



Lower Grand River Watershed Project

Information and Education Subcommittee Minutes

Meeting Date: February 3, 2004

Time: 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Location: Kent County Road Commission – 1500 Scribner, Grand Rapids

Prepared By: Donna Stevens

Attending: Peggy Weick, Patricia Pennell, Janice Tompkins, Rick Sullivan, Donna Stevens, Jane Secord, Don Stypula, Bonnie Shupe, Dan Wolz, Andy Bowman, John Koches.

Item 1: Introduction.

Mr. John Koches brought the meeting to order and began introductions around the table. Mr. Koches also informed the group that no formal agenda was made for this meeting.

Item 2: Formation and Evaluation of a Third News Insert.

Ms. Janice Tompkins proposed that the members evaluate the inserts in order to find out what was done right or wrong. This will help future organizations. Ms. Patricia Pennell also recommended that when a product is produced an evaluation process should be built into it. It was reported by Ms. Pennell that WMEAC asked for opinions from the recipients of the first Lower Grand River Watershed insert about the product, but there was no formal evaluation process.

The members agreed that an evaluation would be desirable.

Ms. Tompkins suggested that before a third insert be made an evaluation should be done on the previous two although this might be cost prohibitive. It was then agreed that there would not be a creation of a third insert. Instead the members agreed to focus energy on something else.

Item 3: Vision for the Lower Grand Project.

Mr. Dan Wolz asked if the project could be done without a vision. Mr. Koches replied with: Every watershed plan has been different. Watershed projects are of two types: planning and implementation. The Lower Grand River Watershed Project is a planning project not an implementation project. During the planning project we (as a group) want to ensure participation from key decision makers and technical experts to create an accurate and comprehensive plan. I & E components are often limited with this objective in mind. The implementation phase has generally a more involved I & E component in order to make people aware of watershed issues and also to educate, and motivate people to take action. This group seems to be pushing the implementation process forward with this project.

Ms. Tompkins mentioned that one of the challenges were that this groups has grown from the bottom up. There is no model for what this group is trying to accomplish. Ms. Jane Secord added that there have been a lot of watershed plans made but none dealing with a watershed at this scale. This group does not have a major driving force. It is imperative to find what people are interested in.

Item 4: Working with Sub-Watershed Councils.

Mr. Andy Bowman suggested to flush out the other sub-watershed groups to see how the group can help them. Ms. Tompkins has been in contact with staff from FTC&H. FTC&H has proposed the plan to be a tool kit, and that the group invite the other sub-watersheds in to review the tools.

Information and Education Subcommittee Minutes: 2-3-2004

Item 5: Goals, Uses, and Vision for the Lower Grand Project.

Ms. Bonnie Shupe wanted to know the Goal. Ms. Shupe was not sure what the group wanted to achieve. Mr. Koches volunteered to bring a list of pollutants and that the group discuss potential I & E strategies that deal with each pollutant, their source, and cause.

Mr. Wolz suggested that a purpose be made from:

- Designated uses
- Pollutants
- Desired uses

The vision statement created for the watershed was then stated, and the members were encouraged to memorize it: Grand River Watershed drinkable, swimmable, fishable, enjoyable, connecting water to life. It was suggested that the phrase "Connecting Water to Life" could be included on every product that we produced.

Item 6: Requirements and Suggestions.

It was then decided to produce a list of things that were required and things that would be great to do.

Required

- I & E Strategy- with the goal being that the stream/water bodies meet designated uses. Ms. Tompkins stated that: "All that is required for the I & E strategy is that there is a strategy." Since the meeting Ms. Tompkins has made a clarification of this statement via e-mail. A portion of the e-mail has been included below.

"We can have flexibility in the I&E strategy design as long as we meet the intent behind the guidance. I will bring copies of the DEQ Watershed Guidance Blue Book, LGR contract narrative language to explain what we said we would do, copy of the CMI approval checklist, and explanation of the DEQ intentions that laid the frame work for the guidance to the Feb 23rd meeting."

- Evaluation

Things that would be great

- There has to be an explanation of what this group is doing, and how it is different from what has been done and what is being done currently.
- A workshop to de-confuse the local governments.
- Inform people how all of the little projects will in the end fit together. Show people the "big picture". Identify the cost so that there is no double payment.

Item 7: Evaluations

It was mentioned several times that the process of evaluation needs to be declared and put into the I & E strategy. It was suggested that an individual from social marketing develop the evaluation questions.

- Kathleen Summerfield- from Northwestern Michigan College in Traverse City was suggested.
- It was agreed that quantitative evaluations were nice, but that qualitative evaluations were more helpful.

Information and Education Subcommittee Minutes: 2-3-2004

Item 8: Generic I&E Tools.

Generic tools were brought up. It was suggested that a source of what has been made in other projects be put together with contact information.

Generic tools

- Brochures
- Published communication- print products, brochures, posters
- Media – Television, Radio, Signs
- P.R. – Editorials, newspaper, articles
- Others – T-shirts, buttons, water balloons, pens, pencils
- Strictly educational – pre & post tests, curriculums
- Events – Watershed fairs

Each tool would be created for a specific target audience and would include its own evaluation process.

Item 9: Current Goals

A list of the current goals was brought up and discussed.

- Mr. Wolz- brought up a Watershed Education Center, and also agreed to look into proposals, and ideas.
- It was agreed that we needed to disseminate the generic tools (mentioned in Item 8)

Item 10: Short Term Activities

- It was agreed that at the next meeting each of the organizations involved would give a short presentation on their current projects. The organizations were also asked to bring a short synopsis of these projects to pass out among the group. This is to show how these projects can come together and work with the Lower Grand Project.
- The members also agreed that a tool needs to be developed that summarizes what decision-makers need to know about this plan.
 - A power point was suggested to wrap up the final forum. This power point will compare and contrast the PEP plan and the I & E strategy.
 - Letters and articles need to be sent out to stakeholders in order to really promote the final forum.

Item 11: Next Meeting

February 23, 2004 at 1:30 at

Kent County Road Commission
1500 Scribner,
Grand Rapids, MI 49504

Information and Education Subcommittee Minutes: 2-3-2004

For the next meeting

- Identify the players: Lessons learned, focus groups
- Review the PEP Plan – Wendy Ogilvie or Jason Buck needs to be contacted.
- Mr. Koches is bringing in a list of pollutants, sources, and stakeholders as related to designated uses. From this we can figure out how each of the participating organizations fit into the overall I & E strategy.
- Each participating organization will describe their I & E activities. What is good about their projects, what could have been done differently. Participants were encouraged to bring a short synopsis outlining their projects.
- Ms. Secord will be contacting Kathleen Summerfield at Northwestern Michigan College about evaluation questions, and if she would be willing to help out.
- Mr. Wolz will look into what would be needed for a Watershed Educational Center.