



### **October 23, 2013 VLWP 47th Meeting Summary**

The forty-seventh meeting of the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership was held on Wednesday, October 23, 2013 from 4:00 – 6:00 pm at the Port of Vancouver Administrative Offices.

#### **Attendance:**

##### **Member Present**

Jane Van Dyke  
Lehman Holder  
Don Jacobs  
Gary Kokstis  
Thom McConathy  
David Page  
Jacquelin Edwards  
Eric LaBrant  
Brian Carlson  
Joe Laxson  
Steve Prather  
Ron Wierenga  
Patty Boyden  
Brett Raunig

##### **Member Seat**

Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen  
City of Vancouver  
Clark County Public Health  
Clark Public Utilities (Alternate for Doug Quinn)  
Clark County Environmental Services  
Port of Vancouver  
WA Dept. of Ecology (Alternate for Iloba Odum)

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

Dorie Sutton  
Jeff Schnabel  
Phil Martello

##### **Association:**

City of Vancouver  
Clark County Environmental Services  
Port of Vancouver

##### **Public in Attendance:**

Vanessa Rose  
Jackson Gross  
Steve Willie

WSU Vancouver  
Smith-Root  
Citizen

##### **Project Management Team:**

Phil Trask  
Eileen Stone  
Alex McManus

PC Trask & Associates, Inc.  
PC Trask & Associates, Inc.  
PC Trask & Associates, Inc.

##### **Not in Attendance:**

Vernon Veysey  
Bruce Wiseman  
Debrah Marriot  
George Medina  
Ralph Dannenberg  
Iloba Odum  
Allen Lebovitz  
Anne Friesz

Citizen  
Port of Ridgefield  
Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation  
WA Dept. of Ecology  
WA Dept. of Natural Resources  
WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

## **Opening of Meeting**

Phil Trask welcomed everyone to the 47th Partnership meeting and reviewed the agenda.

## **Public Comment**

Phil asked for any public comment. Citizen Jackson Gross introduced himself and explained his interest in Vancouver Lake.

## **Partnership and the Recommendation Process**

Phil reminded everyone of the aggressive schedule for developing the Recommendations Report. Meeting dates and report draft deadlines were highlighted. The first draft of the Recommendations Report will be delivered on November 6, 2013. The second draft will be delivered on November 26, 2013. The final report will be completed by December 11, 2013. Please see the Upcoming Meetings section below for meeting dates and times. Phil also reminded everyone of the crucial timing of input from Partnership members for writing the Recommendations Report. The management team needs as much feedback from the Partnership as possible so as to characterize the thoughts and opinions of the Partnership in an accurate manner.

## **Overview of Technical Group Discussions**

Phil and Eileen presented an overview of Technical Group work from the October 14, 2013 meeting. At that meeting, Technical Group members discussed potential benefits, issues, and key uncertainties for lake management actions focused on the management objectives for nutrients and cyanobacteria blooms. Based on USGS information, the Technical Group recognizes that Lake River and internal cycling are the two major nutrient sources to Vancouver Lake. The group members rated each action low, medium, or high based on the actions potential for addressing the nutrients and cyanobacteria bloom management objectives.

## **Partnership Discussion of Potential Actions**

Eileen passed out voting sheets for Partnership members to cast their vote for actions based on the Technical Group information presented for each action. Partnership members were asked to answer two questions about each action: 1) based on impacts to lake use(s), would you consider this action an option for Vancouver Lake? 2) based on your understanding of this action's effectiveness, would you support including this in the Partnership's initial suite of actions? Partnership members were also asked to provide comments expanding upon their 'yes,' 'no,' or 'undecided,' votes for each question. The Partnership discussion of potential actions generated many thoughts and questions about the actions. In general, more specific narrative on the conceptual design of the actions was requested.

### Constructed or Floating Wetlands (Lake River Source)

The discussion began with using constructed wetlands to address nutrients coming into the lake from Lake River. There was interest about how constructed wetlands could affect boating recreation depending upon their location. There was also discussion that constructed wetlands treat a symptom, not a source. The sources could be treated with enhanced watershed management, however. Constructed wetlands (grounded near the confluence or floating along Lake River shoreline) could be implemented on an incremental basis, but if it was just grounded dredge material wetlands it would most likely occur once, not incrementally. Creating wetland habitat could also be considered a benefit for fish. Specifically concerning carp, created wetlands could be destroyed by carp and/or used as a place to catch and manage carp. Engineering Turtle Island (grading down, expanding footprint) to

perform nutrient uptake functions was also considered. Before voting, it was clarified that Partnership support for any action should be considered preliminary and simply an action worthy of additional consideration.

#### Water Control Structure (Lake River Source)

Discussion of a water control structure mainly included design questions and permitting concerns. Phil explained to the Partnership that at this conceptual stage, a water control structure could be a weir, dam, or even an inflatable dam). In all cases, the water control structure is intended to reduce nutrients entering Vancouver Lake from Lake River sources. The issues are similar for each level of implementation, but would vary in degree – fish access, boat access, and lake water levels. Permitting a water control structure is seen as a major obstacle to implementation.

#### Enhanced Watershed Management (Lake River Source)

Enhanced watershed management was seen as an action that could be implemented in all the tributary watersheds of Lake River to address sources of nutrients before they enter Vancouver Lake. It would be expensive to increase higher standards than what is currently in place (e.g., applying standards for new construction and retrofitting older construction); however, implementation would be incremental over time. Suggested steps to implementation of this action included outlining current watershed management practices and nutrient load studies on Whipple, Salmon, and Flume Creek.

#### Wind and Wave Breaks (internal nutrient cycling)

The Partnership discussed wind and wave breaks to reduce sediment/nutrient re-suspension. The main concern about wetland berms was the extent of the action's implementation and its effects on recreation (e.g., sailing and rowing). Wave breaks were viewed as potentially having a stronger effect and less interruption to recreation.

#### Sediment Removal (internal nutrient cycling)

Sediment removal could be implemented two ways depending on what is learned of the nutrients in the sediment: a high volume of removal at one time or repeated small removals. This action could be effective in removing accumulated nutrients to a certain depth in one treatment, but could have diminishing returns after that (because of increased costs of moving equipment). Permitting a sediment removal operation, especially one with high maintenance frequency, was seen as a major obstacle to implementation.

#### Carp Management (internal nutrient cycling)

Carp management was characterized as a recommendation to the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife to increase/expand the commercial Carp fisheries in Vancouver Lake to seasonally reduce population numbers. The general feeling on Carp management was that chemicals, electro-shocking, capture, etc. would not be successful at Vancouver Lake due to openings to the Columbia River at the Flushing Channel and Lake River.

Some general feedback was collected from the Partnership about the process so far and the Recommendations Report:

- Significant impairment of lake uses will not be accepted by the community of users.

- A plan and goal is important to facilitate Partnership input on updating western Washington State water standards for Vancouver Lake.
- A strong buy-in from Partnership members in the Recommendations Report is the best chance the Partnership has for securing funding for future actions/study.
- The Recommendations Report should mention adaptive and ongoing management, emphasize the time and effort invested by the Partnership, and foreshadow the governance issue moving forward.

#### **General Partnership Announcements**

Eric LaBrant announced meetings on the oil terminal lease at the Port of Vancouver. Informational and scoping meetings are scheduled at Clark College.

#### **Close of Meeting**

Phil thanked the group for their work and closed the meeting.

#### **Upcoming Meetings**

Partnership:

Wednesday, November 13, 2013, 4-6 pm

Wednesday, December 18, 2013, 4-6 pm

Steering Group:

Friday, December 6, 9:30-11 am

Technical Group:

Monday, October 28, 9am-12pm (City of Vancouver Engineering)

All meetings are at Port of Vancouver Administrative Offices unless otherwise noted.