

## September 21, 2005 Meeting Summary

Draft 10/12/05

The ninth meeting of the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership was held on Wednesday, September 21, 2005 4:00-6:30pm at the Port of Vancouver administration Offices.

### **Attending**

#### **Partnership members in attendance:**

Ron Wierenga for Pete Capell, Brian Carlson, Carl Dugger, Nancy Ellifrit, Curt Loop for Martin Hudson, Don Jacobs, David Judd, Gary Kokstis, Clark Martin, Thom McConathy, Iloba Odum, Maureen Chan-Hefflein for Larry Paulson, Randy Phillips, Steve Prather for Doug Quinn, Scott Robinson, Jane Van Dyke, Victor Ehrlich

#### **Partnership members absent:**

Debra Marriott, Lee McCallister, James Meyer, Vernon Veysey, Bruce Wiseman

#### **Public Information Committee:**

Loretta Callahan, Jeanne Lawson, Amanda Garcia-Snell

#### **In the audience:**

Dvija Michael Bertish, Dick Carroll, Justin Clary, Eldon Edwards, Jacquelin Edwards, Vinton Erickson, Lisa Faubion, Annette Griffy, Lehman Holder, Jeroen Kok, Bob Moser, Lenora Oftedahl

#### **Committee Business**

Jeanne mentioned that it may be time for a hiatus

#### *07/20/05 Meeting Minutes*

Changes to the minutes are:

Page 6, bottom of 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph should be changed from “and that is no longer the case” to “and that the problems now are different”

Page 5, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph “ostricycle” should be changed to “phosphorous cycle”

Page 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph should be changed from “we have tapped” to “we haven’t tapped”

#### *Follow up from the July meeting –*

Curt mentioned that the Corp has asked their hydrologist, Brad Byrd, about the influence of the flows of the Willamette River into Vancouver Lake. The response was that during periods of winter flooding, the Willamette will have a small influence on the lake. At this time of year, the Willamette, the Columbia and the tidal influences all affect the flows out of Vancouver Lake. During the rest year the influences are very minor. The predominance will be the Columbia and they

control the flows out of the Willamette. Curt also clarified that this response is Brad's technical judgment based on his experience over the last twenty years. He did not conduct any research or consult past files to determine this opinion.

Thom asked for clarification about "tail water". Curt responded that the tail waters are the flows that they release from the dam. They have a rule curve that allows them to keep the level of the dam at a certain level. They will release flows based on the rule curve and their requirements for instream flows for fish. He interprets that [tail water] as the flow down the Willamette that is released from the dam. Included in this water are contributions from other tributaries as well.

#### *Walking Tour – Thom*

Thom mentioned that the walking tour was good and the group was able to get a view from a higher elevation. This view was of the entire lake area. He mentioned that Vern shared his frustrations with the VLWP process suggesting that the group needs to be moving forward with a technical study. Thom also mentioned that much of the walking tour group shared Vern's feelings about the VLWP process.

#### *Member's Info Needs – Jeanne*

Jeanne clarified that the list of members' information needs, which is based on the questions from the question bin, will be used as a tool to determine what the next steps are regarding technical study.

#### *Public Comment*

Vinton Erickson mentioned that he also went on the tour and mentioned that it was a good but small group.

### **Discussions**

Jeanne began by discussing the process map. She recapped how the partnership has worked toward a common understanding of what some of the drivers are to the problem. She reminded the VLWP of the values discussion, and explained that the values have been refined based on the partnership's comments. She mentioned that the partnership is prepared to develop an unrestrained vision, which is a slightly different step than when the VLWP began. She then explained that the partnership agrees that there is much more work to be done before the VLWP can develop a refined vision. Based on this there is an expectation that a scope of work will be developed, gather more technical data, procure funding, conduct studies and analysis, and then refine the vision. As the process progresses there will be further characterization of what the problem is. This will eventually lead to an adopted refined vision and an implementation plan.

Brian wanted to mention that the problem statement should really be stated as opportunities, constraints and identification of initial data gaps. This more accurately describe the process that the VLWP has gone through. He also asked

for clarification about the two different steps for funding identified in the process map. Jeanne clarified that the first step for funding is in regards to determining an inter-governmental agreement and a more formalized structure for the process. David also mentioned that this could pertain to reconnaissance funding from the Army Corp of Engineers through Congressman Baird.

*Refined Values – Jeanne – handout attached*

Jeanne began by mentioning that the vision does not stand alone. It builds on the values which add specificity and context for what is being said in the vision. She also mentioned that there is nothing in there regarding meeting regulations as it seemed redundant. There was also nothing in the values concerning hunting, which can be added back in. She then asked the VLWP to look through the refined values and make any final edits.

Nancy asked about economic development, she wondered why it was in the list of refined values as she did not feel it was anything that had been discussed previously. Jeanne clarified that it has always been in the values in one form or another. Brian also mentioned that he was unclear about the phrasing of balancing the needs of economic development. Don also asked about if this was specific to Port activities in the watershed area or is it limited to economic development on the lake. Jeanne suggested that maybe something be added concerning neighboring development. Clark asked if there is a stakeholder that has plans for economic development that the group is unaware of. Jeanne clarified that the Port does have a bit of a stake on the economic development but they have been very clear about that. David asked for clarification that the phrase economic development is in reference to the Gateway project and not the lake itself. Maureen asked if what is being defined is if the values pertain directly to the lake and the bodies of water or if they pertain to the entire lowlands and watershed. Jeanne suggested that this particular value statement be saved for later as it requires more work to define appropriately.

Don then asked if the VLWP should limit their view to the immediate areas around the lake as opposed to the watershed for Salmon Creek, Whipple Creek, Burnt Bridge Creek and other tributaries. Jeanne mentioned that discussions concerning environmental health may be in reference to the entire watershed where as discussions concerning economic development may be in reference to the immediate lake area. Thom clarified that this is a bigger equation than looking at recreational opportunities for Vancouver Lake; it could be looked at as a watershed approach. Jeanne clarified that it is the activities that relate to environmental health that are discussed when looking at the broader area. When discussing recreation they are referring to the more immediate areas. Thom disagreed that the VLWP is looking at recreation and environmental health when referring to the broader area as well. He gave the example of fishability which is recreation but it is also dependent on environmental health. Nancy mentioned that the development should not be limited to economic development as there is

residential development also. Jeanne suggested that this discussion be noted for further exploration.

Jeanne readdressed Don's question about what specific area the VLWP should be referring to. Suggesting that the VLWP needs to make sure that there is a common understanding of the area that they are discussing.

Maureen also mentioned that although the Port of Ridgefield was not present at the meeting, they are very much impacted by the flow of Lake River.

Brian also wanted to add a statement that referred to meeting water quality standards as opposed to a measurable improvement that still does not meet water quality standards. He suggested that the wording could be similar to "water quality that meets standards that then supports a healthy population of fish and wildlife". Clark also mentioned that this could be tied into the recreational component like swimming, boating etc.

Thom suggested that the VLWP adopt the standard of fishability and swimability. Within the EPA this is a defined standard.

Jeanne clarified that the values need to be something that the VLWP is comfortable with. She then asked Brian to draft a water quality statement.

Thom mentioned that that phrase "sound science" should be changed to "best available science"

Thom also asked that the term sustainable be added to the values list. Jeanne clarified that the first value statement is in reference to sustainability.

Don asked if the Columbia River meets standards for swimability. Thom answered that in many places it does not. He also clarified that this is a difficult standard to achieve based on the "grab sample" collection method.

Carl mentioned that LCREP may have more information concerning the swimability of the Columbia River. Although it may not be complete information, they did conduct some studies using lipid bags to detect fat soluble and this, they spent a fair amount of money looking at this,

Jeanne mentioned that while this is useful information for developing the implementation plan or the refined vision, it may not be applicable for the values discussion. She then mentioned that Don had expressed concern that the lake will not ever be swimmable, in which case if the vision is for swimability then the goal is not achievable. Jeanne clarified that this is why the VLWP is working toward an unrefined vision at this point. She also mentioned that although the VLWP may not be able to achieve all of the values but the choices should be

based on the information contained in the value statements. Carl mentioned that he is not convinced that swimability is an impossible goal.

Thom offered, as a fall back position, that swimmable within the area of defined recreation be added. He suggested that installation of groundwater infusion, or the channeling of the flushing channel itself directly to the swimming beach could be ways to better meet these needs if they are actively managed. Jeanne suggested that in order to include these possibilities without directly stating swimability the wording can be phrased as “to provide opportunities for swimability and fishability”. Thom suggested that the VLWP first try to meet the standards with the values that have been outlined before the VLWP engages in diminishing the value statements.

Nancy mentioned that water quality information is also available from the bi-state commission that conducted water quality studies. Jeanne reiterated that the VLWP is now at the point to determine the values based on the information that has been presented thus far.

Ron mentioned that fishable and swimmable is a “waterized” way of saying meeting standards. The term swimmable is equated to “meets bacteria standards”. Jeanne asked the VLWP if the term swimmable is sufficient in terms of addressing the needs for water quality in the value statements. Carl also mentioned that fishable and swimmable is easier to sell and the group will need to sell this to the public. Jeanne reiterated that the term swimmable will be used in place of having a separate value directly related to water quality standards. She then suggested that this be added to the list of values that the group will come back to.

Nancy commented that in order to have “measurably improved fish and wildlife” we needed more information about current conditions. Brian mentioned that he wrote a value statement concerning water quality that also addresses Nancy’s question. His statement read “the refined vision should provide for the Lake to meet water quality standards and habitat that supports diverse populations of native fish, wildlife and plant communities”. Jeanne suggested that this could replace the statement using “measurably improved fish and wildlife” phrase. Thom expressed concerns that diverse populations of fish are not necessarily desirable. He suggested that the phrase “native fish” be used. Brian clarified that this phrase was already included. It was agreed that Brian’s version of the value statement will replace the value statement referring to “measurably improved fish and wildlife habitat”.

Doug asked Brian what water quality standards he was thinking of when he wrote the value statement. Brian answered that he was thinking of the Washington state standards.

Jeanne recapped the changes which are:

- Change the third values statement to read "...including boating, swimming ..." instead of "...such as boating, swimming..."
- Replace the fourth value statement with Brian's version
- Change the sixth value statement to read "Be based on best available science..." not "Be based on sound science..."
- Add the word "hunting" to the list of recreational activities listed in the third value statement

The group also agreed to come back to the value statement discussion concerning economic development at a later time.

*Exploration of Visions – VLWP, handout attached*

Jeanne gave the partnership a moment to read the vision statements before discussing them. She also explained that the separate vision statement (on colored paper) was an attempt to capture the common themes that were mentioned in the individual vision statements. It is to be used as a discussion draft if appropriate.

Jeanne asked for any observations that members would like to share in regards to reviewing the various vision statements.

Thom would like to include something about Vancouver Lake as the receiving waters of a number of larger watersheds.

Thom also requested that the word "native" be added to the "diverse plant and animal" phrase. He would like the phrase to read "...diverse native plant and animal...".

Jeanne then asked the VLWP if the vision statement on colored paper was suitable to use as a discussion draft. She made a list of members' suggestions of elements that need to be added.

Clark mentioned that the word balanced was used twice in the discussion draft. It is not anything that can be measured nor is it accurate because nature is constantly changing. He would like to see something that says "the needs of the lake remain a stakeholder in the active and economic vibrant neighboring development" meaning to say that the lake's character and needs always come into consideration.

Carl mentioned his concerns about the lake being a stakeholder. Clark clarified that the needs of the lake are a stakeholder. Jeanne suggested that it say "that the needs of the lake are supported...". Brian mentioned that the lake needs to be preserved. It is an important piece of the overall preservation and restoration of those pieces of the lowlands. Jeanne suggested the wording be "the needs of the lake are addressed in concert with..." Thom felt that this wording is still not strong enough.

Jeanne reminded the VLWP that throughout the discussions there has been reference to the fact that this area is an important economic center in terms of the industry of the Ports of Vancouver and Ridgefield. These ports are very vital to the economy of the region and that does not diminish the importance of restoring the lake and its health but they have to co-exist. Thom clarified that just because they have to co-exist does not mean that they do not co-exist without confrontation. He also mentioned that in light of the plans that the Port has presented to date, regarding rail lines and developing roads in roadless areas, there is confrontation. Maureen mentioned that the Port believes that Vancouver Lake is a natural resource that ought to be preserved. She also mentioned that the Port has listened to some of the concerns regarding the Lake and they have rolled out a new South alignment option for the rail line. They may also find, as they conduct more research, that other options are available which have even fewer impacts to the Lake. Jeanne suggested that members not focus on what the conflicts are right now but rather the visioning process. She reminded the VLWP that this region values the Port as an economic driver. Although the VLWP was formed because of the natural and recreational resource and what needs to be done to preserve it, it still values the Port as an economic driver. The vision should include something that acknowledges respect for that element. Brian mentioned that the idea of the resource co-existing with active economic development but suggested that the term in balance suggests that the vision could be changed at some point in the future.

Clark mentioned that the lake as a sensitive measure has to be respected and preserved. The VLWP is really making a value statement and they should want to assert themselves about the preservation of the condition of the lake for future generations in some kind of natural state. The forces that want to negotiate with the VLWP about that may be incredibly strong and to co-exist with them does not really seem possible. He would rather be an active stakeholder for the maintenance of its natural habitats. His vision is for the lake to remain a significant player in the development of the county.

Gary mentioned that the lake is a measure of the quality of life in the area. If they allow the Lake to deteriorate or not be healthy it speaks directly to their quality of life deteriorating and not being healthy. There is a direct connection to that and the values that they hold and share concerning quality of life.

Jeanne asked the group whether or not economic value of surrounding development should be recognized. The group then discussed the use of the word balance in relation to economic development. Thom mentioned that the idea of balance suggests that the Lake could be compromised for economic sustainability and he does not think that this is an alternative that the VLWP should accept. Victor mentioned that the basic rules for current economic development do not allow for a balance of the environmental status quo. They require an improvement and no impact on the environment. So we are starting on a trend to take the urban and industrial areas as they are and improve them. He

does not think it is too radical of a statement to say that active enhancement of the watershed be required. He suggested the sentence read as, "this resource coexists with economically vibrant neighboring development which will actively enhance environmental protections". Brian mentioned that this is an improvement but it needs the Port's input. That is part of the Port's plan as well, there some areas that they are going to develop but other areas they are going to improve. Victor also mentioned that the Port has just taken 500 of their 1000 acre development and dedicated it for enhanced mitigation of their industrial development. They are actively enhancing the environmental protections.

Maureen asked mentioned that she would like to take this statement back to the environmental group to see if the word enhanced means what the Port is currently doing or if it means that the Port will do more. Jeanne suggested that this statement be added with the understanding that the Port needs to look at it. Thom mentioned that it is too much to arrive at a final vision statement by the end of this meeting. The VLWP is making the process drive them too much. He thinks that they need to invest more time in this process. He would like to have a draft in his hand to take away and think about it. Jane agreed with this suggestion.

Jeanne clarified that as there is a proposal that the VLWP not meet for a while and she feels it is important for the group to have achieved a milestone before they take a break. Perhaps the milestone will be a draft visions statement that will be finalized and adopted when the VLWP reconvenes. Brian and Thom suggested that the part of the group could continue to meet. Jeanne also mentioned that she feels that the VLWP should be able to leave tonight with a vision that is really close to complete.

Brian mentioned phrases that he had questions about. Is the phrase "people-powered" meant to exclude jet-skis, motorized boats, atvs etc? He also asked about the definition of the "lake and its surrounding watersheds". He would like to see the definition of the lake area to include a smaller area than "surrounding watersheds". He also asked clarification about "naturally balanced system".

Jeanne asked about the phrasing of "people-powered". The group discussed what people powered includes or excludes. Jeanne asked if "people-powered" could be replaced with "compatible". This will still have the implication that they are looking for things that do not degrade the resource.

Randy suggested that the phrase "it draws" should be changed as well as "naturally balanced". He would like to see something that indicates that the Lake is a magnet to the community. He would also like to have something that promotes that it is a priority to the community to protect and preserve the lake.

Clark suggested removing the phrase "naturally balanced", the VLWP agreed.

Thom wanted to add “swimmability and fishability” to the end of the sentence about supporting diverse plant and animal communities. Clark suggested bullets be added to indicate what is meant by some of the more vague terms. Jeanne reminded the group that the vision statement doesn’t stand alone; it is accompanied with the value list which is attempted to be encompassing enough and not exclusive. David mentioned that the phrase compatible recreational activities is meant to be inclusive of all recreation. Jeanne mentioned that swimmable and fishable is meant to address water quality and possibly the phrase should read “safe for human contact”. Thom clarified that swimmable and fishable goes beyond safe for human contact. Clark mentioned that every statement needs more definition. He re-asked where in the process does the VLWP get specific about what exactly the vision language means? Jeanne clarified that the values give a better understanding of the intent of the vision statement. Clark mentioned that we are not just trying to be environmentally conscious but they are really trying to ensure that the specific intents are accomplished. Jeanne suggested that the VLWP add language of introduction which ties the values to the vision in some way.

She recapped the changes to the draft visions statement:

- “naturally balance” will be removed
- “people powered” will be changed to compatible
- “native” will be added to plants and animals
- “it draws” will be removed

She then asked the VLWP about what is meant by the term “watersheds”. Brian would like to keep the vision more focused on Vancouver Lake as opposed to the larger watershed area.

Gary asked how it is possible to maintain the rivers and improve the lake if we don’t address what’s coming into it from the watershed. Jeanne clarified that if referring to improving the water quality of the lake and the surrounding area that takes measures anywhere that can improve the water quality. However, that does not mean that the vision has to address those areas. The vision is for the lake but the measures to improve the lake go well outside the area. It does not mean that the vision is for all of the tributaries. If this is what the VLWP is saying then the language needs to be clear about these specifics.

Clark suggested that it be added to the economic development piece to state that the lake wants to have input in to how the economic development occurs and also the watershed. Include it as a specific concern about the watershed.

Thom mentioned that this is such an important issue that the EPA would not obligate to anything until there were inter-local agreements that assured that water going into the lake would be assured of a high enough standard that would sustain this very large commitment of federal funds. Without a commitment from the watersheds of which contribute, anything we advocate for is empty. There

must be a watershed based plan one of which is actively and institutionally advocating for. Thom feels that it is kind of empty to not include any watershed council since there are not any pre-existing watershed councils in Clark County. He feels that this is the time to initiate them. There is a need of watershed councils to address Salmon Creek and Burnt Bridge creek. The VLWP should try, as long as possible, to work toward a vision were they will be collaboratively working on this. If the VLWP will be in a as situation where they simply advocate to the City of Vancouver or Clark County there are going to be problems there because it has not worked in the past. He feels that the VLWP needs more of a commitment than they have now. He would like to see an institutional commitment. The VLWP has a collaborative approach for the future that is supposed to be a part of this. He thinks that if they do not make that collaborative approach a watershed plan then they will walk away from this and in ten years they will be readdressing the same problem. It will be similar to Salmon Creek where every ten years there is a new volume on how to solve the problems of Salmon Creek. Jeanne interjected that she thinks that the VLWP is in agreement with this idea. She mentioned that one of the changes that were agreed upon, which she forgot to add to the values list, was the wording that Brian developed stating "a watershed council like structure is established to provide ongoing oversight and accountability". Brian suggested removing the "like structure" to just read "a watershed council...". Jeanne also mentioned that she is not hearing a conflict. She thinks that Thom is saying that water quality needs to be addressed upstream because it is all part of the whole and that cannot be ignored; which is consistent with what the VLWP is saying. She also suggests that the purpose, in the case of the VLWP, is to address upstream water quality and the impact from economic development and recreation throughout the county that affects it. This group is not convened to look at what is in other parts of the county; they are convened to look at Vancouver Lake. However, they are looking at water quality in other parts of the county because they are looking at Vancouver Lake.

Ron mentioned that what the vision statement does say as opposed to what it doesn't say. It is not an action plan, watershed plan, commitment to form a watershed council and it doesn't need to say what exactly what they are going to do or are taking into account and what they are not. The first statement which says that "Vancouver Lake is a community treasure that provides a special connection between nature and the surrounding urban areas" says a lot because currently Vancouver Lake is not these things. Although there are people who utilize it and hold it as a core value, it is not a community treasure. In order to make a community treasure and establish that connection in a heavily urbanized area with something like Vancouver Lake we will need to go a long ways from where they are now. Providing recreational activities and all the things that are stated in here are pretty powerful statements and they don't necessarily say that we are going to do it and focus solely on Vancouver Lake and we are going to ignore all of the watersheds. In order to get year-round recreational activities we will need to make some changes and that will include changes in the watershed

and changes in the surrounding areas. Ron feels that having the vision be fairly general making the few statements that are in the vision more powerful is an important thing to do.

Jeanne asked the group if they agree that they are about Vancouver Lake and what it takes to make the lake a community treasure and that they are looking holistically throughout the watershed to do that. Brian clarified that VLWP is attempting to draft a vision for Vancouver Lake, not a vision for the overall watershed landscape. It is one piece of that overall watershed landscape puzzle. He wants the VLWP to recognize that this is a part of that greater whole and that writing a vision for the whole is completely different than writing a vision for Vancouver Lake. Jeanne asked Thom why he was shaking his head since she did not see Brian's comments in conflict with what Thom has been saying. Thom mentioned that he sees Brian's comments as representing the City's unwillingness to commit to being part of this by including Burnt Bridge Creek and the improvement of it to the point where it will benefit the system. Jeanne expressed concern that Thom is responding in fear that Brian is saying this although that is not what she is hearing Brian saying. She hears Brian saying that this is part of the watershed and needs to be looked at as part of the watershed but that this vision is not a plan for the whole watershed. If Brian is saying that this is part of the watershed then she can't see how Burnt Bridge Creek would not be looked at when addressing how to achieve the goal of Vancouver Lake as a community treasure if Burnt Bridge creek is having an impact on the lake.

Clark suggested that the two or three things that the VLWP wants to emphasize can replace the last part of the vision statement. Things such as they want to support and recognize being aware of the interdependence of the watershed, that they want to be involved in watershed development in the future and that they want it to be fishable and swimmable.

Iloba suggested that the VLWP focus on what it desires for the next twenty years and generalize the statement. He thinks that they should stay away from too much wordsmithing because it will take too long. He also mentioned that he does not see anything referring to public involvement. Brian suggested that a watershed council is public involvement.

Jeanne clarified that she is hearing the group say that they would like to get rid of everything after the first sentence and come up with two or three sentences that the VLWP really cares about. She reminded the group that, that is what everything currently after the first sentence strives to do based on the draft visions statements that members submitted previously.

Brian suggested that a smaller group get together to draft some language that will work.

Jeanne explained that she does not want a group to go off to draft language without first hearing what each member is assuming the small group will return with. The following are each member's response:

Gary – thinks the current draft is close, would like to focus on the lake which will have a lot of meaning for the watershed

Steve/Doug – agrees the current draft is close, remove “the watersheds”, understanding that will be a tool that is used in implementing whatever comes out of this

Curt/Martin – thinks it is going in the right direction, the big pieces are there, likes the idea of a watershed council to manage, thinks it still needs some polishing

David – agrees that current draft is close, likes the watershed council statement which says that part of the visions is not just the end product of the lake but also what is the participatory way that they would monitor, would like to add that it would be through a watershed like council structure that they would be stewards of this process in the future

Ron/Pete – put a lot of value in vision statements, thinks they chart the course, thinks they are close, in reworking the lake should be focused on, it needs wordsmithing but likes what is in it

Jane – agrees that current draft is pretty good, thinks focus should be on the lake, likes swimmable and fishable terms which define a clean water standard that is knowable

Randy – agreement with all vision statements, should be generic enough so that when we determine how we are going to accomplish these things we would be constrained

Clark – does not see more than three points, agrees that it needs wordsmithing, likes the swimmable and fishable as being meaningful, thinks watershed relationship with the lake and the interdependence could be one of the three points along with neighboring development

Thom – thinks have made progress but afraid of making it completely meaningless by not putting the most elementary pieces of specificity, would like a more concrete collaborative, have fishability and swimability, have commitment toward watershed process without it nothing will work

Iloba – wordsmithing needs to ask basic questions; does it describe the desirable? Is it long range? Does it lead to a goal statement? Does it involve the public involvement process? If answers these questions then it is complete

Don – could not add more than what has already been said, is comfortable with one more meeting

Brian – would like it to have measurable objectives, he would like to see the following key points; lake is a community treasure, lake and surrounding areas are environmentally healthy, water quality meets standards, have diverse populations of native fish, wildlife and plant communities, the lake is fishable, swimmable and boatable, supports both passive and active recreational opportunities that are compatible with protections of the

resource. The vision should also be viable, sustainable, actively managed and properly supported. Also wants for something to be established that provides ongoing oversight, and accountability. A watershed council is a collaborative effort of public and agency.

Nancy – nothing to add, wants to make sure watershed council piece is added  
Maureen – vision statement needs to inspire and have passion, when we roll it out to the community it needs to be looked at from ten thousand feet level, should say what are we trying to achieve

Jeanne reiterated Brian's suggestion that a smaller group get together to wordsmith the vision statement. She added that it would then go to the Steering Team for review. The group will consist of Thom, Brian, Larry and Clark. Jeanne also asked the wordsmithing group to address the value statement regarding economic development.

#### *Partnership Next Steps – Steering Team*

Jeanne, speaking for absent members from the Steering Team, mentioned that the assumption is that the VLWP would not meet for a while. What the Steering Team would like to do is take some time and use the information needs that have been identified, which included a lot of what has been talked about today, to develop a draft scope of work. In the course of working on that the ST would like to check in with the full VLWP to get input on the scope of work. January would be the suggested time to reconvene and work toward funding.

David explained that there has been a lot of information that has been shared, they know that there is more information they need and they know that there are funding sources to pursue. In some ways there are two parts. First, how would additional information, needed to develop an improvement plan, be produced? Secondly, how would they move toward that and what would be the funding strategies and agencies that they would need to pursue and procure in order to help provide that information. They would then try to move forward with that funding and maybe reconvene to review the scope of work and the funding strategy. The steps that would follow that are unclear until they can determine what work is going to be done and what funding would they pursue and when would they have it in hand. This would dictate the longer term in which there would be check in meetings and they would be working on a series of things. They would bring this current part of the discussion to a tentative end as the vision statement is finalized and then get into fairly specific action steps that may occur months later.

Brian expressed concerns that if the VLWP doesn't meet for a while it will lose some of the momentum. What is strong about this group is the non-agency members who participate. They help provide a different viewpoint, oversight and keep things on task. If the VLWP takes a break they may lose some of that.

Jeanne clarified that there will be a meeting in October.

Clark would like to hear about what thoughts are being thrown out at what the data is going to be collected to see if I feel that it covers the need. Jeanne suggested that he look back at the question bin concerning informational needs. She also reminded the VLWP that a couple of months ago input concerning the informational needs was requested from all of the members.

She clarified that the Steering Team does want the full VLWP to continue to have input. At the last meeting the group seemed to be giving the ST that it was ready for a hiatus to pull together an approach to keep moving. Since we took a month off it seems that the group is rejuvenated and they are ready to keep moving forward.

David was thinking that the Steering Team was assuming that people were hoping that someone could gather up the pieces and come back with a plan. The ST was also worried that there might much for the VLWP to work on for a while. However, if people would like to continue to meet, there is a lot of benefit from having that discussion. He also mentioned Bill Dygert might be willing to come in to discuss approaches to funding in addition to monies from Congressman Baird's office and the Corps that could be available in the future. David asked if this would be something that people would be interested in meeting to discuss.

Maureen also added that Hal Dengerink from WSU Vancouver will attend the next ST meeting. He will be discussing whether or not WSU Vancouver could help with this process.

Thom mentioned that he had attended a training, led by Gary Locke, concerning how four different communities have used the concept of watersheds. He thought that this would be valuable because at least three examples are in Washington and under similar regulatory structures. There are videotapes of these sessions available and the VLWP may want to view them.

Thom also mentioned that it seems that the VLWP is not looking at very many different funding sources. He has mentioned other funding sources in the past such as EPA grants, initial watershed grants and others but these suggestions have not been explored. He feels that the VLWP needs to take a serious look at funding, maybe make it a meeting topic. He also feels that the current political climate requires the need to be thinking more creatively in terms of funding options.

Iloba also thinks that a funding sources session should be scheduled. He is willing to bring in someone who can discuss funding from his office.

Jeanne also mentioned that DNR was interested in giving a presentation.

She reiterated that the VLWP is definitely meeting in October. Thom suggested that the VLWP keep meeting. Brian mentioned that it is important that the

meetings are meaningful. At times it may be appropriate to not have mandatory meetings but working meetings or update meetings. He does not want to lose participation from non-agency members. Curt mentioned that they don't have to be two hours long, they could be shorter. David suggested that the meetings could be around funding strategies or the evolution of the scope of work. He also liked Thom's idea concerning watershed council trainings.

## **Public Comment**

Dvija Michael Bertish wanted to acknowledge Brian Carlson's input as he was actively pursuing water quality improvements. That is one of the main reasons that Dvija has been coming to the meetings. He thanks Brian as that was one of the things that was missing to the observer. He is also greatly relieved that the Port is reporting that it is reconsidering the railroad placement. To him that was an obvious conflict of what else is going on. Reviewing the process, as an observer, he looks at the commitment of everybody in the room and how long they have been meeting, it has been a long time. He is looking toward work product, what have we got to show for it. Just now the funding issue, which he thinks they have all been waiting for is being discussed by the Army Corps, and the commitment that Mr. Carlson was speaking of, of getting things on paper. For someone who is impatient, he would like to say "draw a big circle around it, call it a perimeter, call it a protected area, everyone join in who is responsible and let's move on..." is what he keeps wanting to say on the inside. Dvija then read his version of a draft vision statement it reads; the partnership's priority is to actively remove and prevent adverse impacts to the lake and its contiguous environments and to implement viable improvements to these areas as a commitment to continued protection of these natural resources. [The following is a revision of that statement submitted after the meeting; The partnership's priorities are to actively remove and prevent adverse impacts to Vancouver Lake and its contiguous environments, and to implement viable improvements within these areas as a commitment to the continued protection of these vital natural resources] He also mentioned that there are so many problems going on, there are bad things and there are ideas on how to fix it and he feels that is what everybody was stumbling on with the mission statement. It has balance in it if you look at that. He wanted to offer that as something that struck him as being offered in the room. He also re-asked why the EPA was not at the table. Jeanne answered that she re-follow-up with the ST and get back to him.

Lenora Oftedahl commented that the partnership needs to recognize the entire watershed not just the lake and it's immediate environment. Without this recognition the name of the group should be the Vancouver Lake Partnership not the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership. The vision needs to recognize the entire watershed and let the specific goals delineate what will be done where. Recreational development is economic development. Recreation provides jobs and increases the livability of an area which increases property values. Each major tributary should have its own watershed council rather than just Vancouver

Lake watershed council. When there are no meetings there should be more walk-aboouts and the VLWP should have a Christmas party. Lenora also mentioned that Bill Juracki, of the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University, who is funded by the EPA, would like to come and get an idea what the partnership is doing and how he could help fund the things that the VLWP would like to do.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2005 from 4:00pm to 6:30pm. The location will be confirmed and sent out via email meeting notice. The focus of the next meeting will be to discuss the next steps of the partnership.