Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership

Steering Group Meeting Summary
Meeting Date: July 20, 2011

Steering Group Members Present:

Patty Boyden	Port of Vancouver
Brian Carlson	City of Vancouver
Kevin Gray	Clark County Environmental Services
Eric LaBrant	Fruit Valley Neighborhood Association
Jane Tesher Kleiner	Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation (alternate for Pete Mayer)

Other Agency Members Present:

Jeff Schnabel	Clark County Environmental Services
Rob Guttridge	Clark County Environmental Services
Andrew Ness	Port of Vancouver
Loretta Callahan	City of Vancouver

Project Management Team:

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

Public in Attendance:

Thom McConathy	Northeast Hazel Dell Resident

Project Manager Update

Phil began the meeting with an overview of the agenda and asked if there were any additions.

Jane asked for time at an upcoming meeting for a presentation about the Parks trail extension. The team is about to go out for SEPA as they go forward. This will be added to the agenda for the September 14th Partnership meeting.

The idea of adding live video clip of the presentation to the website of the trail extension and the USGS presentation might be of interest to the general public. This might be best in form of a short synopsis than a full video of the presentation.

Eileen will check back with the Steering Group and the Loretta, who updates the website about the potential addition of video to website.

Eric would like to add a citizen volunteer group to the outreach strategy to improve public perception about the lake and the Partnership's work.

There were no other discussion topics to add.

<u>Funding Framework Update:</u>

Plan for completion: to get Steering Group input now, would like to have a near final draft ready for the Partnership meeting in September, and then bring back to the Steering Group for final approval.

Thom had concern that some of his comments were missed. One area is that if a salmon study is conducted it can lead to salmonid funding. Eileen will check that Thom's comments were incorporated as appropriate.

Kevin felt the overall document was good. He would like to see clearer goals. If we don't know exactly how much funding will be or exactly when we are going to need it, be clear about that – give the range for an idea. For the first phase: we know how much we need for remaining research. For Years 5-7 (next range) we generally know. We don't really know for implementation: it is a wide range. But the reader could then understand magnitude of what they are looking at.

The document should also show the total of funding to date.

The entities section will be developed further; it is only a place holder at this time.

Under entities, there is a diking district present. A quick review of the RCWs will give information on them. Only about three sentences on each entity should be plenty: This isn't a decision document but a forum for putting the entities on the table so we have something to look at when it is time for making a decision. More research would be done at that point. Don't want to put too much time into researching options that will be off the table later.

While some of these items may have been discussed in past hasn't been written down in past as to risks and opportunities of each.

Looking at near term, mid and long term phases of work and funding. Definitely want something stable on long term basis what we have right now is doing okay, although there are risks.

We need to note that under organizational considerations. It will take resources to form any entities. There are always opportunity costs.

Looking at other lake groups, implementing management plans takes time. For example, Capitol Lake is continuing implementation of a plan from the 1800s.

Once we know the costs of management actions and the boundaries of different funding possibilities (in brief description) it will be easier to determine what type(s) of entities are feasible. Certain districts have funding limitations and can only be for certain amount. Smaller entities can only handle a certain level of costs. Timing will also be important for different funding types.

An entity won't be "necessary" for large appropriations that would come through a federal agency. For example: working through the Corps or other appropriations.

Joint Powers Authority – Inter-local Agreement – administrative agent – this is how this would work going forward. Need to add discussion of becoming a more formal inter-local group the Partnership is in its current form. Jane mentioned this working well in her previous experience.

Need to describe the differences between fees and taxes. Look at the RCWs relating to utilities and taxes and fees.

Eric asked if forming a 501(c)(3) organization would preclude anything else. Brian said no; we could see if forming a 501(c)(3) organization is a short term goal for the Partnership. A 501(c)(3) organization can be a support entity, not a major source of funding. Such an organization is one aspect that can help in both funding and outreach support. A 501(c)(3) organization can also target certain sources that the Partnership couldn't reach otherwise.

Eric mentioned that Fruit Valley has both a neighborhood association and a foundation. They each serve different audiences and bring in more volunteers. A foundation can also be used to attract funders for other community involvement who may want to fund community instead of the research aspect.

Phil: In analysis so far we want to be clear which entities would be support for the Partnership and which are ones we may want the Partnership to evolve into.

Phil briefly mentioned that the goals listed in the document will be developed further this was a start in this direction.

This document is to serve as a listing of funding options to consider, including the parameters of each option. When we are further along on looking at management techniques we can look at which options make sense for what is under consideration and then do more research on those options.

Everyone's comments on the funding framework are due Sunday, August 7th. Eileen will make updates prior to next Steering Group meeting and then a final draft prior to September 14th Partnership meeting.

Technical Update
There was no update from the Technical Group at this time.

Algal Control Techniques Document

Phil mentioned that this is the next project in the contract identified for an update. The Project Management Team will start work prior to the next meeting.

Patty raised the concern that an update to the report would actually work towards paring down techniques to the several that are feasible. That is the critical work we have in front of us. Patty would like the Technical Group to weigh in on the value of working on the report towards the goals of narrowing techniques so that it is not only a report update. A Technical Group meeting will be called to discuss this prior to the next Steering Group meeting.

Outreach Update

Bookmarks are being handed out to Park visitors at the entrance booth.

Andrew handed out Partnership bookmarks at the July 4th Felida parade and had a few general lake questions from participants.

Andrew is presenting to the West Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association for the Partnership tonight.

Kevin gave summary of the REI Event. It was a nice event with some people visiting the Partnership booth, but not many. It doesn't seem worth paying staff to attend events when participants are there for trying out boats. There are likely other events that would have more people interested in hearing about the Partnership. It was nice of Lehman and Thom to volunteer their time for the event. During Kevin's shift there were 20 visitors; during Eileen's there were three.

September 17th Update

Eileen handed out a map of the lake with some of the proposed cleanup areas listed.

There are many other events the same day: City of Vancouver has opening and the Sturgeon Fest at Water Education Resource Center. Vancouver Downtown association has a mushroom festival and Fort Vancouver has an evening event.

It was asked why Lower Reiger Road not being listed as a cleanup location. This location was removed from the list out of safety concerns due to the materials that can be found there.

It was raised that we should photo document the event and give information to the media afterwards for outreach (and not overly publicize the event beforehand when expecting 500 volunteers).

Eileen will need to look into parking at Burnt Bridge Creek area.

To North – Reiger Road – bridge to island – needs cleaning up –

Jane will follow up with her crews to see how appropriate it will be for volunteers to clean up area off of Reiger Road; parking on the road and moving in toward the lake and the island.

Eileen asked if the Steering Group wanted to pay for a vendor to prepare/provide the food for the event or have Partnership volunteers do the food prep, in which training and a food handler's license will be needed. Andrew mentioned that the cost of grilling can be expensive.

The Steering Group agreed that a private vendor should be used, and recommended checking into several vendors.

Eileen asked if the City water truck would be available for the cleanup event, but it is committed to other City events that day. Eileen will check with CPU about their water truck.

Closing/Next Steps:

The Partnership outreach volunteer group that Eric asked about forming at the beginning of the meeting will be a topic for discussion at the next Steering Group meeting.

The idea of video taping interesting presentations/summaries will be looked into further before next Steering Group meeting so a decision is made prior to Partnership meeting.

Meeting Adjourned.

Next Meetings

The next Steering Group meeting will be on August 24th at 3:30 pm at the Port of Vancouver offices.

The next meeting of the full Partnership is on September 14th at 4 pm at the Port of Vancouver offices.