

Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership

Steering Group Meeting Summary

Meeting date: November 14, 2007, 3:30 pm

Steering Group Members Present:

Patty Boyden	Port of Vancouver
Brian Carlson	City of Vancouver Dept. of Public Works
Ron Wierenga	Clark County Dept. of Public Works (alternate for Pete Capell)

Partnership Members Present:

Thom McConathy	Citizen
Vern Veysey	Citizen
George Medina	US Army Corps of Engineers
Iloba Odum	Department of Ecology

Public in attendance:

Jacquelin Edwards	Citizen
David Page	Citizen

Other Agency Members Present:

Jessi Belston	Port of Vancouver
---------------	-------------------

Project Management Team:

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

Agenda/Discussion Topics

The project manager introduced the agenda and asked if there were any modifications. The Corps presentation was moved up on the agenda to ensure sufficient time for the update.

USACE Update

George Medina from the Corps presented findings on behalf of his team and said that an earlier presentation had been made to the Technical Group on November 7th. He described the Biological Synthesis that Dennis Schwartz had written and how it summarized available fish data for Vancouver Lake. He noted that there was little fish data available for Vancouver Lake, and even less for salmonids specifically. Some important research pieces available were the pre- and post-construction fish surveys associated with flushing channel construction. The Corps concluded that there are large data gaps and existing literature sources are insufficient to adequately address salmon utilization questions at this time.

Hydraulic findings to-date included results from the Corps 1-D hydraulic model HEC-RAS. Initial runs of the model studied the flushing channel and Lake River by populating the model with 2006 and 2007 flow and stage data. Modeling scenarios investigated included leaving the system as-is, increasing the diameter of the flushing channel culverts from 7 to 11 feet, modifying Lake River to a uniform 150 foot wide channel, and the combination of the latter two. These were coarse scenarios suitable for answering larger scale questions about the hydraulic system and highlight the benefits of further hydraulic investigation. The Corps did not look specifically at dynamics within the lake because bathymetry data is not available.

Brian noted that Vancouver Lake is very shallow. Given this trait, does the Corps think they would see drastic differences with a 2-D model compared to a 1-D model? George said it would be similar, but a 2-D model would provide more detailed information about circulation in the lake. He added that increasing

water turnover in the lake (flushing) would have an impact on the temperature, turbidity and nutrient cycling.

It was asked if flushing is improved, will it impact mainstem Columbia River water quality? Ron replied improved flushing of the lake could have some impact on Lake River or on the Columbia River, but overall it would likely have minor effects in the larger system. More information will be needed to gauge the magnitude of contaminants and in the lake system.

It was noted that from the presentations so far, the 1-D model didn't show that modifying Lake River would play a major role in flow dynamics. George reaffirmed this initial conclusion and added that increasing flushing channel culvert size would have a larger effect. Patty asked what increasing flushing channel culvert size and reducing water residence time by half meant. George replied that the quicker you can turnover the water, the more you minimize the water heating up (increase temperatures) which is better for fish.

George described that the Partnership and Corps have different but overlapping objectives for Vancouver Lake and he is focusing on this intersection. Information gained from continuing the Feasibility Study by initiating bathymetry and photogrammetry studies, and running the 2-D model will generate information the Partnership can use in the future if the Corps cannot proceed to a project.

It was asked if this was a go- or no-go point with the Corps. George said this was a "small" go taking the group towards a larger go- or no-go decision early next spring. He said these preliminary findings are encouraging and justify further investigation in the form of a bathymetry study and 2-D modeling.

Ron asked George what he thought the Partnership's role would be in scoping the bathymetry study. Will the Tech Group be able to review the scope and provide feedback to the Corps? George said the Corps always welcomes the Partnership's input and will share the scope with them.

George added that Sharon would have a Hydraulics Synthesis Report, similar to the Biological Synthesis, distributed to the Partnership by the December meeting. Phil noted that in his experience presenting the information first at the Partnership meeting prior to website posting might be a good idea to reduce misinterpretation of the information. The Steering Group agreed that materials should be sent out to the Partnership before the meeting for review along with the agenda and then posted on the website after the meeting.

Partnership Business

Project Manager Update

Work Program

The project manager handed out a new draft of the Vancouver Lake Work Program that now spans two years. Included with the work program is a timeline and flow chart which shows how work program components fit together over time. The project manager said that the Steering Group has been seeing this information for the past four months and that it has been refined into this near final document. He said that he would be presenting the work program at the December Partnership meeting for their recommendation of acceptance.

Statement of Work

The project manager said that he has been working with Ron and with Deb Marriott to develop a two-year scope of work (SOW) that would begin January 1, 2008 as the current scope ends in December. In developing the SOW, Phil said that he went back and forth with Task 6, Developing an Interim Vancouver Lake Watershed Plan. He noted that work on the Watershed Plan is set to begin 2009, but the plan scope and scale still needs to be defined. It might make sense to pull Task 6 out of the SOW and budget for now and revisit it next year. Patty said she thought that made sense, however, she thought it would be good to keep the line item in the scope and develop the budget for the task later when its extent is better known. Brian and Ron agreed. Ron said it was important to document decisions made and perhaps this Task

could be scaled back for now but still remain in the SOW. He also added that he asked Phil to develop this SOW for the Steering Group to review as he is hoping to have something to the County Board Commissioners by the middle of December.

Site Visits

Phil said that Ron had taken him and Sabrina out on Vancouver Lake recently. They had the opportunity to circle the Lake and go up Lake River to the confluence of Salmon Creek. The site visit was very useful and we both learned about the Clark County Volunteer Monitoring Program.

In addition, the project management team toured Capitol Lake in Olympia and met with the project manager of their restoration planning program. Phil noted that Capitol Lake is 4 to 5 years ahead of the Partnership in terms of technical studies and they are currently evaluating management alternatives. However, they have not involved the public to the degree the Partnership has and that may slow them down later in the project. The project manager noted that the Partnership has done a good job making sure all stakeholders are involved.

Citizen Member Solicitation Process

The project manager noted that the vacant Partnership seat solicitation process would be on the December Partnership meeting agenda. With some minor changes, the same process as last time could be used. Phil confirmed that the Partnership had one open seat to fill and that several citizens have already expressed interest in filling the seat.

Legislative Budget

The project manager stated that he met with two of the three Steering Group agency lobbyists. They had suggested drafting a one page summary describing the request. The project manager said that in order to work with the lobbyists effectively, he would like to make sure local legislative bodies are aware of the fund raising effort. Brian said he did not think there was an issue with this from the city. Patty stated that once it's known what the money is for, and for how much, she did not think it would be a problem. Loretta added that the request will have a bigger impact if we can show that it is supported by the diverse interests of the Partnership.

Tech Group Update

Ron Wierenga reported on behalf of the Technical Group. He said they held a meeting November 7th and received a briefing from the Corps on their biological and hydraulic findings to-date. George had outlined the findings earlier in the meeting.

Ron added that Clark County submitted two grant applications on behalf of the Partnership in October. One was for the Ecology's Centennial Clean Water Grant Program for \$270,000 and the other was the Freshwater Algae Grant Program for \$50,000. Iloba said he could advocate for these grants in Olympia and asked that they be forwarded to him. Thom said that at the Tech Group meeting it was mentioned that Ecology was scoping a new Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and monitoring effort for the area.

Public Information Update

Loretta Callahan spoke on behalf of the PIO group and outlined ways to increase citizen involvement, including some ideas for getting citizen volunteers involved quickly. Some projects might include: plantings, weed/invasive species removal projects, a plant or tree survey, and, for the first of the projects, a cleanup along the roads around and into the Park. She said the need for trash removal/cleanup had come up in past meetings as request from citizens and would be something we could do fairly quickly and get people involved. She noted it would be difficult to get a project started in December with the holidays and colder temperatures and that spring would be a better time to begin. She said the PIO group had suggested early April, late March, around Earth month, but perhaps it could be sooner. Thom asked if an ad hoc committee could be formed and include others to help plan the event. Loretta said yes, that it had been discussed, and an ad hoc team was proposed, with representatives such as solid waste staff and others (citizens). Thom asked when the group might meet. Loretta said possibly in December.

Agenda for December Partnership Meeting

The project manager reviewed the agenda items for the December Partnership meeting. Items include a presentation from the Corps on the study results, the vacant Partnership seat solicitation process, and the presentation and recommendation on the Work Program. Brian added that it would be good to provide an update on the questions list and brief discussion on the PCB situation by Ecology.

December 12, 2007 Full Partnership Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome/Agenda Review
2. Partnership Business
 - Vacant Partnership Seat Solicitation Process
 - Work Program
 - Question Bin
 - Alcoa Cleanup
 - Tech Group Update
 - Public Information Group Update
3. Report on Corps Findings
 - Q & A
4. Public Comment
5. Next Steps/Meetings

Next Steps/Close

Phil thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting

Next Meetings:

Full Partnership Meeting – December 12, 2007, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Steering Group Meeting – January 16, 2008, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.

All meetings will be held at the Port of Vancouver Administrative Offices.