



June 20, 2007 Meeting Summary

The nineteenth meeting of the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership was held on Wednesday, June 20th from 4:00-6:00pm at the Port of Vancouver Administration Offices.

Attendance:

Member Present	Member Seat
Patty Boyden	Port of Vancouver
Bruce Wiseman	Port of Ridgefield
Brian Carlson	City of Vancouver Dept. of Public Works
Ron Wierenga	Clark County Dept. of Public Works
Randy Phillips	Clark County Public Health
Scott Robinson	WA Department of Natural Resources
Tim Rymer	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
Iloba Odum	WA Department of Ecology
George Medina	US Army Corps of Engineers
Nancy Ellifrit	Citizen
Gary Kokstis	Citizen
Thom McConathy	Citizen
Vern Veysey	Citizen

Public in attendance:

Dvija Michael Bertish	Citizen
Dick Chandlee	Citizen
Amanda Dotson	Citizen
Jacquelin Edwards	Citizen
Vinton Erickson	Citizen
Skip Haak	Citizen
Traci Nolan	Citizen
David Page	Citizen

Other Agency Members Present:

Jessi Belston	Port of Vancouver
Loretta Callahan	City of Vancouver Dept. of Public Works
Tonnie Cummings	WA Department of Ecology
Victor Ehrlich	City of Vancouver Dept. of Public Works
Jim Gladson	Clark County Dept. of Public Works
Annette Griffy	City of Vancouver
Shane Cothorn	WA Department of Natural Resources
Jordan Larner	Port of Ridgefield

Project Management Team:

Phil Trask	PC Trask & Associates, Inc.
Sabrina Litton	PC Trask & Associates, Inc.
Mardy Tremblay	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership

Agenda Review

Introductions

The project manager welcomed the group and attendees introduced themselves.

Agenda/Discussion Topics

The project manager introduced the agenda and asked if there were any questions or modifications. There were no changes.

Partnership Business

Meeting Summary from 4/18/07

The project manager asked if there were any additions or modifications to the summary of the April 18, 2007 meeting. The meeting summary was approved as written with no changes.

General Announcements

There were no general announcements.

Project Manager Update

The project manager said he had been meeting with the Corps, the WA Dept. of Natural Resources, Steering Group members and attended a Public Information Officers meeting. He said these had been productive meetings and very informative. The project manager indicated that he did not have any additional updates besides the workplan discussion which would take place after other updates.

USACE Update

George Medina advised that the Corps had been reviewing technical data and developing a scope of work for the feasibility study and would begin modeling in the near future. George told the group that the feasibility study might take longer than expected because of the complexity of the project. It was asked by a member when the Partnership could expect to see the scope of work and schedule. The draft timeline would be reviewed later in the agenda in the VLWP Workplan Discussion.

Tech Group Update

Ron Wierenga advised that they had not yet scheduled their next meeting and that it would likely be held off until the Corps scope of work was available. A member asked when the Technical Group would meet next. Ron replied that it would likely be scheduled before the August Partnership Meeting.

PIO Update – The Forum at the Library

Loretta Callahan noted that the PIO Group had met with the public involvement staff of WSU and USACE to coordinate outreach and public information about Vancouver Lake. She also told the group about the proposal the Steering Group received at their last meeting from Bob Moser to participate in the Forum at the Library on Thursday, September 20th at 7pm. The request was to invite three or four panel members to present information at the Forum on the work being done at Vancouver Lake. It was suggested a representative from the Corps, a representative from WSU, Thom McConathy and Phil Trask participate as panelists. The PIO will coordinate this with the Library and more information is to follow. It was asked if the forums were televised. Loretta confirmed that she believed they were.

VLWP Workplan Discussion

The project manager said that at the last Partnership meeting he had been tasked with developing initial workplan products and that he had some draft documents to share. The first document was a draft VLWP gantt chart that identified Partnership milestones and processes as

well as on-going research projects. The project manager noted that while he thinks the tasks are pertinent to the process and still rough, the schedule is definitely inaccurate as there is information we do not know. He reiterated that this was an initial product and he was looking for feedback from the Partnership. He advised that the timeline would become more complex as more information became available. In going through the timeline, he told the Partnership they had completed the first milestone which was to hire a project manager.

USACE & Partnership Agreement – The project manager stated that a Feasibility Cost Share Agreement between the USACE and the Partnership will be necessary for Corps to continue their work at Vancouver Lake after a point. He indicated on the timeline an area where he believes the Corps may expend their initial \$100,000. This is an important juncture to be aware of because if the Partnership remains interested in proceeding with the Corps they will need to enter into a cost share agreement with the Corps. This will be discussed at the August meeting when the scope of work is available and a recommendation from the Partnership is needed.

Technical Study Gap Analysis - As current research efforts get underway, the Partnership will need to know what information the studies are going to provide them and where the data gaps will be. Identifying these gaps will be important so that remaining questions can be followed up in additional studies.

Unresolved Topic Resolution – This is an inventory of topics, including technical and social issues that need resolution at some level. This task is not necessarily technical instead it involves a process to define the VLWP area of interest, what is technically feasible, socially acceptable, and economical.

Vision Refining – The project manager related how this is a continuous process that will go on in the upcoming year until it is complete. He noted that he doesn't see the Partnership answering their questions until they have a clear vision to ground their decisions against.

Develop understanding of Capitol and Moses Lake - Both of these lakes share similar traits to Vancouver Lake and are going through their own planning and restoration processes. This work item will involve becoming more familiar with activities at Capitol and Moses Lake and to determine if any of it can relate back to Vancouver Lake. One member added that it would be important to know if the work they had done so far at those lakes made a difference. The project manager said he would report back on what their efforts were and what we can learn from them.

At this point a member asked if a column/row could be added to the timeline tool to say who is going to be responsible for each work item. The project manager said this brought up a good point regarding how the work will be accomplished. He noted that it might be an idea to develop ad-hoc committees assigned to specific tasks that form and dissolve as the additional work is needed. One of the members said he sits on the Capitol Lake group and that they break in to sub-groups to divide up the work. The project manager agreed and said that ad-hoc groups keep everyone involved in what they are interested in.

2007-09 Legislative Supplemental Budget Process– The project manager suggested that the VLWP try to get an appropriation from the State and that he thought the supplemental budget process begins with the passing of this year's budget. It was confirmed by a Partnership member that the supplemental budget cycle was starting. It was suggested that if the VLWP is interested in funding, now is a good time as there have been funds given out to other planning efforts. It was stated that it is important to get local representatives involved. The project manager said he would take this up at the next the Steering Group meeting. One of the members said that it should be taken up with the full Partnership as in some ways it is easier for citizen groups to lobby for funds.

Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership Meetings – The topic of meeting frequency had been brought up at the last Partnership meeting because of its relevance to the workplan. It was

expressed that it was important to keep people interested without unnecessarily working them. Given the importance and timing of the Corp's scoping activities, it was agreed that the meeting frequency would remain as before through the August Partnership meeting. In October when the workplan is better developed the issue would be addressed.

The project manager stated that the remaining elements of the timeline reflected his current understanding of the research work going on around Vancouver Lake. He added that as he continues to meet with the various groups the timeline will be filled in with more detail. Over the next six months text will be added and schedules will be revised to complete the work plan.

One of the members asked to talk more about the unresolved topics. The project manager said there are two documents to look at to help explain this. At this point he introduced another draft document, a spreadsheet titled "VLWP Questions Trends and the Current Studies that Might Help Address Them" that was sent out with the agenda. He described how this document is a tool to help evaluate which of the on-going studies will best address current questions held by the Partnership. It is a way to relate the studies to the questions and identify gaps. He added that these probably aren't all the questions and these probably aren't all the studies. This is just a tool developed to organize and associate the questions and studies. In the future as the Partnership refines their vision, they will need to figure out which questions are most important to them and how answers might shape the vision.

One member expressed that he liked the matrix and that it did a good job of summarizing the questions. He said the number one question he hears from non-technical people is "Is the lake safe to swim in?" He said the number two question is "Is the flushing channel working better than before?" followed by "What's the future?" Another member expressed that this was an incomplete list as the Partnership had come up with 95 questions and he did not think this was a good summarization of original questions. He indicated the original questions were still on the website. Ron Wierenga said this was a consolidation of questions that have come up in past meetings and if there is a specific question that was lost that is important, bring it up with him and he will explain the reasoning behind its inclusion or exclusion from the technical group question trend summary.

Unresolved Topics – The project manager then referred to the third draft document, "VLWP Tracking of Unresolved Topics", and stated that this was a list of the things he was aware of that were unresolved. It is not a complete list and it is not his intent to drop anything off the list. He would like to keep adding to the list to capture any unresolved issues the Partnership might have so that none are lost and can be addressed further down the line. One member said these are things we would like to know, but are they important? And if we know them what difference do they make? Another member said this helps focus the questions and determine if they are a critical need-to-know. The project manager said that we start with the core questions and we see how the list evolves. It was suggested that reasoning behind the questions may not only be technical and that the group will need to acknowledge other issues as well. A member added again that the technical list was not complete.

The project manager said the products would be discussed again at subsequent meetings, however, maybe not at the next meeting as it will be single agenda item meeting. It was suggested that they be reviewed at the October meeting once the Partnership has had a chance to get the Corps scope of work and Technical Group meetings have been held.

Burnt Bridge Creek

Annette Griffy from the City of Vancouver provided an informative presentation on the water quality monitoring program at Burnt Bridge Creek.

The presentation began with a brief history of Burnt Bridge Creek and its distinguishing characteristics. It is a highly modified urban stream that covers roughly 27 square miles. In recent years there has been significant growth of watershed programs and monitoring efforts.

Water quality at Burnt Bridge Creek has been monitored extensively, but not consistently throughout the past several decades. Historical monitoring data for Burnt Bridge Creek shows impairments typical of urban streams and it is on the Federal 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies for temperature, dissolved oxygen and fecal coliform.

For the presentation three sites were chosen for a quick data comparison because of their location in the watershed and access to comparable historic data. Temperature, dissolved oxygen and fecal coliform bacteria were discussed because of their importance to aquatic life and recreation. The City of Vancouver has multiple water quality objectives to ultimately bring Burnt Bridge Creek into compliance with state water quality standards.

The presentation will be available on the Vancouver Lake Partnership website. Following the presentation, a good discussion resulted about how Burnt Bridge creek contributes to the condition of the water quality of Vancouver Lake.

Public Comment

Some questions included: What is the affect of Salmon Creek compared to Burnt Bridge Creek? Is there any way to clean the water up before it gets into the lake from Burnt Bridge Creek? Is it true that at times there is no water coming through the flushing channel? One person thought that from a previous presentation from the department of Ecology, it showed the toxics in the sediment in Burnt Bridge much higher than any other tributaries. It was also wondered what other contaminant levels, such as phosphorus, in Burnt Bridge Creek might be and what their effect is on contaminant loading at Vancouver Lake.

One member of the public commented that this weekend there was a Regional Masters Rowing Regatta at the lake. He added that the lake has a big potential for recreation and it was good to hear there is a social side to this effort.

Next Steps/Close

The project manager closed the meeting and thanked everyone for coming.

Next Meeting: August 15, 2007