

Yahara Lakes Legacy Partnership Coordinating Committee

Meeting Notes

Date/Time: Tuesday, October 19, 2010, 3-5 pm

Location: City Water Utility Building Conf. Rm. B
119 E. Olin Ave., Madison, WI

Present: Sue Jones, Sue Josheff, Dennis Presser, Genesis Steinhorst
Guests: Jon Becker, Jane Elder, Steve Falter, Don Heilman, Brett Hulse, Rebecca Power, Tim Roehl, Barb Sanford, Doug Voegeli

1. Call to order: 3:05 pm

2. Announcements

Dennis Presser announced that a few people need to leave early.

3. Public comment on items not on the agenda

- Jane Elder requested that the September 30 notes be closed out.
- Genesis Steinhorst asked if it was o.k. to post the approved meeting notes to the Web site. It was agreed that it was.
- Steve Falter announced that \$10,000 for river signs is in the county budget. They will educate people on what watershed they are in and what the local watershed group is. People can adopt waters much like the beach and highway programs.

4. Notes of the October 5 meeting were approved.

5. Celebration status

The group agreed to postpone the celebration thanking CLEAN report contributors until the MOU signatories are comfortable with the report and agree on next steps.

6. Status of document archiving

Sue Jones announced that she and Pat Sheahan had organized many files on their end. Their goal is to finish deleting extraneous files such as early drafts by November. She asked if we needed to schedule a separate meeting with Jane and the consulting team to discuss this. Jane responded that it would be helpful to go over details in a small meeting with Jane, Sue Jones and Pat. Dennis asked about the kinds of documents we are interested in archiving, and his list included meeting notes, draft plan recommendations, news articles, interim reports, events, some draft documents and the CLEAN Report. Meeting notes, final reports, records of events, news coverage, will be posted on an archive portion of the Yaharawatershed.org Web site. Sue Josheff said she also has beach and sediment information and maps. Some documents, especially graphics, may need explanations. Sue Jones agreed that

this would be helpful, and that she and Pat will share the list of archived documents with the Coordinating Committee and ask members to send any missing documents for the archives..

7. Implementation of CLEAN MOU

Sue Jones said that the next step is to do the work plan and identify action items. We will check in with the Lakes and Watershed Commission. (Brett Hulsey and Rebecca Power from the Commission were in attendance for this discussion.) We must flesh out a plan including the expected costs and the benefits of implementing the actions. A consideration for potential priorities will be how to describe them in ways that are compelling and attractive to funding sources. We must begin to engage the commission and committee on this.

Sue Josheff discussed the DNR's response to the Report. Lloyd Eagan has scheduled a meeting with the mayor's office (an earlier meeting needed to be rescheduled.). Another meeting is likely to be scheduled with Topf Wells at the county. Lloyd has requested that the Report be called "interim" at this stage. The next steps are identifying specific activities for action, and costs including estimated reductions in phosphorus (or other targets). Lloyd has provided Sue Josheff with her editorial comments.

Genesis Steinhorst talked with the City Parks and Health Departments but hasn't yet met formally with them. She'd like input from Engineering, UW and DNR re: which beaches will be studied, what we want to do, and who will pay for it.

Sue Jones asked Dennis if he had received any formal input from DATCP. It is still pending.

To move forward, Sue Jones proposed that agency staffers get together to further discuss potential priorities, and related reductions as well as costs. Sue Josheff noted that we can proceed, but reiterated that the expectation among the staff team was that agency leaders and signatories would have provided feedback on the report to provide guidance for priority actions.

Sue Josheff also requested additional clarity on two items: the geese issue and how beaches will be maintained (kept clean) during periods when they are closed and there are no lifeguard or other staff on site.

Sue Jones asked those present from the Lake and Watershed Commission how much the Commission's Yahara CLEAN Implementation Committee wants to be engaged. Brett said this is where the rubber meets the road. They don't need to know every next step and the costs, but identifying the next three steps would be good.

Other points in this discussion:

- One of the clear objectives is to make sure that the lakes don't get on the 303(d) list ("impaired waters" under the Clean Water Act).

- We need to clarify the process to get decisions from the agencies.
- We need a partnership across the agencies to move forward and find funding, and that it is not one agency's responsibility.
- Brett noted that City and County have 3 weeks to get their budgets in
- Rebecca commented that total dollar amounts are listed in the Report. We need the agencies to select priorities
- Brett suggested figuring out three to four CLEAN-related items for the county budget. Genesis recommended that UV filtration at the beaches should be one item.
- Dennis noted that the Dane County Mississippi River Basin Initiative (MRBI) grant is \$2 million plus Madison Community Foundation (MCF) support for staffing for the grant. Sue Josheff said if we had more staffing, we could apply for more resources from this program. Rebecca suggested including a description in the Report for projects already underway and related costs.

Jon Becker asked if it was possible to modify the city or county budget at this stage in the process. Brett replied that while funds were tight, there may be opportunities in the capital budget and that it was always good to identify needs and ask. He advised that explaining projects in terms of "dollars per pound of reduction" would be helpful. He has spoken with the MCF re: funding an endowment. Hopefully, dollars can flow to the successor organization. Jon asked what levels of support for lake projects would be likely to clear the county budget. Brett said it was \$200,000. There is a possibility of a 60 to 90 percent match on the algae treatment system for the manure digester in Waunakee.

8. Associated costs for MOU actions (I think this is the same group envisioned in #13)

The team is still working on this and has made some headway. Sue Josheff will organize a working group meeting, starting with an Email request for workable times. A small fundraising subcommittee was formed from volunteers, which will include Sue Jones, Sue Josheff, and Pat Sheahan. Don Heilman volunteered and Tim Roehl also expressed interest. The charge is to identify specific high visibility and high impact projects, as well as smaller scale "near-term" opportunities for success.

9. Feedback on core functions

Because several members of the group had not yet reviewed the working draft on core functions, Jane Elder asked if we could again schedule this for discussion at the November 9 meeting. Sue Josheff inquired about the fourth bullet point. Have we agreed that the scope of the partnership's work would extend to the full watershed (the mouth of the Bad Fish) or will we stop at the county line? Don Heilman said the involvement of 3 counties would be helpful for involving THRIVE. Jon Becker wants it to be for the full watershed.

Sue Jones commented that there are more stakeholders in a successful organization, so it would make sense to be more inclusive. Jane said it is useful to identify areas of

concern where we don't have agreement among the core functions. She asked everyone to review the document and make sure they're comfortable with the core functions, and/or to identify areas of divergence that we can then resolve. As we build the new partnership, we should work from areas of agreement, keep it nimble, and use the core functions document as a way to start a conversation about core functions and values.

Jane said the team will use the document a set of operating assumptions on core functions for now. Between now and the next meeting people may comment, and we will send out updated copies. It will also be up on internal YLLP Coordinating Committee Google site. Included are the focus and scope of the organization, profiles, funding, resources, learning and sharing scientific information, leadership, and platform.

10. Schedule team meetings and draft agenda

The first and third Tuesdays work the best. However, November 9 is the next meeting because of Election Day. The following meeting will be on November 16 at the Water Utility if available.

11. Transition team meetings

The first transition team meeting is scheduled for November 9, within the YLLP meeting. Dennis asked if anyone else needs to come to the meeting. Jane said she is making overtures to Carpenter's NSF team at UW. Others who have some interest in aligning efforts include Sustain Dane.

The group briefly discussed the potential of the NSF grant but noted the need for more information to align efforts with future YLLP work. (for more information, follow this link: <http://wsc.limnology.wisc.edu/page/proposal>) Sue Jones asked if there could there be a presentation at a future meeting.

12. Communications team

Jane is waiting to see if the website funds come together. It is still pending. Jane suggested clarify the thrust of the new organization before going too far with the website, which will serve the organization. By spring, we hope to launch its public face. It is not part of the current contract but a critical part of communications. Jane sent Gathering Waters the Scope of Work. The group reiterated some of the points made about Web needs at previous meetings. The current Web site hosting has been renewed for another year.

13. Fundraising advisory team (same as 8?)

Jane said we could talk more specifically about a fundraising advisory team when we know more about what the new organization will look like. We need examples and ideas that people will get excited about. Sue Josheff suggested that Don, Tim, Caryl Terrell, Pat and Sue Jones serve on the team. She will "doodle it" (send out an Email Web-survey).

Jon asked if there was any chance the fundraising team can get money from the Joyce Foundation. Jane responded that their environmental priority is the Great Lakes, and not the Mississippi Basin, and thus we are unlikely to be the right watershed for their interests. McKnight Foundation is better prospect. Jon thought it would still be worthwhile to pursue Joyce. A major effort draws attention. Sweetwater Trust received \$1.9 million from Joyce. Jon expressed concern that our agenda might be driven by funders.

Structure for new organization

Jane put a sketch of one model for the structure for the new organization on the whiteboard. Based on Chicago Wilderness and Sweetwater Trust, it is a rough organizational chart. She will follow up with a document before the next meeting. The core group consists of the Lakes and Watershed Commission, the county, city, DNR, DATCP, CARPC, sewerage district. These could be members of the governing council.

Other key participants could include liaisons from the Clean Lakes Alliance, Friends groups and neighborhood associations, sustainability groups, farm groups, the university, policy groups, and potentially at large seats, although this could create a large group, and we want to keep decision-making from becoming too complex or cumbersome. There could be permanent seats and seats that change with various initiatives, priorities, or levels of interest.

Key advisory groups include science and technology, business and corporate council (economic development and business leaders) and a policy advisory group. Sweetwater is geography based. Chicago Wilderness is organized around Initiatives. Jane suggested initiatives might be a better fit for our needs. These could include: Implement the MOU; develop community education and responsive action; 21st century farming; and green infrastructure and stormwater.

There would also be needs for working groups aligned around core capacities, such as communications and fundraising/development. And, there are key agency roles, and it will be important to know who is doing what and why.

Possible names include Lands and Lakes, Capital Lands and Lakes, Yahara Lands and Lakes, and Capital Lands and Lakes Trust. It is a sketch, a place to begin and think about it. We must identify a core team and think of ways we can package our initiatives. It is complex. We would like to develop and enhance the community network capacity to solve problems in the watershed. What are our essential network functions? What are we pulling together to accomplish? This is the big challenge of moving forward.

Sue Jones was curious about groups maintaining their own role and membership. Jane responded that if we create a new organization, the intention is that it is not competitive with existing organizations. If we use it to create a table around which people come to have a conversation about common strategies and ways to share

resources to achieve common goals, it can be value added. How can we move the community conversation forward and foster dialogue and teamwork? We must look at it as a network rather than a stand-alone organization. Don commented that we need everyone at the same table to buy into it.

Jane said we should consider having written affiliation statements to sign on to our core mission functions, based on Chicago Wilderness and Sweetwater. We need to focus on areas of agreement. She noted that both of our potential model organizations have their work framed with strong “driving” documents. The MOU is not there yet. It is still a menu of options, not a clear set of priorities with agencies lined up to take the lead on various actions

Various Comments

- Add the Drain Commission.
- Unlike Milwaukee, our efforts are designed to improve, not just “hold the line” on environmental condition
- Policy is important to wrap in
- The natural system restoration is missing. It is the ecological part of our work. It should be about the watershed, not just the lakes.

As expected, the discussion of potential names raised many comments.

- a problem with “Capital” in the name.
- “Yahara” isn’t recognized by many people
- People are concerned about the lakes, and that’s important for fundraising and support.
- Tim said that the Dane County Towns Association membership needs to be a player. Clean water is important, but the towns are dramatically affected by both rural and urban issues.
- Genesis suggested the name, Clean Land and Water Trust.

Jon said we should think about quality of life and generational values. What do we want to come out of it? We must start from the right foundation.

Pulling the discussion back to the organization itself, Jane asked how we can create a way for the committee to move forward. She asked the committee to play with words and educational initiatives. What will bring people to the table? How nimble and structured can the organization be? She will mark up the draft. She said that building organizations is difficult. This is just a beginning. We must create momentum, build excitement, and find leadership. Jon said that that we need to build a foundation for a watershed group. Steve said there are already watershed groups in the area. Jon urged us to pick a name that says what we do.

14. Status of web project and education assessment

Web site was discussed under item 12. Sue Jones will meet with Rebecca and Jane re: education assessment.

15. Next meeting agenda

Dennis will set the next meeting agenda.

16. Adjourn: 5:00 pm

Barb Sanford, recorder, reviewed by J. Elder