

# Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership

## **Steering Group Meeting Summary**

Meeting date: November 24, 2009

### **Steering Group Members Present:**

Brian Carlson                      City of Vancouver Dept. of Public Works  
Peter Capell                        Clark County Dept. of Public Works  
Andrew Ness                        Port of Vancouver (alternate for Patty Boyden)

### **Public in Attendance:**

Harvey Claussen                  Vancouver Lake Sailing Club

### **Other Agency Members Present:**

Ron Wierenga                      Clark County Dept. of Public Works

### **Project Management Team:**

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

## **Project Manager Update**

### Centennial Grant

Phil gave an overview of the Centennial Grant application to be submitted to Ecology by December 1<sup>st</sup>. The Steering Group approved the application for signature. Pete Capell signed three copies for submission on behalf of the applicant (Clark County). Pete asked about State funding and how unknown it is, and also when we might hear about the grant. Ron explained that we'd have the project rankings early in 2010 with final results after the legislature adjourns.

### Management Techniques

Phil gave a summary on the management options: the document is maturing, there are still gaps. This document could be an appendix to the Technical Foundation. There will be an introduction detailing assumptions and known gaps in the document at the time. We don't know enough yet to know which options are best suited for Vancouver Lake. We are laying out what the options are at an abstract level but not recommending a specific course of action at this point. We will deliver the final draft to the Partnership a week before the meeting on 16<sup>th</sup>. Any input regarding whether we ought to consider this an interim document? There is some risk of some techniques, which may or may not be beneficial or feasible, causing controversy due to their inclusion.

Pete: the document informs the Partnership about the reality out there, as long as we qualify that there is a need to better understand the options before choosing a course of action, this can be final.

Brian: Need to put in a purpose statement – that it's purposefully not passing judgment, and that we mean to keep everything on the table right now. Need to explain to the readers what this document is, and what it is not.

Phil: We will put a new title page together, add to the introduction that options are not being judged at this point, and have that part to the Steering Group for review next week.

## Five Year Research Plan

Phil gave an overview of the Research Plan and Gantt chart. The Technical Group reviewed this document twice, but there is still more work to do. Rob Zisette of Herrera provided technical assistance for this document. The point of the Gantt chart is to expand the sense of schedule. There is a five year slice, within the context of ongoing work and future work. Five years is a narrow window. This could also be an appendix to the Technical Foundation.

The group discussed the importance of the plan showing what research is needed to understand Vancouver Lake. It helps organize studies and is good for the "shovel ready" concept of external project funding. PIO perspective: does this mean at the end of 5 years we dig dirt for restoration? There should be a disclaimer on the timeline that the purpose is to lay out an ideal course of action/order, but without identified funding the exact date of any work is unknown. It is nice to have the tasks identified as must do/useful to do. For example, toxics do not play a role in cyanobacteria issues but can be important to know in general as well as if considering dredging. The first page puts the plan in a good context by identifying this as a planning tool.

Phil: Each task will have costs added, based on certain assumptions; a range of costs may be more appropriate.

Ron: Are there issues with credibility once you lay out timing and cost?

Pete: There usually are, but this is not an exact plan, it is a framework. Funding will be adjusted to take advantage of opportunities. It is comparable to the County's six year improvement plan, with adjustments made as needed.

Group discussion on finalizing the Research Plan: There will be a range of costs for the plan, along with the timeline. The Research Plan will go to the Partnership a week before the Dec. 16 meeting. Both this and the management options report will be sent to the PIO group again prior to the Partnership meeting.

## **PIO Group Update**

Andrew briefed the group on the request from Gary Bock of Vancouver Watersheds soliciting Partnership funding of tree planting in 2010. This could be like the SOLV event of 2008 in which the Partnership was involved. The request is for \$20-30,000 for the plants; Gary would coordinate all the volunteer work. Pete and Brian discussed that while planting trees is good, Partnership money can't pay for tree planting unless it has a clearly identified water quality benefit for Vancouver Lake. The Partnership could however provide volunteers. It would be good a good outreach opportunity.

Andrew presented a PIO budget for next year, with a total of \$4,650. Costs included \$1,650 for development and construction of a sign at Vancouver Lake Park. Installation costs are not included as there is a potential that it could be installed by a local volunteer group such as boy scouts. Updating the Partnership website through a contractor would cost \$2,000. Printing for informational cards and for an annual or semi-annual report is estimated at \$1,000.

Pete and Brian recommended that the PIO Group go ahead with the proposal.

## **Technical Group**

Ron provided information to Representative Baird for potential US Army Corps of Engineers research on fish use of Vancouver Lake to be considered under the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). Research would cost an estimated \$100,000.

## **Next Steps/Close**

The Steering Group discussed cancelling the formal Steering Group meeting for December. A meeting will be schedule to discuss the upcoming project manager contract/RFP.

Everyone was thanked for their participation and the meeting was adjourned.