

---

# Water Quality Summit Report

---

*Proceedings of the Water Quality Summit March 19-20, 2003*

---

*Convened by the following Watershed Groups:*

James River Basin Partnership

Table Rock Lake Water Quality, Inc.

Watershed Committee of the Ozarks

Upper White River Basin Foundation

---

---

# Watershed Groups Statements of Expectations

---



## James River Basin Partnership

Since its inception, James River Basin Partnership has been working to develop a watershed plan to “protect and improve water quality in our springs, streams, rivers and lakes.” We have taken part in writing a Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (WRAS) and a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) document. The James River Basin Partnership is currently administering a \$1,000,000 319 grant to educate the public on watershed issues and to implement restoration programs.

The James River Basin Partnership wanted to convene a water quality summit to help fine-tune our efforts to create a watershed plan for the James River Basin. The delegates were chosen from a broad variety of interests in hopes of gaining broad, balanced ideas about how to manage a watershed. The consensus statements gathered at the meeting would help the James River Basin Partnership prioritize action steps and more objectively choose projects to complete in the basin. We were interested hearing all the concerns of the delegates to be certain we have not been missing an issue that is of interest to the public.

With the intense level of interest in the basin, JRPB wanted to ensure that we are doing everything our organization can do to reflect the wishes of the stakeholders in the watershed.



## Table Rock Lake Water Quality, Inc.

Table Rock Lake Water Quality, Inc. joined the other Watershed Groups in sponsoring the Lakes Area Water Quality Summit for the exact same reason the summit was held. Which is: The only hope we have of addressing local water quality issues (in our case, Table Rock Lake) is by all parties working together on a watershed wide basis. If our organization was somehow able to convince every business or landowner, around Table Rock Lake, to adopt pollution prevent measures regardless of the cost, it would still be in vain if our watershed neighbors did not also adopt the same measures. The hope of this summit is to bring together a group of leaders from all areas, have them consider the water quality issues we face and reach a consensus on how best to address these issues. Only through a watershed wide cooperative effort can we hope to achieve our goals of pollution free waters for all to use and enjoy. Table Rock Lake Water Quality, Inc. is glad to be able to be part of this process.

---



## Watershed Committee of the Ozarks

The Watershed Committee is a citizen-based advisory group working to protect sources of public drinking water in the Springfield/Greene County area. Public drinking water protection issues are closely linked with those affecting business, recreation, tourism, wildlife and commercial and private water use. Therefore, the Committee supports citizen generated efforts to identify issues of concern and especially those directed toward finding practical, cost-effective solutions. It was our expectation that the Summit would lead toward the development of a reasonable road map, or strategy, from which real progress could be made toward the long-term protection and sustaining of our precious lakes, streams and groundwater resources in southwest Missouri. We realized that only a broad-based, citizen driven initiative involving the wide variety of interested stakeholders had much of a chance of achieving measurable success. We hope that the recommendations from the Summit will be seen as a guiding light by local governments, agencies and citizen groups—that these recommendations will be accepted and embraced by them as logical next steps toward lasting stewardship of our water resources.



## Upper White River Basin Foundation

Successful public policy development and implementation require a well informed public, a well informed political and civic leadership, and continuing dialogue among all the groups to reach effective solutions.

The Foundation believed that the Lakes Area Water Quality Summit could achieve significant community milestones:

1. Improve the flow of information on water quality to key civic, political and interest group.
2. Demonstrate that there is more agreement between the diverse groups on the issue of water quality than there are differences.
3. Determine whether it was possible to align diverse – and in some cases competing - groups to seek common solutions to water quality problems.
4. Create an immediate and broad-base of support for new efforts to improve water quality in the basin.
5. Heighten public awareness of causes and potential solutions to water quality problems.
6. Test the limits for what local leaders would support in community changes to improve water quality.
7. Develop a committed core group of community leaders who would actively participate in implementing the solutions they could recommend.

---

# Introduction to the Process

By Shawn Grindstaff, Consensus Builder and Summit Facilitator

The process surrounding the Lakes Area Water Quality Summit is based on theories of consensus-building and long-term construction of community capacity. The Summit, held on March 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, was a very vibrant and high profile event in southwest Missouri that exposed many people to the basic underpinnings surrounding the concept of “consensus.” However, the “Summit” consensus process started in mid-2002 and is still going on today. The Summit at Drury University was but a mere step in a series of events designed to achieve actionable consensus on regional water quality. In broader terms, the consensus process was not the Summit, but the Summit was a carefully planned “introduction” to a much more ambitious, long-term process.

Consensus is defined as the process by which we seek unanimity of agreement on a particular issue. Typically, all stakeholders in the process approve of the discussions, are accountable for themselves, and have shared control and input into how ground rules and action items are developed and carried out.

Consensus is a newer, bolder approach to policymaking than the typical methods of holding meetings and seeking agreement previously used in Missouri environmental policy. Generally, two other methods dominate the landscape:

The Communications method of stakeholder engagement features the classic “public meetings” model. This method, used constantly by environmental agencies at all levels of government, seeks outcomes like information exchange, hearing the concerns or options of others, and gaining better understanding of a proposed action or policy. The sponsoring agency determines the policy outcome, steers the process, and is the primary driver of action.

The Consultation method of stakeholder engagement features the agency “advisory group or board” models. This method, commonly used in state government circles, seeks more from their stakeholders in the process. Here, a stakeholder “advisory” body drafts opinions or recommendations for action. The actions are developed and refined in a plan or “report”, then circulated to the appropriate group. The sponsoring agency, though, still controls the process and produces the policy outcome from such efforts.

The Consensus process of this Summit expands on the concepts of these models by bringing the stakeholders together as equals with the intent of crafting, agreeing to, and implementing actions or policies as one body. A convening organization may bring them together, but the stakeholders decide their own process, ground rules, and acceptable limits of their participation. Most importantly, they control their own outcomes, and are accountable to steer themselves in policy actions where they can find agreement. The stakeholders never totally get what they want, but agree to find areas of agreement to save time, energy, and resources wasted against each other. They agree to work together, learn from one another, and strengthen relationships so that mutual gains can be realized.

With this in mind, we crafted a very exciting and fascinating summit to introduce policymakers and citizens to the benefits of such collaborative processes. This effort, as the organizers have learned, is one of the most ambitious and daunting tasks ever attempted. The geographic and political hurdles of bringing this far-flung group of “delegates” together makes this process all the more interesting and significant as time and processes move ahead.

The delegates were selected by the convenors (the four watershed organizations) as “composite” representatives from 14 Missouri counties, and represent an extremely wide population and divergence of views. Observers were allowed to view the delegation and submit written comments at the close of the proceedings. The process was deliberately designed to be inclusive of citizens, particularly the “unheard voices” of the Upper White River Basin.

This delegation, which consisted of 39 extraordinary individuals, worked to create the ground rules and expectations for the Summit, and have agreed to continue efforts and work through the larger process.

The following proceedings reflect their hard work in preparing for this process, and their teamwork in seeking out important common ground for future discussions.

**MISSION OF THE SUMMIT:** To seek insights, perspectives, and common ground between delegates on specific issues related to water quality improvement across the region. This will provide the foundation for consensus-based strategies and solutions to many problems associated with regional water degradation. The Summit will use consensus to help identify and ratify areas of agreement across the region from Stockton Lake to the Missouri/Arkansas border.

**SUMMIT STRUCTURE:** The Summit will be organized as a delegate-centered exercise where a mix of general and sub-group sessions will be utilized to advance the goals of the summit. The sub-groups will be divided into four groups.

### **Consensus statements approved unanimously by the delegates:**

1. We have learned a lot from each other, and have begun a critical thinking process on the regional complexities of water quality. This has made us step outside our own boxes to see a bigger view.
2. In areas where I, as a delegate, feel I cannot make as much of a difference, I would prefer to see the four watershed groups work on these things, in some cases as one voice or coalition.
3. Even though I may agree on the language today, I cannot speak for everyone in my area or line of work. However, I will take action items back to them and do what I can do to promote the broader agenda

SHAWN GRINDSTAFF  
PRINCIPAL and SENIOR MEDIATOR  
p 636.728.1034 ext 16  
[shawn@forrestergroup.com](mailto:shawn@forrestergroup.com)

**THE FORRESTER GROUP**  
**Insightful Environmental Solutions**  
500 Chesterfield Center, Suite 300  
Chesterfield, Missouri 63017  
p 636.728.1034 f 636.728.1035  
[www.forrestergroup.com](http://www.forrestergroup.com)

---

# Final Consensus Statements

## Agriculture

1. Develop a web site for a nutrient exchange to be operated by University Extension or Department of Ag offices. (To be funded by the watershed groups, NRCS and county Extension offices) The program would include:
  - a) List of individuals with surplus nutrients
  - b) Mandatory NPK (Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Potassium) testing of nutrients
  - c) List of applicators with demonstrated experience in compliance with state rules on nutrient applications
  - d) Advice on when to spread nutrients
2. Promotion of five specific Best Management Practices among farmers in the watershed.
  - a) Plugging abandoned wells
  - b) Establishing Riparian Buffer Zones
  - c) Setbacks for spreading of nutrients
  - d) Soil testing prior to nutrient application
  - e) Rotational Grazing
3. Creation of a credible comprehensive Water Quality Monitoring Network with recommendations to:
  - a) interpret data
  - b) use of proper monitoring locations,
  - c) uniform parameters of collection so data can be compared and
  - d) recruiting farmers to participate in the Missouri Stream Teams programs so they can do their own testing of farm streams.

## Public Awareness

A comprehensive approach, coordinated by the four water advocacy groups, will be implemented employing strategies to accomplish these 5 priority action items. (In this order)

1. Media
2. Youth Education
3. Public Officials
4. Outreach
5. Special Events

**Media** – Seek media assistance to convey water quality/quantity information, emphasizing solutions.

**Youth Education** – Encourage water resource education to foster life-long behavior changes.

**Public Officials** – Organize forums, programs, and resources to effectively educate public officials.

**Outreach** – Identify target stakeholder groups, to communicate a message and design a delivery system appropriate for each.

**Special Events** – Develop new events and capitalize on existing special events.

## Septic/Sewer

1. Seek support from local government and elected officials to establish a White River Basin Partnership District to:
  - (a) Develop a model for quality and cost effective waste water systems
  - (b) Develop short and long term plans to address wastewater treatment
  - (c) Develop funding mechanism to assist stakeholders in meeting wastewater treatment responsibilities
2. In partnership with universities and institutions of higher learning in the White River Basin, establish a science/research/engineering center for wastewater treatment technologies, within one year.

## Urbanizing Issues

1. Complete a comprehensive study of groundwater quantity and quality in southwest Missouri, which may lead to further action.
2. Develop creative action marketing strategies in cooperation with marketing professionals to address urban runoff. Strategies include rain gardens, buffer strips, and demonstration projects involving business and public buildings/sites.
3. Collect data that allows a more specific understanding of the causes of water quality impairment and specific measures that can be used to reduce runoff and improve water quality.
4. Work with agencies, citizens and business to target ongoing economic resources, such as financial incentives, taxes, fees and voluntary programs, toward protection of water resources.
5. Establish local committees to examine development review processes in cities and counties in order to incorporate better water quality practices earlier in the design process.
6. Encourage green space/open space programs and requirements to improve water quality.

---

# Brainstorming Compendium with Notes

At the beginning of the two-day process every member of each subcommittee was asked to list all the possible steps they could imagine to help improve water quality from their perspective. Inclusion on the list does not mean that the issue was supported by all members of the subcommittee, only that the idea was considered at some point during the entire event.

## Agriculture Brainstorming

***The Agriculture sub-group included Cynthia Andre, Lynn Crabtree, Lester Davis, Joe Ewing, Montie Hawks, Gaila Limeberry, Jessica Salsig, and Russell Wood.***

*Items in parenthesis refers to combining ideas, with the permission of the original authors, during the priority setting phase which includes the steps of clarification, voting, and ranking and discussion of results.*

1. Transportation of litter to areas with field crops.
2. Prioritize point source and non-point source (12/4 priority ranking)
3. Education of what the water quality problems are (add 23, add 15) – send all to 6
4. Work with producers to develop nutrient management and pest management plans (1/1 priority ranking)
5. Ban import of cheap foods from areas with no environmental regulation.
6. Education to landowners about what water quality problems they contribute to and what BMP's they can use (add 3, 15, 23) (15/5 priority ranking)
  - educate children, vo-ag, science questions
  - that water quality is a problem
7. Increase awareness of landowners about EQIP programs available to them
8. Confinement operations should not be located so runoff goes to streams.
9. Regulators need to do a better job of explaining exactly what they are trying to do. Add 66 – be partners not adversaries.
10. Need demonstrations on farms where BMP's are being used.
11. Need more buffers in riparian areas.

12. Strengthen programs and/or develop markets that are seeking to find more appropriate uses of manure/nutrients, including use of stockyard or CFO waste, transportation problems, incentives to land owners that are appropriate locations, and regional composting possibilities. (17/5 priority ranking) - Add 31, 1, 33, 30 and 14
13. Need regional or county P&Z authority with some control over where homes/septic/construction takes place with Farmland Protection from urban sprawl. (3/2 priority ranking) - Add 52
14. Centralized composting for all kinds of waste, domestic and ag. Add to 12
15. Educate population that there are quality problems (not the choir) Add to 6
16. Improve ground cover – add 43
17. Improve programs that help farmers transition to organic methods
18. More people/landowners need to know how and why to take a soil test – also needs funding. – add 42 fertilizer rates
19. Promote responsible use of commercial fertilizer use on lawns & golf courses. Add 49 – require soil samples. (4/1 priority ranking) (Outside of issue scope)
20. Need scientific evidence and facts about fertilizer runoff (6/2 priority ranking)
21. Consider livestock diets and how it affects waste.
22. Look for ways to treat sludge and animal waste to reduce runoff.
23. Education of school children about water quality issues (to 6)
24. Education and awareness that bigger farms aren't necessarily more environmentally irresponsible.
25. Better public awareness that landowners/farmers have a major stake in water quality. (2/1 priority ranking)
26. More rotational grazing systems for cattle. (10/4 priority ranking)
27. Teach more about water quality to vo-ag and science classes. – go to 6
28. Need ways to increase financial incentives for farmers to do a better job. Add 68 – need money (8/3)
29. Find incentives for small farmers, including alternate energy uses.
30. Incentives for using litter on lands where it is most needed and is appropriate use geographically. - go to 12

31. Ways to use manure from stockyards and large confinement areas, like for fuel or fertilizer. - go to 12
32. Educate the public on cheap food and its relation to environmental affects. - go to 34
33. Develop markets to utilize wastes off-site. go to 12
34. Promote markets for local foods and increase awareness about why it is an environmental issue. (1/1 priority ranking) - Add 32
35. Better education and communication to state & federal legislature about water quality and financial needs.
36. Reassess use of septic systems related to geology and soils, especially around Table Rock Lake or tributaries. (outside of issue scope)
37. Regulatory agencies should work from the ground (landowners) up to the top, instead of formulating regs. at the top and passing down. (1/1 priority ranking)
38. All need to monitor the legislation process before the decisions are made.
39. Need legislative support (\$) for DNR
40. More funding for ponds.
41. Education should be based on scientific fact, not emotion. (15/3 priority ranking)
42. Soil sampling for fertilizer rated. Moved to 18
43. Ground cover. – moved to 16
44. Farmers could become “stream teams” and get free sampling kits, and get help interpreting results – go to 45
45. Establish a credible water quality monitoring systems for watersheds. Add 44 including stream teams. (15/4 priority ranking)
46. Educate Agricultural. Landowners about BMP’s of gravel mining.
47. Send usable information from this conference back to the poultry industry – move to 54
48. Create a web-site for farmers to see who has nutrients (manure/litter) they need to get rid of (exchange site) and who could apply litter to their ground within proximity of each other. (5/2 priority ranking)
49. Require soil samples for urban fertilizer application – move to 19
50. Regulatory and rule-making entities need to “have the same story” and be more user friendly.

51. Limit number of livestock per acre on small acreage (3-5 acres).
52. Planning and Zoning, Farmland Protection, and other ways to protect the farmland we have from urban sprawl. -go to 13
53. Litter and manure needs to be treated to remove pharmaceuticals before application to land.
54. Communicate solutions from this conference from watershed groups, especially to poultry industry,
55. Dredge Table Rock Lake and apply sediment to farms and yards. (4/1 priority ranking)
56. Need to plug abandoned wells
57. Programs offered to Planning and Zoning and/or developers to provide information about land use, siting and conversion. (outside of issue scope)
58. Generate list of available funding sources for AG practices.
59. Increase research to provide alternatives to address non-point source pollution.
60. Handbook for farmers about BMP's in agriculture.
61. Don't fertilize if it is going to rain
62. Need study on groundwater availability and affect of high use wells.
63. Need coordination of use within aquifers
64. Wildlife management plans to address WQ issues related to wildlife
65. Sludge needs to be treated before application to fields because of high levels of phosphorus
66. Government agencies need to be partners, not adversaries – go to 9
67. Total RMS plans for cropland.
68. Need money – go to 28

## Urbanizing Issues Brainstorming

***The Urban sub-group included Ruth Bamberger, Janice Green, Alane Roy, Tim Smith, Todd Wagner, Stan White and Jan Wooten.***

- A. Big Picture/Planning: The goal is an adequate, clean supply of groundwater.

1. Complete a comprehensive (projected use, current status of levels and quality, expected recharge, past history) study of groundwater quantity/quality in the lakes area.
2. Inform the public and community leaders of the results of the study.
3. Respond with programs and laws to the above, e.g., limitations on unrestricted water withdrawal, programs for caps on hookup fees to water systems or other incentives/financial assistance.
4. Promote regionalization of water supplies.
5. Promote water conservation
6. A second goal is clean lakes and streams. Emphasis should be on pollution prevention, source control and limits on impervious areas.

#### B. Education;

1. Demonstration projects, e.g., use of native plants in water conservation and runoff control.
2. Demonstrations at public buildings.
3. Publicize businesses using better techniques as an incentive
4. Explain how to rectify existing problems.
5. Cultivate partnerships with the local media.
6. Educate decision makers, business leaders and regulators.
7. Demonstrate buffer zones around impervious areas.
8. Get school districts to buy into these ideas, perhaps by targeting groups in the system.
9. Tie runoff education to instructional goals (standards).
10. Creatively market ideas with different techniques to motivate homeowners.
11. Develop marketing strategies.
12. Increase/enhance existing efforts through better funding for these efforts.
13. Funding linked to education.
14. Use low cost production (e.g., through schools, PSAs); be creative with less money.
15. Increase education about water conservation.

#### C. Data: Goal is to have sufficient data to make broad policy decisions.

1. Need to know more about the impacts of urban pollutants—quantify.
2. Quantify impacts of urban practices such as lawn fertilization/golf courses, etc.
3. Coordinate beneficial uses (e.g, drinking water) with upstream practices/land uses; e.g, connect use of chemicals with beneficial uses of water.
4. Quantify sources of pollutants of concern (compartmentalize), e.g, amount contributed by lawns.
5. Conduct focused studies.
6. Don't use lack of data as an excuse not to act.
7. Use university/student/service learning projects as ways to gather data.
8. Use businesses to help with data gathering efforts—marketing.
9. Need specific cause and effect data.
10. Get data on effectiveness of better practices.
11. Need groundwater level data.

#### D. Regulation:

1. Need ordinances to protect trees in development projects.

2. Runoff controls are typically inserted late in process (an “add-on”), not discussed early in process—talk to parties earlier.
3. Subdivision design community needs incentives for “designing with the land.”
4. Review ordinances to incorporate better design processes.
5. Examine regulations on “gray water.”
6. Intensify enforcement (better at front end).
7. Strengthen green space and open space requirements in urban ordinances.
8. Examine ordinances and regulations affecting impervious areas.
9. Examine parking space requirements in ordinances.
10. Examine landscaping ordinances for water quality effects.
11. Strengthen sediment and erosion control on construction sites.
12. Comprehensive regulations on litter control.
13. Investigate pet waste controls.

#### E. Funding:

1. Voluntary funding, e.g., workplace giving
2. Investigate grant resources and provide information to potential grantees.
3. Partnerships with businesses associated with environmental causes/issues.
4. User taxes (e.g., on fishing gear) and license fees dedicated to specific programs.
5. Utility fee for stormwater, i.e., sustained, permanent, dedicated funding source for stormwater.
6. Citizen support to comply with Hancock Amendment.
7. Investigate small tax on vehicles related to roads/stormwater.
8. Linking need for funding with generation of runoff (“top of hill” problem).
9. Make bonds more attractive to citizens.

#### F. Economics:

1. Economic incentives for better practices and new technologies.
2. Tax credits for better practices.
3. Better practices (e.g., open-space subdivisions, curbless streets) may cost less but public perception can be an impediment.
4. Recognition and advertising programs.
5. Rebates for better practices.
6. Incentives for creating open space/green space in re-development.
7. Need a list of the “better practices.”

## Septic/Sewer Brainstorming

***The Septic/Sewer sub-group included Jim Craig, Scott Foley, Rick Helms, Peter Herschend, Steve Krysiak, David Ledford, Bruce Martin, Matt Morrow, Bob Schaefer, John Soutee and Randy Swanson.***

1. Avoid tunnel vision on phosphorous
2. 2 cent sales tax for water quality

3. Community support for cost of increased levels of operation/maintenance/rehabilitation/reconstruction
4. Mandated correction of failing onsite systems noted during loan evaluations
5. Stop sale of phosphorous detergents
6. Give DNR authority to apply financial penalties administratively vs. going to court
7. Mirror image MO-AR enforcement
8. Do we treat all watersheds the same?
9. Evaluate and learn from Greene county 17 year water quality study
10. Increase priority education in schools and public awareness on Karst
11. More lobbying with legislature
12. Develop short and long term plans to replace/eliminate septic tanks with central systems where practical
13. Establish urban service areas to reduce sprawl
14. Plan sewer trunk line extensions
15. Evaluate planning – zoning laws
16. State mandated performance based standards
17. Encourage maintenance contracts
18. Establish science/research/engineering center for wastewater
19. Demonstrate new wastewater technologies
20. Create science/rybo typing to ID problem sources and responsible parties
21. Develop regulatory/legal model for mandatory management of every system
22. Coordination between state/city/county for clear concise regulations
23. Pre- and post-inspections for onsite systems
24. All counties/cities given authority to regulate onsite systems
25. Authority for sewer districts to enforce issues within their boundaries
26. Clear authority given to regulate violations
27. Determine where phosphorous will go
28. Reduce red tape for the expedition of solutions and to fast track the SRF process
29. Grants to assist small communities to establish wastewater systems
30. Financial assistance from state for low income
31. Create resources for development
32. Use sound science to give cities advanced information on future treatment requirements
33. Comprehensive plans that are understood
34. Mass-based permit limits
35. TSL total stream loading
36. Reduce cost for initial systems or upgrades
37. Year round monitoring requirements of NPDES permits in sensitive areas
38. No single solution recognized
39. Tax rebate funding for secondary treatment for new and existing homes
40. Monitoring “Inspect what you expect”
41. Authorize treatment credits for larger facilities
42. Encourage alternate systems (natural) for phosphorous removal and treatment
43. Community consensus on what is acceptable enforcement

## Public Awareness Brainstorming

***The Public Awareness sub-group included Jim Anderson, Charlie Campbell, David Coonrod, Duane Galloway, Tracy Kimberlin, Rita Needham, Lois Reborne, Debbie Redford and Mike Sowders.***

- A. Media – Seek media assistance to convey water quality/quantity information, emphasizing solutions.
  - 1. site specific success stories as feature stories
  - 2. media is the cornerstone, evaluate status, recognize media, and build on this relationship
  - 3. enlist support of the media
  - 4. employ use of public service announcements on TV and radio
  - 5. water quality index on the evening news and in the paper
  
- B. Education K-12 – Implement water resources curriculum to foster lifelong behavioral changes.
  - 1. watershed festivals
  - 2. schools
  - 3. start early in the schools to identify grade level to develop curriculum, field trips
  
- C. Outreach – Identify target stakeholder groups, design a message and delivery system appropriate for each.
  - 1. newsletters
  - 2. web site
  - 3. videos highlighting successes
  - 4. speakers list, pointing out successes
  - 5. like ACORN – experiential learning activity packaged for a variety of adult audiences
  - 6. utilize neighborhood associations for dissemination of responsible lawn maintenance
  - 7. demonstration projects for how to do it right
  - 8. hotel tent cards
  - 9. visitor awareness associated with natural resource attractions such as WOW, Bass Pro, Fantastic Caverns
  - 10. use chambers of commerce to distribute information
  - 11. utility bill inserts
  - 12. consolidate web site
  - 13. use web site for resources, etc. with details related to success stories
  - 14. work with pet industry to educate on pet waste problems/solution
  - 15. develop “myth-busters” fact sheets
  - 16. speakers bureau with talking points
  - 17. include water quality information in tourism packets
  - 18. educate landowners about shoreline management
  - 19. citizen-led education, awareness on lots of issues
  - 20. letters to the editor, guest columns (weekly and daily newsprint)
  
- D. Elected/Appointed Officials – Organize forums, programs, and resources to effectively educate public officials.

1. host legislator forums to ensure legislators understand water quality issues, present and future
  2. legislative forum
  3. legislative tours – visit a variety of locations with Clean Water Commissioners or other groups
  4. conduct field trips for local officials (state and federal) to educate them on water quality /quantity issues
  5. monitor legislation introduced
  6. provide implications of introduced legislation
  7. provide legislator input to ensure minimum flow debate on merits, cost/benefit
- E. Special Events – develop new and capitalize on existing special events
1. watershed festivals
  2. lawn contest for environmentally friendly lawns
  3. lake advantage of pre-existing activities within the community using hands-on activities
- F. Cooperative Efforts – Promote collaborating among organizations to present a unified approach
1. involve universities and utilize students to meet volunteer requirements
  2. cooperation between city and county organizations
  3. get advertising agency for videos, etc.
  4. consolidation of interest groups
  5. “Good News” bureau
- G. Strategy – Integrate current research and recommended strategies to effect behavioral changes in support of water quality.
1. illustrate personal relationship to the issue “how does issue impact me?”
  2. targeting message to stakeholder
  3. enviroeconomics – encourage understanding and use of the term
  4. identify common ground between chamber of commerce and “greens”
  5. slogan
  6. reinforce “Is what we are doing good for water?”
  7. identify groups impacted
  8. customize message
  9. storytelling speakers bureau
  10. get advertising agency to create a centralized message
  11. centralized point of contact
  12. marketing expertise/changes in habits behavior modification beyond awareness
  13. encourage to “take action”
  14. cost/benefit education
  15. identify messenger in relation to credibility and integrity
  16. identify consequences and incentives to take right action
  17. positive reinforcement
  18. utilize different styles of learning
  19. campaign to emphasize the importance of healthy lake ecosystem
  20. role of faith community in support of stewardship
  21. prioritize target audience and concentrate here greatest impact first
  22. message need to indicate affect of one person’s contribution
  23. recruit celebrities to speak on water quality issues

H. Other Issue related comments -

1. maintain awareness of need for natural vegetation
2. communicate to Army Corps of Engineers about enforcement of shoreline management
3. educate landowners about shoreline management
4. Distribute science – based information on land applied waste
5. Demonstrate visually the impacts of sand and gravel mining

---

# Listing of All Delegates and Affiliation



## **In alphabetical order:**

Jim Anderson, President, Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce  
Cynthia Andre, citizen delegate, SMSU student, Bull Creek area  
Ruth Bamberger, citizen delegate, retired from Drury University, Springfield, MO  
Charlie Campbell, citizen delegate, pro fisherman, Forsyth, MO  
Dave Coonrod, James River Basin Partnership, Greene County, MO  
Lynn Crabtree, poultry sector, Willow Brook Foods, Monett, MO  
Jim Craig, citizen delegate, Mayor of Cassville, MO  
Lester Davis, citizen delegate, turkey producer/farmer, Stone County, MO  
Joe Ewing, citizen delegate, small farmer, Stockton, MO  
Scott Foley, citizen delegate, Positronic Industries, Springfield, MO  
Duane Galloway, Sr. Mgr for Govt Relations/Env.Affairs, City Utilities of Springfield  
Janice Green, Director, Bull Shoals Field Station, SMSU (technical delegate)  
Montie Hawks, Asst. State Conservationist- Field Operations, USDA-NRCS, Springfield  
Rick Helms, Operations Mgr, White River Valley Environmental Services, Branson, MO  
Peter Herschend, Board President, Upper White River Basin Foundation, Branson, MO  
Tracy Kimberlin, Executive Director, Springfield MO Convention and Visitors Bureau  
Steve Krysiak, Missouri Dept. of Health and Senior Services, Springfield, MO  
Gaila Limeberry, citizen delegate, small farmer, Stone County, MO  
Bruce Martin, Regional Director, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Springfield  
Matt Morrow, Executive Director, Home Builders Association of Greater Springfield  
Rita Needham, Executive Director, Southwest Area Manufacturers Association  
Lois Reborne, Bryant Creek Watershed Project, West Plains, MO  
Debbie Redford, Environmental Specialist, Public Works Dept., City of Branson  
Carol L. Rose Gee- citizen delegate, small business owner, lives north of Springfield  
Alane Roy, Environmental Science Teacher, Ozark High School, Ozark, MO  
Jessica Salsig, high school student interested/involved in water quality, Marshfield, MO  
Bob Schaefer, Asst. Dir, Env. Services, Dept. of Public Works, City of Springfield  
Lew Scott, Manager, Member Services, Associated Electric Cooperative, Springfield  
Tim Smith, Greene County Resource Manager, Greene County, MO  
John Soutee, Administrator, Taney County Regional Sewer District, Forsyth, MO  
Mike Sowders, Mike's Professional Fishing Guide Service, Table Rock Lake  
Randy Swanson, Marina Owners Association, Port of Kimberling, Kimberling City  
Todd Wagner, Principal Stormwater Engineer, Dept. of Public Works, Springfield  
Stan White, citizen delegate, Mayor of Crane, Missouri  
Russell Wood, citizen delegate, rancher living near Mountain Grove, MO  
Jan Wooten, Watershed Committee of the Ozarks, Springfield, MO

## **Delegates unable to attend:**

Rosella Hamilton, President, Table Rock Lake Chamber of Commerce, Kimberling City  
Dan Schumacher, Manager, Millwood Golf Course, Springfield, MO  
Ross Summers, Executive Director, Branson/Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce

# Listing of All Registered Observers

Last Name	First Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email
Alsup	Tim	PO Box 225	Springdale	AR	72765	tim_alsup@cargill.com
Barnett	Pat	1353 Lakeshore Dr	Branson	MO	65616	patb@kanakuk.com
Boone	Marsha	1856 S Glenstone	Springfield	MO	65804	marshaboone@clearchannel.com
Burks	Stacy	1700 S Campbell, Ste E	Springfield	MO	65807	stacy_burks@bond.senate.gov
Campbell	Terry	300 S John Q Hammons Pkwy	Springfield	MO	65806	terry_campbell@talent.senate.gov
Clingan	Kevin	4664 S Forrest	Springfield	MO	65810	
Cody	Teresa	628 Cynthia Lane	Montgomery City	MO	63361	dtv8d3@mizzou.edu
Fields	Kim	370 State Hwy DD	Marshfield	MO	65706	kfield@mr1.k12.mo.us
Formica	Sandi	8001 National Dr	Little Rock	AR	72209	formica@adeq.state.ar.us
Hefner	Steve	1786 S 16th Ave, Ste 102	Ozark	MO	65721	steven.hefner@mo.usda.gov
Holt	Drew	833 Boonville Ave	Springfield	MO	65802	holtd@missouri.edu
Hull	Jim	PO Box 176	Jefferson City	MO	65102	
Lindsey	Bill	1949 E Sunshine, Ste 2-115	Springfield	MO	65804	mecspringfield@sbcglobal.net
Lucks	Barbara	864 S Devonshire	Springfield	MO	65802	barbara_lucks@ci.springfield.mo.us
Martin	Larry	550 Saint Louis St	Springfield	MO	65806	lmartin@scotteng.com
Mooney	Ryan	202 S John Q Hammons Pkwy	Springfield	MO	65806	ryan@springfieldchamber.com
O'Neill	Ted	PO Box 8368	Springfield	MO	65801	ted_oneill@ci.springfield.mo.us
Parker	Kaye	1928 S Oak Grove	Springfield	MO	65804	
Perrin	Kristi	PO Box 176	Jefferson City	MO	65101	nrperrk@dnr.state.mo.us
Rache	Heather	2348 E Parkwood	Springfield	MO	65803	heathrlyn@msn.com
Rose	Katie	300 Main St	Cassville	MO	65625	cassch@mo-net.com
Schrader	Mark	1811 Meadow Lane	Edwardsville	IL	62025	mschrader@empowering.com
Schulz	Bob	PO Box 180	Jefferson City	MO	65102	schulb@mdc.state.mo.us
Shemitz	Peter		Kansas City	MO	64110	nrshemp@dnr.state.mo.us
Shurgar	Page	11796 Madison 3605	Kingston	AR	72742	fbfarm@madisoncounty.net
Stokely	David	1141 Davis Bridge Rd	Republic	MO	65738	dastokely@yahoo.com
Sturdevant	Dave	641 S Kentwood	Springfield	MO	65802	dsturdevant@concoccompanies.com
Unsell	Jeanette	2219 E Mirabeau	Springfield	MO	65804	jrunselltoo@aol.com
Vest	DeDe	688 S State Hwy B	Springfield	MO	65802	dede.vest@mo.usda.gov
Warner	Alex	4457 S Farm Road 145	Springfield	MO	65810	
Williams	John W.	PO Box 45	Eunice	MO	65468	willi@train.missouri.org
Wood	Rep. Dennis	PO Box 112	Kimberling City	MO	65686	wood@inter-linc.net

---

# Information About the Convening Groups



## **James River Basin Partnership**

Holland Building, Suite 200  
205 East St. Louis Street  
Springfield, MO 65806  
(417) 836-8877

Executive Director – Diana Sheridan

Mission: Working to protect and improve the water quality in our springs, streams, rivers, and lakes.

## **Table Rock Lake Water Quality, Inc.**

2 Kissee Avenue  
P.O. Box 606  
Kimberling City, MO 65686  
(417) 739-4100

Program Coordinator - David Casaletto

Mission: Table Rock Lake Water Quality, Inc. is a single purpose organization dedicated to maintain and improve the water quality of Table Rock Lake.

## **Watershed Committee of the Ozarks**

320 N. Main  
Springfield, MO 65802  
(417) 866-1127

Executive Director – Loring Bullard

Mission: The mission of the Watershed Committee of the Ozarks is to preserve and improve the water supplies of Springfield and Greene County through education and effective management of the region's watersheds.

## **Upper White River Basin Foundation**

215 S Second Street, Suite 1B  
PO Box 6218 Branson, MO 65615  
(417) 334-7644

Executive Director - Floyd Gilzow

Mission: With your help we will work together to make Beaver, Table Rock, Taneycomo and Bull Shoals lakes the four cleanest manmade lakes in North America."