

ICICLE STRATEGY
Icicle Work Group Meeting
Confluence Technology Center, Wenatchee
Thursday, September 12th, 2019

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Jim Brown, WDFW; Anthony Jantzer, IPID; Levi Jantzer, IPID; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Melissa Downes, Ecology-OCR; Dan Church, Reclamation; Sharon Lunz, ICWC; Mike Anderson, Wilderness Society; Jeff Rivera, USFS; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Raquel Crowley, U.S. Senator Murray's Office; Kelli Scott, U.S. Representative Schrier's Office; Carlo Aguon, USFWS; Elizabeth Heether, Reclamation; Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County; Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth; Cody Gillin, TU; Christi Davis-Kernan, Reclamation; Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Confederated Tribes; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Bob Bugert, Chelan County; Carmen Andonaegui, WDFW; Bruce Williams, ICWC; Dick Rieman, ICWC; Jeff Dengel, WDFW; Tony Buhr, Wenatchee World; David Rice, Anchor QEA;
Facilitators: Cynthia Carlstad, Northwest Hydraulic Consultants; Peter Dykstra, Plauche & Carr

Welcome, Review Agenda

Melissa and Mike introduced the new IWG facilitators, Cynthia Carlstad and Peter Dykstra.

Decision Item: The IWG approved the May 9th, 2019 Meeting Summary

New Facilitation Team Findings and Recommendations from IWG Interviews

The new IWG facilitation team presented on the results of their discussions with the IWG members over August and September, which included their assessments of positives and challenges as well as their recommendations for moving forward. The presentation is available here <https://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-work-group-meeting-information>

The IWG facilitated a question and answer session with the IWG Members and audience members. The group discussed questions regarding the IWG facilitation team's presentation. Questions and discussion included the following topics:

- What does “measured support” mean?
- Remembering to review all of the Icicle Strategy Guiding Principles and goals is important.
- The Icicle Strategy can be challenging for entities to participate in and participating in the process can slow down efforts that could be taken independently.
- What was the discussion around the guiding principles and metrics during the interview?
- A sense that everyone was focused on implementation.

- How might interview with non-IWG members, affect the recommendations from the new IWG facilitation team?
- How well is IWG was balanced?
- The fact that some topics seem to dominate the IWG agenda but the membership is balanced.
- The fact that some IWG members don't feel they are heard.

Small groups were established to discuss the following questions:

1. What themes resonate with you from the presentation? How do you feel about that?
2. Lack of trust between IWG members was identified as a barrier to implementation because:
 - a. Competition among projects may leave some projects behind.
 - b. Decisions have been made outside the IWG consensus framework that some members disagree with.
 - c. Members don't all feel valued and heard.
 - d. Actions of some IWG members have been interpreted by others as undermining the group's support for an integrated strategy.
3. What are some actions that you can commit to that would help build the needed trust among members?
4. Recognizing the enormous commitment for members to truly collaborate and commit to working together and supporting each other through implementation, what are your ideas for making this commitment worthwhile?
5. There are many stakeholders outside the IWG who have strong and relevant views about the Icicle Strategy. How can we bring those viewpoints into the IWG in a constructive way? Are there groups that are not part of the IWG that need to be for it to be successful?

Small groups reported back to the larger group. See Attachment 1 for individual small group responses.

Discussion around next steps included:

- Some expressed a fear of old habits – focusing on their own interest only and not seeing the big picture/programmatic approach.
- There's a need to get into the details now. Today was a high level discussion, the details are needed.
- IWG members need to be honest and have the hard conversations.
- IWG members need patience

Action Plan

1. Bring missing IWG members up to speed on today's discussion: IWG members who are here should reach out to those missing and share about the discussion.

2. Clarifying decision authorities, roles, etc. – The IWG Facilitation team will prepare strawdog revisions to the Operating Procedures for the October 10 Steering Committee. This will include describing member’s responsibilities around engaging with external stakeholders.
3. Implementation Framework – The IWG Facilitation team will work with the IWG Co-Leads, technical consultants and project leads to prepare a draft for the October 10 Steering Committee.
4. Steering Committee – Implement new job description for the Steering Committee as described in the presentation
5. Funding and Budget – The IWG Facilitation team, IWG Co-Leads, technical consultants, project leads, and Melissa develop draft 2019-2021 budget for first consideration at October 10 Steering Committee mtg.
6. Public Outreach – develop a strategy, begin this discussion at October 10 Steering Committee mtg.

2019-2021 Budget Development (Mary Jo Sanborn, Melissa Downes)

Chelan County is still under contract with OCR under the 2017-2019 contract and funding through the end of October. One task will continue until January – COIC design. A decision is needed on how to develop the next contract, some of which must be in place for November 1st to keep facilitation, coordination, technical support going.

Decision Item – The IWG approved \$150,000 to be contracted initially for administrative, facilitation and technical support.

The IWG Facilitation team and Chelan County will collect information from project sponsors to develop budget information to inform IWG decisions on the remaining OCR funds for 2019-2021.

Reclamation’s WaterSMART grants are open right now. The City of Leavenworth is planning to submit an application for their meter project. Chelan County and Aspect are assisting IPID with an application for Alpine Lakes Automation.

Project Updates

Alpine Lakes Automation – Pilot Manual Releases (Tony Jantzer)

IPID decided mid-summer to conduct manual releases of the Alpine Lakes during this drought year to test the idea that the automation project could help instream flow even in drought years. The County hired a lake runner to implement this who has been coordinating with Tony. Details will be discussed at the instream flow subcommittee later this fall and IWG meeting.

- A question was asked about how late in the season could the releases help instream flow? IPID indicated that they could leave the gates open into October but they need to ensure they can get in to close them.

Eightmile Lake Update (Tony Jantzer)

Input on 30% design was received by Ecology Dam Safety and USFS, the 30% design has now been finalized. The original 30% design included one 60 ft long gate with no redundancy. Based on Dam Safety requirements, the revised design includes three 20 ft gates that must automatically lower (with no electricity or human management needed) if water gets above the established height. They are starting to work on 60% design now.

COIC (Greg McLaughlin)

Working on establishing the cost of the easement based on a recent appraisal. Greg will likely request OCR funds to cover the cost of the easement. 60% design is being done now. WWT and Anchor will review 60% with the COIC Shareholders this fall. They expect to have design and bid packages complete in January 2020.

Screens – City of Leavenworth and IPID (Jim Brown)

There is a minor funding gap remaining for the City screen, however a small group met this morning and we think we have a pathway to fill that. Bid package for the bridge is getting ready, planning to award by the end of October.

- USFS reminded the IWG regarding the USFS program of work, noting that early coordination is needed to ensure the Snow Lakes Trailhead is only closed once.
- It was also noted that the USFS 5-Year Workplan Process is something we need to incorporate into the Icicle Implementation Framework as we develop that.

Tribal Fishery Adaptive Management Plan (Dan Haller)

There was a meeting onsite at LNFH in July with LNFH, YN and CCT staff to discuss development of this plan and brainstorm ideas to include. Chelan County and Aspect followed up with a meeting in Nespelem with the Colville Confederated Tribes' Wenatchi Advisory Group to get advice and input. Maps were left so people can add details. Similar follow up discussions are occurring with Yakama Nation members also. A summary will be completed at the end of October which will identify next steps for the next biennium.

Water Management Decision Support Tool (Dan Haller)

Work is underway on the initial scope for this which will identify next steps needed. This will be completed by the end of October.

LNFH Updates (Christi Davis-Kernan)

The Snow Lake valve modification is scheduled to begin September 28th and will be completed by October 15th. Currently reviewing 30% design on the Intake/Screen replacement.

IPID Pump Station (Mike Kaputa)

The Bureau of Reclamation has committed to doing a Value Planning Study on this project (the revised Dryden Pump Station project with a second pump station). This project could result in

20 cfs improvement to Icicle Creek. SRFB funding for preliminary design looks likely, so a request for the match will be made for the OCR funds.

Outreach

Ecology thanked those that participated in the Western States Water Council Tour in July. There was a lot of positive feedback.

Chelan County reminded IWG members that there will be an Icicle Tour as part of the WA PUD Association annual meeting on September 26th. Several IWG members (Bill Gale, Tony, Melissa, Dan, Mary Jo) will be participating. Several others (Chuck Brushwood, Raquel Crowley and Kelli Scott) are interested in attending as well.

WDFW noted that the Coordination Framework for the LNFH is completed and signed. A copy will be sent to the IWG.

CCT noted that the Chair of the Colville Tribes' Fisheries Committee may begin to be more involved in the Icicle Strategy.

Public Comment – none

Steering Committee Chair - Jim Brown announced that he will be stepping down as Steering Committee Chair but will continue to participate on the Steering Committee as a member. The IWG expressed their thanks to Jim for many years of leadership for the Steering Committee and the extra time he dedicated.

Adjourn

ATTACHMENT 1 – RESULTS FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION TASK ON FACILITATOR’S FINDINGS FROM IWG INTERVIEWS

Cynthia and Peter presented recommendations for actions needed to enable the IWG to productively work together and accomplish the outcomes it aspires to. The purpose of this small group discussion task is to hear reactions and ideas around those recommendations.

Please discuss the questions below and use the flip charts to document your group’s responses. After lunch, each group will report out to the rest of the IWG meeting participants. Following the report-outs, we’ll discuss as a whole group and make an action plan.

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Tony J.	Levi	Joel	Mike K.	Melissa
Jim B.	Carmen	Bob	Sharon	Jeff D.
Christy	Dan G.	Mike A.	Chuck	Dale B.
Mary Jo	Cody	Kelli	Jeff R.	Carlo
Greg	Bruce	Dick R.	Elizabeth	Raquel
	Steve			

1. What themes resonate with you from the presentation? How do you feel about that?

Group 1:

- Feels like Day 1
- Lost time and now working on persistent problems.
- Lack of clarity in operating procedures allowed for conflicting agendas.
- Full IWG should focus on how to get to yes, not the potential no.
- Internal pressure within organizations can make it difficult to engage on full programmatic.
- Original intent with integrated Project List.
- If a project becomes not feasible the IWG will find a new project or modify the project to meet all GPs.

Group 2:

- Commitment to collaborative even when individual priority being delayed
- Yakima effort had good trust building amongst sometimes distrustful stakeholders > good model
- Transparency is critical - there have been a lot of extra - IWG conversations that have ended trust
- IWG group (and non-group) stakeholders understanding interests and benefits, need for some outside groups to see benefits
- Need for better communication from IWG through outside stakeholders to more distant interested communities; trust within and good facilitation can help with this and other communications issues

Group 3:

Group 4:

- Civility is bedrock: trust, collaboration > leads to durable solutions; helps resolve intractable issues
- Need for wilderness community engagement
- Need for transparency
- Great time for re-set
- What is back-up plan for projects e.g. wilderness
- Need common level of understanding across IWG members

Group 5:

- Let it Go! To move forward:
 - optimism/exciting time
 - New tea, - portfolio of projects work on marketing
 - Whew. G.P. are solid
 - Communication needs work but we have help!!
 - Help is here, to lay the foundation for needed/better group discussion.

2. Lack of trust between IWG members was identified as a barrier to implementation because:

- a. Competition among projects may leave some projects behind.***
- b. Decisions have been made outside the IWG consensus framework that some members disagree with.***
- c. Members don't all feel valued and heard.***
- d. Actions of some IWG members have been interpreted by others as undermining the group's support for an integrated strategy.***

What are some actions that you can commit to that would help build the needed trust among members?

Group 1:

- All IWG members clarify their interest. Why here?
- Consistent participation
- Recognize that your needs are met within the programmatic approach.
- “Everyone get something, no one gets everything.”

Group 2:

- Communication > disclosure from members
- Attendance, staying informed, participation
- Facilitation/coaching of IWG members for how we can be better participating members

Group 3:

Group 4:

- General agreement on need to respect processes and constraints to implement projects
- How to engage wilderness groups who self-selected out of IWG process?
- Natural resource decision-making requires making choices, perhaps sub-optimal
- Need clear and effective communication, identify interests and mutually beneficial solutions
- Two-way communication
- Roles, structure, decision-making
- Clarifying process > in the absence , unclear what organization values or what position may be
- Perception that project support may be influenced by financial gain; integrated project teams may help
- Differences in org. capacity and how to bring all groups to common level of understanding will help build trust
- Informal opportunities to build trust > social aspect, getting to know each other
- Need for “Regulatory 101”
- Need for self-reflection, look for new ways to view issues/solutions [Maoist self criticism > Dale]
- Being engaged, staying in your lane, collaborating > a lot of grey
- Federal support and decision-making influenced heavily by NEPA process
- Discussion about “measured support”...what does it mean?

Group 5:

- Need Absolute transparency
- Express concerns early
- LISTEN
- All decision making occurs in the ISC or IWG (no sidebar decisions)
- Bring up pressure/competition to facilitation team or smaller group
- Leave emotions at the door and focus on technical details
- Allow for these fun small group opportunities to establish relationships
- Listen some more - coffee/tea conversations

3. *Recognizing the enormous commitment for members to truly collaborate and commit to working together and supporting each other through implementation, what are your ideas for making this commitment worthwhile?*

Group 1:

- Find commonality for each project for each IWG member.
 - Takes us away from conflict and brings everyone together.
 - 1. List project. What GPs does this meet>
 - 2. Pros/Cons
 - 3. Solve Problems and focus on area of agreement
 - 4. Helps resolve #1 and #2
- Focus on getting to yes!

Group 2:

- Celebrate successes
- Each party must clearly state interests
- When one project offers benefits and risks, how are risks offset
- Need for clear understanding of linkages/relationships among projects in the whole package; equitable sharing of risks and benefits
- Develop an implementation timeline and necessary components/steps to complete project package
- We share values much more closely than we realize, if we see this we will gain trust and can be proud of collective accomplishments

Group 3:

Group 4:

- Accepting and implementing facilitator recommendations

- Need time to think critically and have “space” to express thoughts
- Other groups > ask? How?
 - We think it is important
- Silence is not agreement
- Need safe space to participate

Group 5:

- Cheerlead for each other (advocate for viable projects across membership)
- Build support that is action - oriented and solution oriented
- Less horse training
- Stay focused on topic/project at hand... get consensus before moving on
- Get a WIN... build/implement
- Track progress/see success and value meeting GPs

4. *There are many stakeholders outside the IWG who have strong and relevant views about the Icicle Strategy. How can we bring those viewpoints into the IWG in a constructive way? Are there groups that are not part of the IWG that need to be for it to be successful?*

Group 1:

- Facilitators ask external groups if they see opportunities to participate constructively

Group 2:

- Commitment to collaboration, good temperament
- Public outreach
- Assuring outside parties of incentives for their involvement

Group 3:

Group 4:

Group 5:

- Wilderness view brought into conversations
- Homeowners Assoc. Rural Homeowners
- Rely on facilitators expertise to help here