



**Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership
Meeting #4 Summary
4–6 PM, Wednesday, June 18, 2014
Port of Vancouver, 3103 NW Lower River Road, Vancouver, WA**

ATTENDEES

Members and Facilitated Group Participants:

- Patty Boyden, Port of Vancouver
- Thom McConathy, NE Hazel Dell Resident
- Ron Wierenga, Clark County
- Jeff Schnabel, Clark County
- Bob Rowe, Vancouver Audubon
- Stephen Willie, Private Citizen
- Gary Kokstis, West Vancouver Resident
- Lehman Holder, Vancouver Resident
- Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia Estuary
- Vern Veysey, NE Vancouver Resident
- Jacquelin Edwards, Felida Moorage
- Iloba Odum, Department of Ecology

Staff:

- Loretta Callahan, City of Vancouver
- Jeff Mize, Clark County
- Julie Rawls, Port of Vancouver

Consultant Team:

- Jim Gladson, BergerABAM
- Traci Chumbley, BergerABAM
- Phil Trask, PC Trask and Associates

Others:

- Dorie Sutton, City of Vancouver
- Harry Claussen, Vancouver Sailing Club
- Annette Griffy, City of Vancouver
- Sunrise O'Mahoney, Vancouver Watersheds Alliance

WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW, PUBLIC COMMENT

JIM GLADSON

Jim welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda. He pointed out that this meeting would be structured to gather comments about the alternative preferred by each member for the future structure of the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership (VLWP) and the member's anticipated role in any future activities. Jim explained that these individual perspectives would then be reviewed for common themes, and that those commonalities would be consolidated into a set of potential alternatives. Using dots to indicate preferences, members would then identify their preferred alternatives. This method would highlight approaches that had the greatest level of group support for future activities. Jim asked for public comment. There was none.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES AND FUTURE ROLES

ALL VLWP MEMBERS

- Thom McConathy – Preferred alternative: Expanded inter-local agreement with additional partners, with the longer-term objective of promoting state legislation to create a Vancouver Lake special district. Future role: Support of group, and leadership involvement.
- Jacquelin Edwards – Preferred alternative: Lake management or special district. Future role: Receive informational updates, continue to remain informed, but not participate directly.
- Bob Rowe – Preferred alternative: Extended inter-local agreement among agencies. Future role: Attend meetings.
- Iloba Odum – Preferred alternative: Non-profit organization such as a watershed council. Future role: Continued Ecology staff participation and assistance with seeking grants where applicable.
- Ron Wierenga – Preferred alternative: Non-profit organization. Future role for Clark County: County will continue to provide staffing support.
- Vern Veysey – Preferred alternative: Encourage elected officials to continue support for status quo of agency funding, and seek additional partners. Future role: Support leadership and advocate to officials.
- Steve Wille – Preferred alternative: Continue some form of inter-local agency involvement and build support for future legislative action to fund lake activities. Future role: Provide technical support and offer leadership involvement.
- Patty Boyden – Preferred alternative: Merge VLWP function into an existing organization that can provide administrative and management structure. Future role for Port of Vancouver: Continued staff and logistical support. Provide seed money from existing Partnership budget, with fiduciary oversight, to support transition.
- Lehman Holder – Preferred alternative: Non-profit organization. Future role: Continue as a member of the new organization.
- Brian Carlson – Preferred alternative: Long-term, form a non-profit organization such as a watershed council or Friends of Vancouver Lake. Future role for City of Vancouver: Provide seed money for transition from existing VLWP budget, continue Public Works involvement in projects of City concern, such as Burnt Bridge Creek watershed activities and ongoing sewer connection incentive/septic elimination program. Short-term and Long-term: Serve as

secondary partner with new organization, but not take leadership role, as lake itself and majority of adjacent land is not inside city limits. Other parties/agencies (Ecology, DNR, County Parks, etc.) with jurisdiction will need to be directly involved in ongoing efforts and step up where not already active to meet those respective responsibilities.

- Chris Hathaway – Preferred alternative: Partner with an existing organization, such as the Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership (LCEP). Future role: Provide staff expertise for projects and grant writing.
- Gary Kokstis: Preferred alternative: Clark County take a leadership role in advancing the VLWP and seek additional support from other partners as necessary. Future role: Continue to serve as a committee member.

DEVELOPING A CONSOLIDATED LIST OF ALTERNATIVES

ALL VLWP MEMBERS

Jim led the review by the group of the alternatives to identify common themes/approaches. The members arrived at these four consolidated alternatives for additional consideration.

- Form a non-profit organization such as a watershed council;
- Merge with an existing group such as the Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership (LCEP);
- Form an ad hoc group of interested members to seek other partners; or
- Recommend that Clark County take a leadership role along with expanded inter-local agreements with other agencies.

SELECTION OF A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

ALL VLWP MEMBERS

Jim explained that members would be asked to use up to two sticky dots to identify their preferred alternatives from among the four consolidated alternatives. He noted they could put their two dots on a single strongly preferred alternative or use one dot each on two alternatives that the member could support. The group took 10 minutes to place dots identifying their preferences. Jim then led the group in a discussion of the results.

Among the four choices, the non-profit approach received seven dots, merger with an existing organization received eight dots, forming an ad-hoc group received no dots, and recommending that Clark County take a leadership role received nine dots. Jim noted that the distribution of the dots did not identify a clear preference other than the elimination of the ad-hoc group option.

Members then discussed the remaining three alternatives and reached consensus that alternatives #2 and #4 required more focused discussion, including consolidation of those alternatives as deserving of follow up. Some members felt that initiating discussion with Clark County elected officials, and related advocacy to these elected officials, should take precedence. Other members preferred an exploratory discussion with the LCEP as the next step.

Ultimately, members decided that an exploratory discussion with the LCEP would be an appropriate action at this time, although strong support remained among a few members for approaching Clark County elected officials with a request for continued financial support of the

VLWP effort. This latter option, they said, should be accompanied by a list of identified projects if the request is to be successful.

NEXT STEPS

ALL VLWP MEMBERS

The funding agencies will set up a meeting with leaders of the LCEP to explore options for merging the Vancouver Lake effort into the overall LCEP program. The agencies will advise members when that meeting is scheduled. Patty Boyden also offered to host a follow-up meeting at the Port offices to share the results of the meeting and discuss next steps. This follow-up VLWP meeting will be scheduled as soon as possible after the meeting with LCEP leaders.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.