

Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership

Steering Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: November 17, 2010

Steering Group Members Present:

Patty Boyden	Port of Vancouver
Kevin Gray	Clark County Environmental Services
Brian Carlson	City of Vancouver

Other Agency Members Present:

Jeff Schnabel	Clark County Environmental Services
Andrew Ness	Port of Vancouver

Project Management Team:

Phil Trask	PC Trask & Associates, Inc.
Eileen Stone	PC Trask & Associates, Inc.

Public in Attendance:

Thom McConathy	Northeast Hazel Dell Resident
Vernon Veysey	Northeast Vancouver Resident
David Page	Northwest Vancouver (Felida) Resident

Not in Attendance:

Pete Mayer	Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation
Lee McCallister	Fruit Valley Neighborhood Association

Project Manager Update

Phil began the meeting with an overview of the agenda.

Outreach Plan

Eileen gave an overview of the draft Outreach Plan, which has incorporated comments from Andrew Ness and Jeff Schnabel thus far. Phil asked if there are any big pieces missing in the plan, and what type of outreach events the Steering Group would like to see.

Patty pointed out that the outreach plan needs to set expectations for the public. One addition to key messages is that the Partnership works on a pay-as you go manner, which takes a little longer. On the section of agency actions to benefit the lake, some of the current actions are quite broad. Would like the list to be specific to those activities that target Vancouver Lake.

Discussion of additions to Key Audience section: elected officials, the League of Women Voters, Lions Club, Master Gardeners, potentially other speaker bureaus. Also, media contacts should be listed as a PIO responsibility.

Vernon stated that we should look to establish strong user groups/strengthen linkage to those who kayak Lake River, and even make connection to Ridgefield Wildlife Refuge through Lake River. Also mention the Parks' trails system.

Kevin: add an element of involvement in the plan, mixing the general presentations with on-the-ground work. Plan should really be an outreach and involvement plan. Brian added that the plan needs to broaden the public's understanding of the existing situation, the complexity of issues facing the lake, complexity of solutions: education and involvement and ultimately build support. The goal statement needs to be revised to include public education/understanding. Include in key messages why we can't fix the lake immediately.

Thom: Another way to get people involved is have students (possibly from Art school) make short films about Vancouver Lake, could be films they make for You Tube or just short format films.

Vern mentioned that showing any experimental restoration efforts (e.g., if did a trial study on certain equipment) and/or research would be good public relations. It would show the community that we are trying new things and not sitting back doing nothing while waiting for research results.

Potential Outreach Event:

Eileen summarized information included in the email to the Steering Group, with three Vancouver Lake specific outreach events of high, medium and low cost:

<u>Vancouver Lake Day</u>	A Partnership driven, open-house type of event, with information and activity booths. Potential freebies like phosphate-free fertilizer, sponsors with food and/or drink. Have partners lead hikes, boating opportunities. Broadest reach and highest cost. Incorporating fundraising could reduce cost.
<u>Lake Planting Day</u>	Volunteer based shoreline planting day. Could partner with Vancouver Watersheds Council for volunteer base. Would need to determine best location for plantings and find donor for appropriate plants/likely pay for some plants. Narrower reach and lower cost.
<u>Lake Clean up Day</u>	Volunteer clean up around the lake. Could have cleanup with some by foot, some by boat. Could schedule on own day, could partner with Vancouver Watersheds Council, and/or schedule in conjunction with April 16 Earth Day or Sept 17 SOLV Beach/Riverside Cleanup. Reach similar or maybe slightly broader than planting, lowest cost. (If partner with SOLV, it would be lower cost, but there would be diminished VLWP visibility).

Phil described this as a spectrum of ideas for an event, and asked which elements of these activities (and plan) will broaden our support base? For example, those people planting or cleaning up are likely those who do that regularly and already have the interest – may not reach as much of the general public/may not be as long term in impact. Who do we want to reach at next year's event?

Kevin: Involve those who will talk with others.

Vern: focus on those interested in lake activities: kayakers, fishers, etc. A boat event could also educate people. Can have a children's training/education program involved. Can involve scout groups by presenting at monthly meeting and service hours could be awarded to Scout volunteers. These groups could bring 500+ people if they also brought their parents.

Andrew recommended a cleanup event first year, then planting event, and then a large celebratory event should take place.

Potential event partners:

Parks and Public Works volunteer coordinators can likely assist us.

Eileen will check in with Gary Bock regarding Vancouver Watersheds Council as well as his experience with SOLV and SOLV itself: Partnering with SOLV may require the VLWP funds. SOLV may promote their group more than the Partnership – may not work as well when wanting to increase awareness of the Partnership. Eileen will also check with Clark Public Utilities as their success was brought up in discussion.

It was noted that there are two schools of thought: those who support improvements to the lake and those who don't see the value. These two groups need to come together. Demonstrate how changes will (or won't) affect those two schools of thought.

Thom added that the issues of dumping and ORV use at the end of Reeder Road and LeFrambois Road site need to be addressed. An event could allow people to see these: we might do something to improve this before an event takes place.

If we know what smaller restoration tasks are needed (cleanup, plantings), these tasks could be outlined for community groups/Partnership members to develop and implement. They don't need to be saved for an event. This may take less project management time in development and event management. The Partnership can facilitate some of these other partners.

Phil and Eileen requested input on the Outreach Plan be sent to Eileen by November 24.

The Outreach Plan, with revisions, will be sent to the full Partnership for their comments at least one week prior to the December 15th meeting. Thom advocated concern that the plan should go out in current form, and not waste time revising it prior to going to the Partnership. The management team indicated the need to show the Partnership a draft plan that incorporates the Steering Groups views. Outreach will be a main discussion topic at the December meeting. This should foster a lot of conversation and could set the stage for discussions on in-reach and alternatives.

Technical Foundation Update

Jeff described the upcoming timeline: the Technical Foundation is due to be updated on January 31st. The Funding Strategy is to be updated in June, and then the Management Techniques to be updated in November.

In-reach efforts

The Project Management Team's in-reach efforts were a valuable investment (three remaining Partners to talk with). We will report back to the entire Partnership on the results. Discussing the results from

these in-reach meetings will naturally lead into a conversation about management techniques, as people had ideas on techniques during the conversations. Discussing the social and financial implications of various techniques will be helpful in narrowing potential techniques as we await research results. Want to understand member's ideas on techniques before we complete the research phase so we can move forward more quickly once research is completed. We may touch on in-reach at the December meeting, but wait for full discussion until March meeting.

Partnership Communications

Phil raised the issue of communications from Partners and distributing them to the general Partnership. We received a communiqué from Thom McConathy at the end of the last Partnership meeting that he would like distributed to the entire Partnership. How are we to handle such communications?

Thom expressed concern that his communiqué was being brought to the Steering Group and wasn't forwarded to the full Partnership in a timely manner. Phil commented that the Project Management Team wasn't clear on how the Steering Group wants to handle communications to the Partnership. How would the Steering Group like the Project Management Team to proceed?

It was suggested that while the Steering Group makes decisions on the agenda, presentations, and certain correspondence that the full Partnership is to weigh in on, a decision on how to handle communications like this would be a full Partnership decision, not a Steering Group decision. It was also asked if there are issues that are inaccurate, should there be rebuttals? Concern was voiced over inaccuracies that would seem to represent fact or seem to represent the full Partnership's view when it does not. There could be a disclaimer stating: these are comments we have received. This is an individual's opinion, not the work of the group. Eileen could send out communications on a periodic basis with such a disclaimer.

The full Partnership needs to have discussion on how to handle this at the next Partnership meeting. There should be a recommendation on guidelines for communications, including whether or not the full Partnership want every piece to go out, and how to send out and how often? Should such communications be posted on the website or not?

Planning for December 15 meeting agenda

We will request Joanne LaBaw of the Environmental Protection Agency to present EPA's guidance on the results of their sediment toxin sampling.

Potential presentation on Parks' water trail planning, depending on the amount of time. (Eileen will check into with Parks.)

The project management team will lead the discussion on the Outreach Plan, mention the coming update to the Technical Foundation, and give a brief in-reach summary— to build on in March meeting.

Discussion/Recommendation on Partnership Communications

Wait until March meeting to request Ecology's Randy Coats to present on his water toxin sampling.

Thom requested a few minutes to mention that Department of Ecology is now asking for comments on their Water Quality Standards as part of their Triennial Review. Thom has petitioned them to do a nutrient load analysis for Vancouver Lake. It was decided that this could be handled in the announcement section. Thom will send information to Eileen.

Thom voiced the need for an update of the Vancouver Lake timeline, including where engineering plans, EIS, and operational plans would fit.

Public Information Staff Update:

Andrew stated that Public Information staff work has been commenting on Outreach Plan.

Technical Group Update:

Jeff gave brief Tech Group update: USGS has started their sampling.

Next Steps/Close

The meeting was adjourned.

Next Meetings:

The next meeting of the full Partnership is December 15 at 4 pm at the Port of Vancouver offices.