

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Steering Team
Friday, June 11th, 2021
8:30-10:00 a.m.
Zoom Meeting

Attendance

Present: Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Paul Dearlove, Coreen Fallat, J Blue, James Tye, Kyle Minks, Mark Riedel, Karin Swanson, Mike Rupiper, Kathy Lake, Renee Lauber, Tom Wilson, Eric Booth, Carolyn Clow, Martye Griffin, Eric Vieth, Kelly Hillyard, Martye Griffin, Richard Lathrop, Ruth Hackney, Scott Seymour, Allison Elli (note taker)

Anticipated Outcomes

- Feedback on (draft & preliminary) goals, objectives, responsible stakeholders, and tactics for the strategies table prepared by SmithGroup
- Initial thoughts on which specific goals or tactics your organization will champion
- Shared understanding of progress to-date on public survey and stakeholder outreach
- Commitments on how and when your organization will promote completion of the survey

Welcome and Check In (Chaired by Coreen Fallat, Wisconsin DATCP)

Meeting convened at 8:30 a.m. Next meeting is July 9th. There is no scheduled meeting in August. The September 17th meeting will likely be a longer session held in person (location TBD).

Summary notes from the May 14th, 2021 meeting were approved as presented. 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.

The timeline of events and progress happening in 2021 was discussed. All is on track as scheduled. The agenda for this meeting includes reviewing and accepting feedback on the strategies table from SmithGroup. The Greater Madison Lakes Survey was launched on May 26th, and we will hear about additional ways we can promote the survey so it reaches the broadest audience possible.

Review of [Strategies Table](#): Goal, Objectives, Responsible Stakeholders, and Tactics
(J. Blue of SmithGroup)

Blue presented updates made to the Strategies Table to gather Steering Team feedback on draft and preliminary content. The 14 action goals from Yahara CLEAN 2.0 were consolidated into nine to refine and further focus them. In the Strategies Table, the “High Level” section includes the nine strategic categories and measurable objectives. The “Tactical” section lists tactics, descriptions, strategy type, location, responsible parties, recommended lead, completion timing, duration, tracking metrics, impact, and relative cost. Strategy type was added to identify each tactic as either policy, implementation, study, outreach, or partnership. The “Value Testing” section will be used

moving forward to assess evaluation criteria applied to each tactic. A key at the bottom of the table defines the timing and cost shorthand used, and can be expanded to define other table elements.

After addressing clarifying questions, virtual discussion groups were formed and tasked with answering three questions (listed below) via Mentimeter polling. Afterwards, the full group was invited to summarize any themes or concerns that came up during conversation. Lebwahl announced that the Menti Poll will be left open for a full week so that every Compact member has sufficient opportunity to further consider the table and provide feedback.

Questions:

- Which tactics might be a good fit for your organization?
- Are there tactics or other content that raise red flags for your organization?
- Is there anything you believe is missing?

Menti Poll Feedback

Q1: Which tactics might be a good fit for your organization?

- Promoting regenerative ag practices
- Increase public awareness & ownership: We will be well positioned through our events, education programs, and State of the Lakes to communicate planning goals and progress (Clean Lakes Alliance)
- Goals #1, 3, 4, 5, 6 7, and 9 have many tactics that might be a fit for the County
- Municipal stormwater goal #3 (TSS reduction): Yahara WINS can help with that goal. Suggest decoupling goal objective from TMDL and create an objective that has MS4 meeting minimum state standards within 2-5 years. MS4 pays Yahara WINS to meet objective now.
- Will need to run tactics by internal City team (stormwater engineer, water resources committee) and do side by side with our existing ordinances, plans, and docs to see where we are already working on tactics and where we need to push the envelope.
- Activities that include permit/regulatory
- Grant funded activities (e.g. shoreline, boat launches, monitoring, etc.)
- Activities that enhance public access and use of lakes/fisheries
- Good fit for CARPC: Map shoreline land use/cover, promote green infrastructure, catalog and map wetland restoration areas, increase public awareness, engage public more frequently
- UW-Madison touches on all of the tactics in different ways from a research perspective (e.g. how do we strategize efforts?) and some touch on implementation (e.g. what can university land management and purchasing choices do?)
- Increase producer participation on problem solving P loading
- Increase public awareness in next 10 years
- Engage the public more frequently

Q2: Any red flags?

- Ag Digester should not be a goal. It is a tactic. Goal should be "Reduce Phosphorus from Manure" or "Stop Winter Manure Spreading" (or merge with #5).
- Riparian restoration can involve a lot of red tape, so incentivizing completion through updating policies could help.

- Line 68 is a red flag: "Facilitate the creation of new producer-led groups." Where did that come from? It seems the opposite of what we have been doing with farmer-led groups.
- Goal #9: bacteria levels have outflow to beaches but we need to find the source point, not the water sources
- Goal #3: Combining a lot of things together. Call out specific goals. Identify our lake parks as an area where we can make a significant difference. Divisions: Private Property, Public Property, Parks
- Do we have goals for #5?
- Objective for goal of reduced bacteria loading will not meet goal. How does education on bacteria result in a reduction of bacteria? Is this a climate change or wildlife management thing? What is the thing to help meet the goal of reduced bacteria?
- We have goals with the responsible party as farmers but no farmer input on the tactics, objectives, etc?
- Responsible party for municipal goals need to be the municipalities.
- Why is the County the responsible party for some things that could be helped by the state or farmer groups?
- We need to be very careful about the language that we use
- It is not clear what all the tactics mean
- Goal #4 could be broader, like "Manure Processing." There may be more tools other than digesters (ie. composting, manure densification/nutrient removal, etc.)
- Need terminology and tactics better defined so we know what they mean. New baselines are important to identify when it comes to estimating and evaluating impact.
- None from CARPC perspective
- Many activities need to be led by a local stakeholder. We can't lead.
- Digester goal: expand to be more than just digester tech. This is really tech for treatment and separation. Expand to on-farm, and then expand responsible parties to include those who implement and those who can help seed the implementation (like Yahara WINS)
- Need to run by city staff in expert areas to see red flags, tweaks, how it applies to our municipality, and where there are overlaps with what we are doing
- Need a goal related to residential property owners that gives this important stakeholder group ownership on some of the solutions
- It would be great to clarify some of the metrics that include a reduction from a baseline. The language was confusing. Also, how do the metrics compare to existing regulatory standards?
- We have had a slow deliberative process so far. This work seems like a sudden shift to a table without background or supporting info, and nothing on where the ideas came from. The work is minimalistic and hard to provide comments on.
- Facilitate the creation of new producer-led groups is a red flag and could cause major issues. Are we saying that groups like Yahara Pride are not doing a good job? Is this a backhanded way of punishing them for not joining the agreement?
- Don't understand the objective "Improve control of construction erosion." We have talked about this a lot at meetings and now the terminology seems to have changed and is confusing.
- Need much more detail on entire "improve nutrient management reporting" section. What is a pay to report program? What communities are using it? What are the pros and cons of a program, and what does it mean for farmers?
- What does "Link financing to regenerative practices" mean? What exactly is being proposed? Where has this practice been used? What are the pros and cons?
- Need more detail regarding "control geese at beaches" recommendation. New ideas should be presented with more detail to the group. Depending on details this could be controversial.

- Why are only Madison and Middleton included in most of the green infrastructure section?
- “Identify greatest contributor farms” seems like it could result in finger pointing and a blame game, and it is the opposite of the ‘we are all in this together’ message.
- In the last line of the table, what is a risk reporting strategy?
- Any tactics that challenge producers or require their action. Any tactics that tell farmers what to do without consideration or buy in.
- Seems that when farmers are required to do something they are not trusting of those who make the requirements
- I did not see any references to individual homeowners or businesses that own land, or government facilities taking actions to reduce or improve stormwater. Those must be added!
- Something must be added to talk about the timing of actions. That was not included and we had a great presentation on the importance of timing.
- There might be too much reliance on farmers in tactics to meet objectives. The farmers might not buy into it, which could hinder our success.
- We need to make staff and elected officials feel these action items are truly good for the community. They need to feel they will provide payback in their success, and without costing too much in limited tax dollars because of increased costs in other areas and levy limits.

Q3: Anything missing?

- Erosion control – inspection and enforcement
- Reduce acronym use
- Restoration of wetlands: 3-5 acres per year seems like a pretty low goal
- Cost is important, but should add a column that identifies potential sources of funding (taxes, grants, etc.)
- Farmer input is needed
- Why are digesters a main goal? Is this the right strategy? Do we need to put more information in the report about the existing digesters and how they work?
- CARPC perspective: Inspection/enforcement for erosion control is key and seems to be missing. Bar for wetland restoration is very low (3-5 acres per year) and could be higher. DNR wetland staff wants projects that are 20 acres minimum.
- Feeling like I need a companion manual to further explain tactics. Not for table, but as a reference to better understand the table.
- The producer engagement section might benefit from having more detail
- Chloride on municipal scale
- Residential responsibility - lawns. Even though it might have small impact initially, it will increase awareness and understanding that applies to larger land masses. Also helps promote city stormwater management techniques on larger scale.
- What about large developers like Veridian? What if they were required to prep soil and downspouts on every house up front, and not leave it to individual homeowners?
- I was really encouraged by the showcasing of managed grazing in the WKOW special. I think this table could expand on that tactic by being more specific about communicating economic benefits. And Clean Lakes Alliance could also play a really important role in developing demand for local grass-fed products. UW is happy to connect more on this. We are developing tools such as a heifer grazing decision-support tool that could be of interest to large producers.

- Under Goal #4, there is no impact shown (lbs of P/yr in the table). Should there be a final column under value testing like an overall score? The cost column probably needs to be fully vetted and truthed in future versions.
- We have talked a good bit about needing to step up practices in certain months of the year. That concept seems to have been missed in this work.
- There is not much in here related to individual actions. We need to focus on that too.
- Info is being presented in a very different manner from how we have previously communicated. The info feels unclear and incomplete. Where did some of the suggestions come from? Much more detail is needed. Detail matters.
- Encouraging individual practices and timing of actions for January to March.
- We need more about promoting or taking individual actions regarding stormwater and related P reduction
- Include raking leaves off the streets, rain barrels, and rain gardens
- Timing of each tactic, like the time of year or season that it is most significant, or when this tactic would be occurring.

Public Survey: Organization Commitments (James Tye)

The public survey is now live and will be available until early September. It is incredibly important that every Compact member promote the survey through all of our individual and professional networks.

The number of people who have taken the survey will be reported monthly, and everyone should fill out the [Survey Promotion Commitments](#) form in order to track how each of us has taken part in spreading the word. Urban Assets was hired by Clean Lakes Alliance to help us more aggressively promote the survey and track responses.

Closing (Coreen Fallat)

Remember to respond to the Menti Poll by next Friday, June 18th. Members were reminded that the next meeting will be held July 17th, virtually, and there will be no meeting in August. ***[POST-MEETING UPDATE: Next meeting will now be held in-person on Thursday, July 29th, at the WDNR Service Center at 3911 S. Fish Hatchery Rd.]***

Meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.

SUMMARY NOTES
Yahara CLEAN Compact Executive Committee
Friday, June 11th, 2021
10:10-11:10 AM
Zoom Meeting

Attendance

Present: Coreen Fallat, James Tye, Paul Dearlove, Kyle Minks, Alison Lebwhol (facilitator), Allison Elli (note taker)

Anticipated Outcomes

- Feedback on goals, objectives, responsible stakeholders, and tactics for the strategies table; and on Steering Team initial responses. Decision if needed.
- Decision on strategies table framework presented at the June meeting
- Decision on draft work plan for remainder of project

Welcome and Check in (Chaired by Coreen Fallat, Wisconsin DATCP)

Meeting convened at 10:10 a.m. ***Summary notes from the last meeting were approved as presented.*** Agenda will focus on the direction and draft content of the Strategies Table, starting with a debrief of the Steering Team meeting, and proposed work plan for the remainder of 2021.

Strategies Table

Feedback on Strategies Table:

- There was discussion about the “Value Testing” section, like whether a final score column was needed, or if there is too much overlap among different assessment criteria. It was decided that column descriptions would be helpful, and that Compact members do not need to agree on rankings. Explanation on why the value testing is happening is recommended.
- The final plan should communicate the intent of the table, and what kind of effort and resources are necessary to implement the goals, objectives and tactics.
- The question of how to set appropriate timelines was debated but not resolved. There are pros and cons associated with setting more vs. less aggressive implementation timelines. Availability and allocation of resources will largely determine the pace of implementation.
- As a suite of different action recommendations, the table could start with the easier tactics to accomplish followed by more difficult ones. The table’s strength is in its diversity of goals and objectives to tackle complex challenges. This fact is important to communicate to the general public.
- There needs to be clear progress-tracking baselines defined within or outside of the Strategies Table for each measurable objective. Establishing baselines and tracking metrics should be informed by the implementation experts and what was done since CLEAN 2.0 to quantify progress. Any information regarding baselines or “cost per pound” should be carefully framed so that it supports our objectives.
- There should be a goal or major objective that is specific and actionable for residential property owners.

- There should be a specific goal devoted to seeking out a dedicated funding source for our lakes and parks, with a spotlight on current opportunities within existing funding structures, such as Adaptive Management.
- More specificity is needed for some of the tactics without being overly prescriptive. For example, Goal #7 calling for an increase in farmer involvement could better explain how that might happen.
- The table should be formatted so that it is clear which sections apply to each of the five stakeholder categories. This should be the foundation of the table's organization so it can eventually serve as a user guide. It will also downplay the urban vs. rural dichotomy.
- Add in definitions to the table (at the bottom) for any terminology that might be confusing or vague.

Decision: Approval of Strategy Table Framework. Request that SmithGroup continue developing and modifying table content based on Steering Team and Executive Committee input forwarded by Dearlove. (All in favor)

Greater Madison Lakes Survey

Continued promotion of the survey by all Compact member organizations is crucial to its success. Urban Assets is promoting the survey and tracking responses. It will adjust its approach based on any missing demographics. Community event tabling will be used to reach people who are not frequent lake users, and who would be less inclined to take the survey on their own time. As approved at the last meeting, Clean Lakes Alliance is funding additional work by Urban Assets to broaden the level of public engagement.

Work Plan

A structured timeline of what the Steering Team and Executive Committee seek to accomplish and what is being asked of SmithGroup each month was reviewed. There will be a meeting on July 17th, no meeting in August, and in-person retreats in September and October to work through the details of the draft plan. ***[POST-MEETING UPDATE: Next meeting will now be held in-person on Thursday, July 29th, at the WDNR Service Center at 3911 S. Fish Hatchery Rd.]***

With no August meeting, we will be relying on some offline work performed by the Steering Team and Exec Committee to get ready for a September retreat. It was recommended that a homework checklist be emailed out to members and partners. This would be an opportunity to explain how much commitment is needed from Compact members between meetings. It is also important to determine what we will be asking of the general community, starting with the acceptance of updated planning recommendations.

Close

Meeting concluded at 11:11 a.m.

Next meeting: Thursday, July 29th, from 8:30-11:00 a.m. at WDNR Service Center (3911 S. Fish Hatchery Rd.). Mark Riedel, Wisconsin DNR, will be chairing.