

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Steering Team
Friday, November 13, 2020
8:30-10:00 A.M.
Zoom

Attendance

Present: Kyle Minks, Anne Baranski, Brenda Gonzalez, Carolyn Clow, Coreen Fallat, Emily Reynolds, Greg Fries, J Blue (SmithGroup), Janet Schmidt, Kathy Lake, Katie Hepler, Jake Vander Zanden, Mark Riedel, Martye Griffin, Matt Diebel, Mike Rupiper, Missy Nergard, Dick Lathrop, Sarah Dance, Sharon Lezberg, Tom Wilson, Tracy Harvey, Tricia Gorby, Alison Lebwohl (Facilitator), Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn, James Tye, Kelly Hilyard

Anticipated Outcomes

Information gathered on:

- Next steps for working with member perspectives, assets and big ideas

Shared understanding of:

- Timeline and next steps for Compact work, including for Public Engagement Subgroup, Executive Committee and SmithGroup

Welcome, Updates & Check In (Kyle Minks, Chair)

- Meeting convened at 8:31 a.m. Reminder that the next meetings of the Steering Team and Executive Committee are scheduled for 12/11/20.
- ***Summary notes of the October 9, 2020 Steering Team meeting were unanimously accepted as presented. There were no requested changes or edits.***
- Lebwohl reviewed the working agreements and facilitator rules. Updated copies of the decision tracker and income-expense report were previously shared and referenced. Members were reminded that these and other materials eventually get uploaded to the “core documents” section of the Google Drive folder:
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1-BD-1Aup9SViTIXlxyGadHoDVMmDB1N?usp=sharing>.
- Introductions: Emily Reynolds (UW Nelson Institute) and Jay (“J”) Blue (SmithGroup)
- Agenda overview: Moving into the strategy-identification phase of the project. We will hear updates from the Executive Committee and Public Engagement Subgroup; learn more about the perspectives, assets and ideas of our Compact member organizations; and discuss the Pecha Kucha presentations to be shared in the coming months.

Project Updates

Executive Committee (Minks)

- Part of the power of this Compact, as identified during last winter’s vision setting, is its focus on finding solutions centered around three areas: science, community will, and funding. Additionally, we are working to take full advantage of the diverse strengths and perspectives of our member organizations.

- At this month’s meeting, Exec will vote to approve a contract with SmithGroup. SmithGroup and its subcontractors will be doing the legwork of pulling together Steering Team input and ideas into a fully updated plan of action. By next month, the goal is to be ready to present a refined 2021 project timeline.
- A proposed Yahara CLEAN 3.0 Table of Contents was presented, showing the expected content categories of an updated plan. The Table of Contents is intended to frame the questions that we need to answer.
- Over the coming months, we will be working to better understand the science, gather input from key stakeholder groups, and identify needed strategies and funding resources. Draft proposals will be brought to the Steering Team for feedback before being recommended to the Executive Committee for approval and inclusion in the plan. Among other things, SmithGroup will be working with our subgroups and the Steering Team to help us:
 - create outreach messages and materials to share with our networks
 - communicate the story of the Compact to the larger watershed community
 - draft recommended strategy solutions
 - gather input from key stakeholder audiences through focus-group workshops
 - share the Compact plan with our member communities
- Work is now underway to refine our project timeline. In the meeting that follows, Exec will be discussing the P Loading Subgroup’s proposed schedule of meetings and deliverables. These deliverables will provide the content for a “state of the science” section of the final plan.

Public Engagement Subgroup Update (Carolyn Clow and Sarah Dance)

- [Presentation](#) of UWEX Report Preview by Clow and Dance
- Three subgroup meetings were facilitated by Sharon Lezberg and Samuel Pratsch from UW Division of Extension to develop recommendations for how to approach public engagement. The meetings were used to get consensus on targeted stakeholder groups and the levels of participation sought for different audiences.
- Audiences to focus on: Farmer Groups, Municipalities, Builders/Developers, Ho-Chunk Nation, Underserved Watershed Communities, and Overlapping Identities. Given the diverse makeup of each group, sub-audiences are to be identified so that we can communicate effectively.
- Next steps include drafting a report with action recommendations that can be considered by the Steering Team, the Executive Committee, and Urban Assets (SmithGroup’s community engagement subcontractor). It is expected that the report will be drafted and sent to the subgroup for review by 11/16 and finalized during the week of 11/23. It will then be shared with leadership and the Steering Team during the week of 12/7 and voted on at the December meeting before getting handed off to the consultant.

Compact Member Interviews: Perspectives, Assets, and Big Ideas (Tracy Harvey)

- [Presentation](#) of Member Interview Summary Report by Harvey
- Intended Outcomes:
 - Resources available to the Compact
 - Learn more about each other as member organizations
 - Motivations to participate

- Candid opinions on what the groups wanted to see in an updated plan
- Methods:
 - 30-minute interviews asked designees from each member group to respond to a set of five questions. All interviews were conducted by Harvey.
 - Feedback was summarized and organized around common themes
- General takeaways:
 - Having a broad and inclusive group at the table is key to success
 - Some are unclear about how and when farmers are to be involved
 - There is an urban-rural divide that must be acknowledged
 - Phosphorus reduction is the top priority and issue to be addressed
 - Need to create a different, larger-scale, more aggressive, and more transformative plan
 - Implementation cost will be significant, so a funding strategy is important
 - Need formal adoption and buy-in from all stakeholders
 - Monitoring and communicating our progress will be key
 - Climate change is working against us
 - Need to think in a large, “systems thinking” way
 - This is no longer a science issue, it is a social issue
- Reasons for joining the Compact:
 - To help create a better process for community action around our lakes
 - Access to resources
 - Shared values and vision as stakeholders
- Discussion points:
 - The report highlights common themes, meaning the “takeaways” represent opinions or perspectives brought up by multiple groups.
 - Caution is warranted when reading and interpreting the feedback summaries. The report documents perceptions that may not be factual or held by a majority of our member groups.
 - Example: There is an implication that farmers have not been involved. Farmers and Yahara Pride Farms have been involved and have stepped up big time. We will want to find ways to communicate all the good work being done, and rural groups need to help get those stories out. Historically, there has been a lot of finger pointing, and a lot has been done to change that situation.
 - There should be a difference between perceptions related to the current process and past efforts. We need a good communication plan on we inform people about the role of farmers over time.

Compact Member Breakout Discussions

As Compact members, how can we leverage our networks, experience, expertise, and resources? How do we bring ideas and voices to the table, share the Compact’s vision, build community will, and complete the needed work? The purpose of the small group discussions is to focus on Section IV of the Yahara CLEAN Compact Member Interview Summary (Titled “Members”) and consider:

1. What stood out for you?

2. What do you need to be an effective champion of the Compact? For example, are there specific tools, information, or partner support that would be helpful?

Responses are as follows, with numbers corresponding to the questions above.

Group 1 (Hilyard, Riedel, Dance)

1. Member input was more consistent than anticipated. Comments about farmers were surprising. Interesting about the plan needing to be big, especially since CLEAN 1.0 ended up getting streamlined down to 14 action priorities to aid implementation. There is an awareness gap among newer Compact members about this evolution process. How do we communicate all the progress made since CLEAN 1.0?
2. Members need to be part of the framing/drafting of the plan. How can members help effectively outreach to the broader public? How do we make the Compact accessible? How do different jurisdictions prioritize these different issues and work together on solutions? Wisconsin is a “home rule” state that prioritizes local decision-making. Local champions are needed to advocate for local decision-making that is good for the lakes.

Group 2 (Reynolds, Hepler, Wilson)

1. Vast range of expertise and networks represented around the table. However, not a lot of representation from underserved groups. Importance of communication and the timing/messaging for each group. Finding organizations that represent these underserved communities can offer points of communication.
2. What are those consistent messages we need to be pushing out through our networks? People need to see messages several times before they start to resonate. Perhaps we should plan to get a specific message out each month. The cadence and arc of the conversation needs to be considered to build trust and ensure that messages appeal to different audiences. UW Nelson Institute has social media tool kits that can be used. Consider getting a list of groups working on DEI issues so we can use them as points of contact.

Group 3 (Gonzalez, Fallat, Minks, Harvey)

1. Considerable expertise, experience, passion and diversity are represented by the Steering Team, with lots of potential to move our work forward. Concern about having enough capacity to do everything. DEI is critical and we need to get that right or more harm will be done than good. We as Compact members need to take the initiative on getting the message right and keeping DEI at the forefront. We should not abdicate that responsibility to others. While there is strong agreement around the technical aspects, a lot of work must be done on the social side of the equation. Keep in mind that the report reflects the perspectives of the Steering Team and not necessarily the community at large.
2. We need an authentic strategy to engage with members of the community who have not been involved in the past. What exactly are we requesting from members of the community? What are the consistent messages we want to convey? We should communicate that cleaning up the lakes is feasible, and explain how CLEAN 3.0 is different from prior efforts. Also should communicate what has been accomplished and has meaning to different groups. The intersection of the groups is something to focus on instead of the individual groups themselves.

Group 4 (Fries, Griffin, Diebel)

1. Most organizations did not consider “funding” as a resource they can provide. This means the question may have been viewed too narrowly. Some groups may be able to help get funding through lobbying, fundraising, or other methods. It may be difficult for member organizations to determine how they can help when we don’t yet know what we intend to accomplish through the plan. There is a perception problem that farmers are the problem. However, we are not on the same page with regard to what participants can bring to the table to help resolve the issue.
2. Good communication will be key to achieving our goals. This is truly a long-term effort that will require the sustained coordination of messaging and work. We must get the public behind this in order for it to work and be sustained as an ongoing endeavor. This is a social marketing challenge. Think of the Chesapeake Bay blue crabs and water quality campaign.

Group 5 (Clow, Gorby, Lathrop)

1. Breadth and depth of experience and participation. Broad set of resources and engaged partners.
2. Needs: increased understanding of the science to be effective advocates; easy access to information about different policy choices and impacts (what does it mean for decision makers); a bigger picture of the issues and link to what is important to communities; recognition of the real problems so they can be the focus of our attention; articulation of a clear “ask.” Also, how we address the impacts of untreated manure getting spread across the landscape is paramount.

Group 6 (Baranski, Tye, Nergard)

1. Great job putting the member summary together! Could use a Compact newsletter or PowerPoint that we can share with our respective organizations. Using the vehicles that we each have, we can amplify the work and provide consistent status updates. Could we prepare social media posts for those channels in addition to or in place of e-mails? Develop a multi-tiered plan for communication back to our networks. Coordinate with SmithGroup’s engagement work to mitigate “media overload.” Perhaps grab the Pecha Kucha’s as a means to disseminate information. A resource development subgroup is likely needed to figure out how to fund the community engagement work now and into the future. Lots of different opportunities for funding that aren’t being captured and it’s not something we’ve folded in yet. Smaller, single-owner, local establishments that receive traffic from the lakes may be contributors and collaborators in this effort. Additional funding opportunities through cost disbursement across the communities (e.g. increased stormwater fee). Making sure that farmers aren’t feeling slighted and getting all of the blame. Not putting the impetus and cost on farmers. Really like that there is going to be a plan to bring the farmers to the table in a fair and equitable way, and to be recognized for all of their successes and efforts to date. A positive out of the interview process is the recognition that we can be creative in getting people’s voices to the table - no need to drive to a meeting anymore!
2. Consistent messaging needs to be produced for our use as Compact members in public forums. This messaging should be done through the lens of diversity, equity and inclusion. It should also attempt to make the science more accessible to non-technical audiences. Recommend formation of a “resource development subgroup” to identify funding strategies.

Group 7 (Schmidt, Lake, Rupiper)

1. The Steering Team members are all on the same page when it comes to the science. We're selling ourselves short by only focusing on phosphorus. Need to expand upon the original plan. Show partnerships are working and expanding. Success is long-term and will require behavior change. How do we better partner and communicate what is being done – both urban and rural? Low-hanging fruit is picked. Whatever we do going forward will be expensive.
2. Our Compact needs to concisely communicate what has been done (urban and rural) and what still needs to be done. How do we connect this to budgets, personal actions, and a baseline understanding of what everyone is dealing with (empathy)? Build relationships. Break down “us” and “them,” and focus on “we.” Find the trusted messengers for each audience. What are we rallying around?

Close (Minks)

- Compact members were encouraged to share announcements with the group through the Zoom Chat feature. This could be done at the start or end of every meeting.
- Next Steering Team meeting is December 11th
- Reminder to claim your Pecha Kucha presentation slot for December, January or February using the signup link. Member groups that do not sign up will be randomly assigned their dates. All Pecha Kucha presentations are to be pre-recorded and emailed to Dearlove within a week of your scheduled date. Detailed instructions will be sent out in the next 1-2 weeks.
- Meeting ended at 10:00 a.m.

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Executive Committee
Friday, November 13, 2020
10:10-11:10 A.M.
Zoom

Attendance

Present: James Tye, Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn, Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Cassie Goodwin (SmithGroup), Coreen Fallat, Greg Fries, J Blue (SmithGroup), Matt Diebel, Kyle Minks, Mark Riedel, Sharon Lezberg, Samuel Pratsch

Anticipated Outcomes

Decisions on:

1. SmithGroup contract
2. P Loading Subgroup timeline and deliverables

Shared information:

- Exec Committee work plan and next steps

Welcome, Updates & Check In (Kyle Minks, Chair)

- Minks, as this month's chair, convened the meeting at 10:10 a.m. Next meeting is scheduled for December 11^h.
- ***Summary notes from the October 9, 2020 Executive Committee meeting were approved unanimously. No changes or corrections were requested.***
- Agenda overview:
 - Vote on SmithGroup contract with amended scope of work and budget
 - Vote on P Loading Subgroup timeline and deliverables
 - Public Engagement Subgroup update
 - Reflections on Steering Team discussion on member survey

Decision: Contract for SmithGroup

Open session with consultant

- Tye: The primary driver for obtaining public input is through focus group workshops with different audiences. A big difference between CLEAN 2.0 and the current effort is to message directly to those target communities.
- No additional comments other than appreciation for those coordinating the negotiation and writing of the contract.

Closed session discussion

- Riedel: Thank you for everyone's input. Moving forward, we are going to need to shoulder a big portion of the load. If people need help, make sure to communicate those challenges so that we do not trigger delays with SmithGroup that could be costly.

- Dearlove: This is not a baton hand off where everything now falls on the consultant. Budget constraints make it imperative that we work together as an integrated team and wisely utilize SmithGroup’s time. As outlined in the contract, a small leadership team is proposed to meet on a regular basis to ensure proper coordination.
- Minks: Agreed. It would be a good idea to keep those deliverable or decision-point milestones in front of everyone as we move forward.
- Dearlove: Presented and reviewed the updated income-expense report and budget forecast. Available funds were highlighted. It was noted that an “In-kind” line item was added and will be updated to reflect those non-cash contributions in the future.

Decision: Approval for Clean Lakes Alliance to move forward with signing the SmithGroup contract. Signing to occur upon Madison Common Council’s authorization of the city’s funding commitment, which is expected on 11/17/20. (All in favor)

Work of Compact Teams

P Loading Subgroup (Diebel)

- Diebel presented a proposed schedule of subgroup meetings and expected outcomes through February 2021. The plan was for the subgroup to meet every 3-4 weeks for a total of four meetings between the end of November and mid-February.
- Work products will be used to create a “state of the science” section in the final plan (as referenced in the draft Table of Contents). The subgroup also plans to come out with recommendations to help guide strategy selection. Those recommendations may not be ready until February.
- Riedel: We need to have Matt’s back on this. It is a tall task to manage a group of very smart and passionate scientists, and there is a lot on their agenda.
- Dearlove: The Steering Team is probably eager to start discussing strategies. However, having some frameworks to guide these discussions will be important before we have the larger group dive in. Those frameworks would likely include the type and scale of strategies we should be considering to effectively address the problems at hand.
- Tye: How and when does the subgroup plan to address climate change and increased rainfall in its modeling assumptions? We didn’t address this topic enough in CLEAN 2.0, and it directly effects strategy selection. He proposes being explicit about where in the schedule the group is addressing climate impacts and models like SNAP-Plus.
 - Diebel: This would occur in late January based on the schedule.
 - Riedel: Modeling data can be updated by adding more representative rainfall probabilities.
 - Minks: Participation in subgroup meetings is encouraged for anyone who wants to track progress and have input.
- Fallat: Asked to let her know if there are any points where DATCP feedback and support might be helpful. For example, if funding for SNAP-Plus development was needed.
- **Action Request:** Diebel will provide Exec with the opportunity to review any draft content for the State of the Science section of the plan. It is expected that this would occur by the March 12th Exec meeting.

Decision: Approval of the P Loading Subgroup’s proposed work plan. This is in agreement that it conforms to SmithGroup’s schedule, addresses climate change and SNAP-Plus,

considers when to talk to DATCP, and includes an opportunity for the Steering Team and Executive Committee to offer input. (All in Favor)

Executive Committee Work Plan

A copy of the Executive Committee's two-month work plan was reviewed. The plan was prepared by Lebwohl in consultation with Dearlove, Tye, Minks and Fallat. Discussion highlights:

- Minks: Invited Lezberg and Pratsch to share any personal takeaways from working with the Public Engagement Subgroup.
- Lezberg: Melissa Huggins from Urban Assets and multiple members of Exec participated. The subgroup was clear that it wanted to prioritize inclusive engagement that goes beyond the groups and individuals who have historically been involved in decision making. Need to find ways to develop relationships with groups that are not officially at the table. This is different from just informing or getting something out of a particular group at one point in time. It will involve devising mechanisms to sustain relationships over the long run.
- Lezberg: How do we set the table together and work toward mutual interests and goals? Two different tracks of engagement were identified: 1) audiences with agency that have a high influence/impact on water quality (requiring more participatory engagement from the beginning); and 2) audiences without a lot of agency that we want to start empowering. Suggested giving consideration to having speakers come to share perspectives at future Steering Team meetings to start off in a listening mode.
 - Questions for Exec: What role is envisioned for the Public Engagement Subgroup from this point forward? What are the mechanisms to develop and maintain relationships with historically underrepresented groups?
- Pratsch: Thanked Dance for the tremendous amount of support she provided. Explained that a report will soon be made available to the Steering Team and Executive Committee, but that no future subgroup meetings were planned.

Close

Next meeting is scheduled for December 11th with DATCP (Fallat) chairing. Meeting ended at 11:10 a.m.