

## **Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership December 15, 2004 Meeting Summary**



The first meeting of the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership was held on Wednesday, December 15, 2004, 4:00-6:00pm at the Port of Vancouver Administration Offices.

### **Attending**

Partnership members in attendance: Pete Capell, Brian Carlson, Carl Dugger, Nancy Ellifrit, Don Jacobs, David Judd, Clark Martin, Chris Hathaway (sitting in for Debrah Marriott), Lee McCallister, Thom McConathay, James Meyer, Iloba Odum, Larry Paulson, Randy Phillips, Doug Quinn, Jane VanDyke, Vernon Veysey

Partnership members absent: Gary Kokstis, Debrah Marriott, Dawn Fletcher

Public Information Committee: Loretta Callahan, Allison Shultz, Maureen Chan-Heflin, Jeanne Lawson, Amanda Garcia-Snell

In the audience: Dvija Michael Bertish, Patty Boyden, Bobby Cowles, Travis Dafin, Tim Dean, Annette Griffy, Lehman Holder, Paul King, Jeroen Kok, Tim Kraft, Lisa Lantz, Bob Moser, Lenora Oftedahl, Ken Rone, Rod Swanson, Terry Toland, Ron Wierenga, Justin Clary, Bob Zak

### **Background**

Larry Paulson opened the meeting by welcoming the partnership members and thanking them for their commitment to this effort. Jeanne Lawson then reviewed the agenda and primary purpose of the meeting: to establish the protocols by which the group will operate.

Pete Capell discussed some of the preliminary background issues of the watershed (later meetings will focus on background information). He identified the need for a vision, what considerations need to be taken in order to develop a vision and what the role of the Partnership will be. He also briefly outlined some of the jurisdictional issues related to various agencies that having ownership of and/or responsibility for the lake and surrounding area. He discussed the importance of meeting community needs and desires as well as the full spectrum of potential outcomes for the watershed. He reiterated that the purpose of the Partnership is: to develop a vision and recommendations that will have merit with elected officials and decision-making bodies, have a role in advising the community and elected officials, and the opportunity for the communities and agencies to be heard regarding this issue.

Various members made the following suggestions: that the Partnership have the characteristics of a watershed council, that elected officials be involved in the process, that the Partnership work toward developing recommendations that would be used rather than just added to the existing information, that the Partnership provide ongoing implementation and oversight, and that Whipple Creek be included in the watershed. Jeanne pointed out that, while the group has a finite charge and is not a watershed council, part of the group's charge is to develop strategies for implementing a vision. Ultimately, that vision could include recommendations that a long-term group like a watershed council be formed.

### **Decision-Making Structure**

The Partnership's charge is to develop a vision for the Vancouver Lake area and consider strategies for implementation of that vision. The group has the responsibility for building consensus for a vision. The decision-making bodies will need to have ownership of the vision if it is going to be adopted and the regulatory and permitting agencies will also need to be involved because they will permit various activities that come out of this plan.

The Partnership is not going into this with any assumptions about what is going to come out of this process. The recommendations that come out of the Partnership should reflect knowledge of concerns or constraints from regulating and primary implementing agencies, so that the outcomes of the Partnership are ultimately viable. Jeanne Lawson introduced the members of the Executive Committee and discussed their role in the decision-making process. The Executive Committee represents the primary decision-making bodies in the Partnership. Their charge is to keep the process moving forward. They are: Brian Carlson, City of Vancouver; Pete Capell, Clark County Public Works; Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver; David Judd, Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation; and Lee McCallister of the Fruit Valley Neighborhood Association is the community representative. The Executive Committee will meet between Partnership meetings to develop agendas. They will help to manage the process and keep it moving forward.

Carl Dugger pointed out the absence of NOAA Fisheries and Army Corps of Engineer representatives at the full partnership table. Loretta Callahan responded by saying that she has been working to try to get a representative from the Corp to attend and she is still working on that goal. Larry Paulson suggested that due to the location of NOAA Fisheries it may be difficult to get a representative to be able to attend the meetings and that it may be more important for the community to be represented. Carl Dugger reiterated that he feels that it is very important to have NOAA Fisheries on board with the process so that they are receptive to the vision that is developed.

### Steps

Pete Capell identified the steps that the Partnership will take towards their charge.

- Establish protocols and ground rules for how the Partnership will operate as a committee.
- Have 1 or more meetings following the first meeting for people to provide reports from people who have been working on the lake in the past to provide past history and background scientific information as well as information about how the lake system and watersheds all function so that all have same understanding
- Committee will discuss and deliberate on the values and desires and the options so that they can understand what the options are for the future of the lake
- Develop several different alternative visions that will lead into technical studies that will be done on behalf of the Partnership so that they can evaluate the options – not extensive but look at from feasibility level.
- Recommend what vision will be - not just infrastructure but systems that need to be put into place to achieve the desired results
- More detailed studies
- Implementation

### Protocols

Jeanne Lawson asked the members of the Partnership to identify important issues in the decision-making process. The issues that members wanted addressed in the protocols are attached. She then presented sample meeting ground rules and protocols. The Partnership discussed whether the protocols and/or ground rules were acceptable and complete. The following decisions were made:

### Guest Speakers

Agency members can invite an expert to present related material at a meeting, but it would need to be discussed and added to the agenda in advance.

### Alternates

Agency members will be allowed to have alternates as long as the alternate is a designated person who attends meetings regularly. The alternate will be allowed to vote and the agency member will need to provide Amanda Garcia-Snell with the name of the alternate as soon as one is identified. In the event of an absence for any member and there is no alternate, the member may provide Amanda with a message to convey to the group.

## Replacements

It was decided that in the event of a Partnership vacancy, the Executive Committee will consult the Partnership as to whether the position should be refilled and will be responsible for appointing any replacement. Regular meeting attendance and familiarization with the process will be a consideration (not the only consideration) for selecting a replacement.

## Public Comment

All written public comments will be distributed to the full Partnership. It was decided that public comment would be heard in the beginning of the meetings and prior to Partnership final votes on an issue, not to exceed three minutes per individual and a total of 15 minutes of a meeting.

## Press Releases

A protocol concerning press releases will be added. Press releases will be provided on a regular basis and shared with the Partnership. The press releases will reflect outcomes of the Partnership.

## Decision-Making

It was decided that if after repeated attempts, consensus can not be reached; two-thirds majority of those who are present will be required for a committee recommendation. Minority opinion will also be recorded and forwarded to decision makers. Jeanne Lawson will work with Thom McConathy to develop language for this protocol.

## Measuring Success

This issue will be revisited at the next meeting.

## Committee Business

- All Partnership related information will be distributed by email unless otherwise noted.
- The meetings are tentatively scheduled for the third Wednesday of every month and will be held from 4:00pm – 6:00pm.
- The next meeting session, and later meetings if necessary, will be dedicated to the sharing of past pertinent information about the watershed area.
- Any member that would like to present information will need to notify Amanda Garcia-Snell (amanda@jlainvolve.com) and provide a summary of the information.

## Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held January 19th, 2005 from 4:00pm to 6:00pm. Location will be confirmed and sent out via email meeting notice.

## Results of Group Brainstorming

### Things that did not work well in past committee experiences

- Hidden agendas – not forthright on what bringing to the table
- Hidden agendas not revealed by those with actual decisions authority
- Hidden agenda – one person dominating the discussion
- Someone who doesn't truly represent their constituency, but has a hidden agenda
- Large group, sometimes hard to hear what someone is saying and what it is
- Group never made decisions
- Too much theoretical discussion with out specifics
- Bad facilitator or no facilitator
- Not recognizing interested parties
- Agency people not communicating back to decision makers
- Lack of orderly discussion, not an opportunity for all to give input
- Meetings that are taken over by a few very vocal participants
- No closure – quieter members views were not heard over the roar of the crowd. (Few folks monopolize)
- Members not making an effort to understand views of others
- People who do not attend then cannot support decisions made when they were absent
- Keep on reliving the past instead of focusing on the future, sink the baggage and go on

### Things that did work well in past committee experiences

- Used graphics to chart how the study was focused down to enough detail to be navigable
- Transparency and participation by the above
- Good facilitator
- Civil equal opportunity
- Views solicited from all
- Respectful debates