



CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP

**Chehalis Tribe Lucky Eagle Hotel , Sky Room
Rochester, Washington
September 28, 2018
9:30 am – 12:00**

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS* and ALTERNATES' PRESENT

Alissa Shay', <i>Port of Grays Harbor</i>	Jan Robinson*, <i>Chehalis River Basin Land Trust</i>
Allison Osterberg', <i>Thurston County</i>	Kim Ashmore', <i>City of Centralia</i>
Bobby Jackson*, <i>Lewis County Commissioner</i>	Lee Napier', <i>Lewis County</i>
Brian Thompson*, <i>Lewis Co. Farm Bureau</i>	Patrick Wiltzius', <i>City of Chehalis</i>
Cindy Wilson*, <i>Thurston County</i>	Terry Harris*, <i>City of Chehalis</i>
Ed Mock, <i>City of Aberdeen'</i>	Wes Cormier*, <i>Grays Harbor County</i>

GUESTS

Jennifer Arnold, *Reciprocity Consulting*; Mike Noone, *Ecology Water Resources*, Mike Gallagher, *Ecology Water Resources*; Devan Rostofer, *Ecology, TMDL Lead*; Mark Mobbs, *Quinault Indian Nation*; Caprice Fasano, *Quinault Indian Nation*; Lauren Macfarland, *Quinault Indian Nation*; John Bryson, *Quinault Indian Nation*; Dave Vasilius, *City of Chehalis*; Trent Lougheed, *City of Chehalis*;

STAFF

Kirsten Harma, *Watershed Coordinator*

FOR MORE INFORMATION

- Meeting summaries are available on the Chehalis Basin Partnership website: www.chehalisbasinpartnership.org
- PowerPoint presentations from this meeting are available on the Chehalis Basin Partnership website: www.chehalisbasinpartnership.org/presentations

MEETING

1. Welcome, Introductions and Overview of the Agenda

Chair Terry Harris welcomed everyone to the meeting. He turned over the meeting to Jennifer Arnold, Reciprocity Consulting, who was brought in to facilitate today's special meeting.

Ms. Arnold provided an overview of the purpose of today's special workshop. The Chehalis Basin Partnership needs to re-energize and refocus their partnership to effectively complete the plan update for local water quantity over the next 2 years as required by the Streamflow Restoration Act with guidance from Ecology. The meeting objective is to clarify roles, expectations and decision-making rules to support an effective watershed plan update.

Ms. Arnold invited meeting participants to introduce themselves and let the group know how long they have been involved in the CBP, and also share an image of the Chehalis Basin in the fall.

Meeting ground rules:

- Be respectful
- It's healthy to disagree

- Listen to each other before reacting
- When someone is passionate, try to hear the message underneath the emotion
- Stay open to all sides of an issue
- Consider what's best for the basin regardless of how you feel personally
- One person speaks at a time
- No sidebar conversations
- Step up or step back so we hear from everyone
- Everyone helps to enforce the ground rules

Members agreed to the rules.

2. Trust Building and Setting Clear Expectations

Ms. Arnold presented concepts for trust-building among multi-stakeholder partnerships. Trust is built on the knowledge and experience of the people in the group. Reliability and responsiveness is another part of trust. Trust can spiral up and build momentum over time, or it can spiral down as it is lost within the group. We can build trust up through getting to know each other to appreciate the expertise in the room. We can also build trust through developing clear expectations so that people are working in the same direction. This needs to continue to happen throughout a process. Sharing feedback helps a group be responsive if there is an issue, so that the Partnership as a whole can build trust. Leaving time at the beginning or ending of a meeting for giving feedback is a good practice. Finally, celebrate your accomplishments as a team.

An online survey was sent out to the membership prior to this meeting. Ms. Arnold used the responses as a starting point for discussion.

If we are successful, what can we accomplish together?

Responses from the survey included: "fair and equitable plan that takes into account all interests", "pro-active at finding winning projects with benefits for people and ecosystems" "be willing to trying new solutions," "coordinated projects" "overlap between projects" "projects that address water quantity and water quality concerns," "a plan that goes above and beyond the requirements of 6091."

Mr. Noone (Ecology) stated his understanding of success as achieving "Net Ecological Benefit" through on-the-ground projects that benefit as many interests as possible.

Meeting participants listed additional measures of success including:

- a plan based on Best Available Science;
- meeting statutory requirements;
- allowing basin partners to be in charge of own decisions; a plan that we can all celebrate together;
- a plan that builds on past work; if we are successful, the plan will be accepted by Ecology within 2 years;
- Use the opportunity to identify project that wouldn't come out of an Ecology "rule-making" – aka, identify projects that can have benefits to streamflows, community, ensuring economic opporutnities, benefits to salmon and water quality, in short, fund projects with multiple benefits;
- a list of projects that are ready for when any funding sources become available;
- realizing other opportunities to leverage process and project funding;

- a reverse in the declining trends of salmon populations.

What needs to happen for us to be successful?

- Getting new participants up to speed on the group's history (there is an existing watershed plan online, with technical "white" papers and appendices);
- using Best Available Science; developing cost-effective projects;
- list actions, not just projects; a monitoring program;
- a good process with clear decision-making partners;
- clarity from Ecology on what they are looking for;
- regular updates from other watersheds/planning groups;
- that Mr. Noone listen to the group and bring feedback back to Ecology and bringing information back to us so the plan will be accepted; coordination between water quantity and water quality regulatory requirements.

3. Discuss a General Timeline and Deliverables

Kirsten presented a timeline with high level decision-points.

Initial decision-points: Plan update submitted to Ecology by February 1, 2021. Draft due by January 2020. Facilitator hired by December 2018.

Additions to timeline made by group, and discussion:

Get the plan to Ecology by November 2020 so that they have time to review it internally and come back to us if they have questions. That will require getting the plan approved by the Partnership prior to that November 2020 deadline. Member groups will need to have approval by their respective jurisdictions before then. It will be up to the member groups to set their timelines internally in order to get approval by November 2020.

The group expressed concerns about group governance. We need to have all of those discussions concluded soon since we will need to give as much time as possible for the technical advisors to do their work. We will be able to find other opportunities for collaborations by talking to each other throughout this process.

Start forming work committees in October.

4. Clarify Roles

To move forward, the group will need to clean up and clarify who will be participating. Ms. Arnold passed around a list of signatories from the CBP Operating Procedures manual, as well as a list of current CBP member seats and representatives that Ms. Harma had prepared.

The group discussed the legislation and who is required to participate in this watershed plan update. For the Chehalis (section 202), the legislation refers back to the groups' own composition: their own authorizing resolutions of their group.

A current need is to re-engage entities currently listed as members. Ms. Arnold asked for volunteers to do personal outreach to non-active members groups to invite them to send a representative to participate in this process. She referred the group to the pages in the Partnership Operations Manual for how to address non-active members.

The group discussed the vacant Port of Centralia seat. The original watershed planning rules said that the ports should appoint a single port to represent all of their interests. That was historically the Port of Grays Harbor and they have always been viewed as the Port representative. Ports will need to decide how they want their formal representation.

The group discussed the Ecology seat. Members questioned the relevance of having a state voice in what should be a local process. There was discussion about whether this should be an advisory role or a voting role. Ms. Napier provided the history on this decision, being that the Interlocal Agreement states that that voice is on behalf of state agencies, and was valuable for having a liason between the Partnership and state interests.

Mr. Jackson offered to reach out to Pe Ell and Napavine in order to encourage their participation. Beforehand, he would like more specifics on exactly what they are being asked to participate in and why they should be involved.

An activity that would help engage all member groups and new designees on the Partnership would be an agenda item about history. There are cities that were important parts of the original watershed planning process, but they might not know it.

It was suggested that there should be a set deadline by which new members should be added in order to effectively move on to next steps. One suggestion was November 1st. Another was to have all parties involved before the new facilitator starts working with the group. Other people felt it might be fine to let people join later in the process if they were enthusiastic. Jennifer shared that some groups set a minimum level of participation before members can participate in decision-making, for example attending at least two meetings.

The Quinault Indian Nation (QIN) had submitted a letter the morning of this meeting informing the group of their planned participation in the Streamflow Restoration Act tasks. Quinault representatives present explained the letter in further detail. They do not want to sign on as a member of the Partnership. They would like technical staff to offer technical input, and they would like to have policy staff be included as decision-makers on matters related to the watershed plan update as if they are a part of the Planning Unit. CBP members present supported this request and agreed that there will need to be discussions with QIN after this meeting to learn how they would like their inclusion in decision-making formalized.

The planned discussion on forming committees was tabled until a subsequent meeting.

Action: Clean up member list. Volunteers from the group will invite inactive members to participate in the CBP again, and if they do not respond by a given deadline (before the end of the year), the rest of the group will proceed on the Watershed Plan update without them. Volunteers should coordinate with Ms. Harma or Mr.Harris as they do this outreach.

Action: Mr. Jackson will reach out to Pe Ell and Napavine, given that he can receive background information about why it is important that they show up to participate in this plan update (will be provided by Ms. Harma and Ms. Noone).

Action: Mr. Ashmore will further outreach to Centralia

Action: The group will discuss forming technical subcommittees at the October CBP meeting. Potential participants should be suggested at that time.

Action: Agenda item for future meeting will be group history.

5. Participatory Decision-Making and Variations on Consensus

Ms. Arnold provided background on participatory decision-making and consensus. She introduced the “groan zone” and variations on consensus decision-making.

Decision-making options:

- Consensus as described in the Chehalis Basin Partnership Operating Procedures
- Consensus with fist-to-five (a simplified version of what is in your manual)
- Modified consensus where if you genuinely try and cannot reach consensus, a decision can be made as long as no more than 1 or 2 members present are in opposition and their dissenting views are documented

Discussion:

Members expressed frustration at not being able to make progress when 90% of the members are in favor but 10% aren't. Others said that a benefit comes when everyone “has skin in the game.” Consensus brings people to a place where everyone can win something knowing that everyone will also lose something.

The “fist-to-five” process helps work through issues and ensure that everyone has been heard. This is a slightly simplified version of consensus as is described in the Operating Procedures manual. The method can be modified as well, where decisions go forward if a certain number of people are in support, such as 80%, of the members agree.

Ms. Arnold guided the group through a practice with consensus. She asked the group if they supported a process where no decisions are made unless there is 100% support. Most participants expressed a 2, which is “needs more discussion”. There was some expression of 3- “can live with it” and one zero (0), which means an objection.

Ms. Napier cautioned that if the group changes the requirement of consensus, there would need to be work done to change bylaws, which requires going back and getting support from all original signatories, as well as drafting entirely new bylaws, which is time consuming. Ms. Arnold used the analogy that changing bylaws is like changes to a constitution- it requires an even higher level of support than an ordinary decision. Others said that we don't need to change our whole organization just for working on this plan update.

Ms. Osterberg mentioned the process the Nisqually Planning Unit has come up with for its watershed plan update, which is on an accelerated timeline. They created a two step process of modified consensus. The goal is to have consensus of the whole group. If they don't achieve that, the decision will go to a sub-group of the most affected entities (Counties and Tribes), and they will work towards consensus of those groups and agreement by 2/3 of the rest of the membership. Thus far, they have had consensus of all groups and haven't had to use this tiered method yet.

Ms. Arnold tried the fist-to-five exercise again. Do people support staying with consensus as currently described in Operating Procedures. More 3s and 4s and 5s this time. Still a 0 and a 2. Ms. Arnold asked for discussion. Mr. Cormier and would like to try something like the Nisqually approach. Ms. Fasano is also interested but this needs more internal discussion.

Action: Ms. Osterburg will provide more information about how the Nisqually planning unit has amended decision-making for this watershed plan update.

Action: This topic will be discussed again in October.

Action: The group will need to finalize group governance/ decision-making rules by the end of 2018.

6. Closing, Next Steps and Feedback

Ms. Arnold asked meeting participants to share what they liked about today's meeting and would like to keep going forward, and also what they would like to change.

Participants enjoyed the following:

- learning what each partner is bringing to the upcoming watershed planning;
- the active discussion; having ground rules and a productive and friendly tone to the meeting; the involvement of Ecology;
- great facilitation;
- the interactive timeline.

Participants would like to change:

- the meeting space so that more people can be accommodated with tables; getting more people involved.
- Additional ideas for the upcoming planning process were mentioned, including:
- ensure that we allow proper time for discussions and do justice to the CBP history and existing technical studies;
- consider that we may need to have more than one meeting per month in order to accomplish all tasks and allow proper time for discussions;
- prepare to aggressively use subcommittees to complete substantial work.

Participants left the meeting positive about the workshop and excited for next steps.

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Terry Harris adjourned the meeting at 1:00.

NEXT MEETING: October 26, 2018

Next month the meeting will also be held in the Sky Room of the Lucky Eagle Hotel, not in the Casino