliance will then summarize all the input so it can be discussed at the December 1st meeting with SmithGroup. In the meantime, everyone should continue to update leadership in your organizations. Now is a great time to touch base and engage your coworkers and networks.

Tye concluded the meeting by once again reviewing the timeline of activities. A vote to recommend Executive Committee approval of plan with any agreed upon changes will be taken at the December meeting. Members were asked to put holds on their calendars for the morning of Friday, February 11th for a celebratory wrap-up meeting. At that time, we will also discuss next steps related to the public rollout of the plan.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m. The Executive Committee will next meet at 10:10 a.m. The Steering Team will then reconvene on Friday, December 10th (8:30-10:00 a.m. on Zoom).

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Executive Committee
Friday, November 12, 2021
10:10-11:10 a.m. Zoom Meeting

Present: Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Coreen Fallat, Matt Diebel, Kyle Minks, Mark Riedel, Missy Nergard, Greg Fries, James Tye, Allison Elli, and Cassie Goodwin (at beginning)

Anticipated Outcomes

- Observations on the plan -- based on the online survey results, your observations, and the Steering Team discussion
- Decision on whether the plan as drafted provides all needed deliverables; and actions/owners if it is not quite there
- Decision as needed on next steps for project close

Welcome and Check In (Chaired by James Tye)

Meeting was convened at 10:10 a.m. *The October 8th summary notes were unanimously approved as presented.* This was followed by a review of today's agenda.

Plan Discussion

Open Discussion with Cassie Goodwin (SmithGroup)

Goodwin:

- Thought the Steering Team round robin was very productive and respectful, with everyone having the opportunity to speak to the two questions posed.
- Agreed with many of the comments and felt they were constructive. For example, the Government section being difficult to navigate and lacking specifics on who is doing what – something SmithGroup recognizes and intends to address.
- It was concerning to hear the comments about the lack of follow through on some earlier feedback. She said she wanted to make sure those issues are remedied to everyone's satisfaction. It was acknowledged that the way this draft came together was probably more rushed than SmithGroup would have preferred.
- There have been ongoing conversations about what subsequent formats might look like for rolling this out to the public. It will be important for people to understand that this document will never serve every public-communication need.

Executive Committee Members:

- It is important for the main plan itself to be as comprehensive and inclusive as possible. More public-friendly summary documents can then be produced as needed. Multiple levels of communication will be necessary for a successful public rollout.
 - Brochures and FAQ summaries can be used as tools for the public rollout. For example:
https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/sites/default/files/topic/Wastewater/WQT_Factsheet_4_32013.pdf

- There may be things that SmithGroup can do now to help Compact members prepare for the eventual rollout. If SmithGroup has specific ideas or recommendations, those can be brought to the December 1st editing meeting. At that time, the Leadership Team will be reviewing the feedback from both today and the surveys so decisions can be made for how to address that input.
- There is so much that SmithGroup was trying to digest. It is to be expected that some more work would be needed to fine tune the draft plan. If there is a way that we can shape this in the limelight of all the progress that has been made, stakeholders will be more engaged and have greater buy-in.
 - The idea for highlighting accomplishments seems worth doing, and maybe in the form of an infographic. It would be beneficial for farmers to see these successes acknowledged.
- There will be a lot of feedback to go through and some level of prioritization will be necessary. Some follow-up actions related to changing or generating content may have to be deferred to others who are better positioned to generate that content.
- Agreement with many of the Steering Team comments, including the need to assign who is going to be doing what, particularly with respect to the government sector.

Closed Discussion

PUNCH LIST: Clean Lakes Alliance will take the lead in gathering, organizing, and interpreting all the feedback and generating a punch list for SmithGroup. The punch list, to be shared with the Executive Committee, will give greatest priority to the significant issues that would be most critical to address to move forward. The list will be reviewed and discussed with SmithGroup as part of a three-hour, in-person meeting on December 1st. Dearlove, Tye, Riedel, Minks and Diebel will be in attendance, and other Executive Committee members are invited to participate if interested.

PLAN ACCEPTANCE: Proposed plan-acceptance language was reviewed and discussed. A vote of “acceptance” is intended to signify agreement that the body of work fairly represents the Compact’s assessment of current conditions and what needs to happen to achieve cleaner lakes. It would not constitute an endorsement of any specific actions or commit a member organization to funding or executing specific action recommendations.

Depending on how the feedback and editing process goes, a vote may not be able to happen until January or February. The plan is to present a revised plan to the Steering Team by January 14th so a vote can be taken by the Steering Team and Executive Committee on February 11th. Member groups will need as much time as possible to run the final document through their chains of command to get any necessary, high-level signoffs. Tye offered to provide a proposed rollout timeline with what to expect moving forward.

Decision: Authorize Clean Lakes Alliance (Dearlove and Tye) to 1) gather and process draft plan editing requests received from the Steering Team by the November 24th deadline; 2) develop and submit a page-turn punch list of requested edits for Executive Committee approval prior to the December 10th Compact meetings; and 3) forward the approved punch list to SmithGroup with a deadline of producing a revised version of the plan by January 7th. (Unanimously approved)

NEXT STEPS (2022): Tye explained his intention of inviting Compact representation onto the Clean Lakes Alliance Community Board to support ongoing collaboration. Once the Compact’s plan-

development phase is finished, it is hoped that the group can continue working in partnership through some form of committee structure.

Because the Compact budget will be exhausted by the end of the year, additional funds need to be found to get us across the February finish line. The extra 1-2 months are likely to be needed to finalize and approve the plan. Yahara Lakes Association has already stepped up by donating funds to Clean Lakes Alliance to help defray costs associated with the additional public engagement work. Tye asked the Executive Committee for thoughts on how to fund the Jan-Feb work. It was estimated that an additional \$4,000-5,000 was needed for two additional months of meeting-facilitation services.

Discussion outcomes:

- Tye offered that Clean Lakes Alliance would commit an additional \$1,000.
- Fries will seek approval for an additional \$1,000 on behalf of city of Madison.
- Nergard hopes to commit an additional \$1,000 on behalf of UW-Madison. However, she said her own ability to continue participating was in question.
- The rest of the Executive Committee was asked to reach out to James if additional funds could be secured to finish out the project.

Close

Meeting ended at 11:03 a.m. The next Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for December 10th (10:10-11:10 a.m. on Zoom) with Kyle Minks chairing.