

## Lake St. Clair/St. Clair River Management Plan

### **Project Management Team**

*December 12, 2002  
Macomb County Health Department  
Mt. Clemens, Michigan*

#### MEETING SUMMARY

On December 12, 2002, the Project Management Team met in Mt. Clemens, Michigan, to review draft vision, principles, goals, objectives, and recommendations for the Lake St. Clair/St. Clair River management plan. This summary was compiled by the Great Lakes Commission. Action items, next steps and the list of meeting participants are provided at the end of the summary.

#### **Review of Draft Vision and Principles**

The Project management Team reviewed the draft vision and principles. Specific comments will be incorporated into the draft vision and principles, where appropriate. A summary of general comments is below:

1. Start vision statement with a simple declarative statement that references both the U.S. and Canada.
2. The distinction between the St. Clair River RAP and the management plan needs to be very clear and stated up front in the document.
3. Principles should include an explicit reference to other plans.
4. Simplify wording of the vision and principles.
5. Change from passive to active voice.
6. All principles should answer the following: "A clean and healthy lake will require...."
7. The principles should be a set of conditions that must be met in order to achieve the vision statement.
8. Change the "Lake and the River," to the "Lake St. Clair Watershed"

#### **Review of Draft Goals and Objectives:**

The Project management Team reviewed the draft goals and objectives. Specific comments will be incorporated into the draft material, where appropriate. A summary of general comments is below

1. For each goal, there should be a set of objectives. The objectives should be the steps required to meet the goal. Need to be able to answer this question: If we meet all of these objectives, will this goal be met? In contrast, if an objective does not help achieve a goal, it should be removed.
2. Objectives should tie into regulations. (i.e. change "eliminate all beach closures" to "ensure that all waters meet established water quality criteria...") Where possible, reference establishes regulations.
3. Simplify wording of goals. Objectives may need to be more specific and technical in order to clarify scope of goal.
4. Change from passive to active voice.

#### **Review of Draft Recommendations**

1. Recommendations need to link to problems and issues as well as goals and objectives. What makes something a recommendation? It should address the objectives; recommendations need to be merged with the objectives.
2. At some level, whatever is suggested needs to have an end goal. Implement provisions for end gain. (i.e. Support provisions of Beach Act *to ensure that.....*).

3. The plan needs to relate to other plans and documents and their recommendations. How should the management plan reference existing plans and documents? One approach is to reference existing documents, and if there is something specific we need to address than pull that out (implement X recommendations in X document).
4. Consider adding an action plan addendum to the plan.
5. The recommendations are currently based on gaps. If the plan describes everything that's happening than we end up with a huge document. How can we resolve this?
6. The management plan should "support implementation plans, but not "implement." (i.e. implement provisions of the Beach Act should be revised to "support implementation of the Beach Act provisions..."
7. Need a monitoring program to track progress on management actions. Under each objective, add a monitoring component for emphasis.
8. The executive summary should include: vision, principles, goals and objectives and recommendations and then implementation table. That scope is useful for the public, but won't be very information for agency implementation. How can we resolve this?
9. Include some form of implementation matrix that demonstrates the connection between goals, objectives, recommendations, and issues.
10. The implementation matrix does not necessarily lead to action. At a minimum, define regulatory responsibilities and identify what is happening. Ask agencies what they are doing to address each of the recommendations when you send the document out for review. This needs to be followed up with some form of implementation plan and oversight of implementation.
11. What's currently being done should be addressed.

### **Action items and Next Steps**

1. The goals, objectives, recommendations and problems will be linked together.
  - a. Make sure that all problems are identified under "Problems and Issues"
  - b. Make sure recommendations are sufficient to address problems
  - c. Make sure recommendations link to goals and objectives
  - d. Make sure objectives are sufficient to achieve goals
2. Determine how to reference separate documents.
3. Determine how to display implementation matrix
4. Determine how to format Executive Summary
5. PMT: Continue to provide info on existing plans
6. PMT: Continue to provide review.
7. PMT: Continue to identify photos to use in document.
8. Distribute one chapter soon in solid, complete format, in both layout and content.

### **Participants**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Ted Briggs	Upper Thames Conservation Authority
Matthew Child	Essex Region Conservation Authority
Ralph Coe	St. Clair Region Conservation Authority
Mike Donahue	Great Lakes Commission
Geoffrey Donaldson	St. Clair County Metropolitan Planning Commission
Matt Doss	Great Lakes Commission
Rose Ellison	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Patty Hayman	St. Clair Region Conservation Authority
Chuck Hersey	SEMCOG
William Howland	Lake Champlain Basin Program
Gary Johnson	Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy

John F. Jones	St. Clair County Water Quality Board
Bob Kavetsky	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Patrick Kuhne	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Ron Ludolph	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Colette Luff	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Elizabeth Moore	Great Lakes Commission
Ralph Moore	National Park Service
Joanne Munroe	Canadian Coast Guard
Art Ostaszewski	Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality
Bill Parkus	SEMCOG
Darrell Randell	Ducks Unlimited Canada   Ontario Federation of Agriculture
Mark Richardson	Macomb County Prosecutor's Office
James Ridgway	Environmental Consulting and Technology, Inc.
Jack Robertson	Lower Thames Conservation Authority
Roy Schrameck	Environmental Consulting and Technology
Jim Selegan	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Gary Towns	Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources
Jennifer Vincent	Environment Canada