

**Yakima County Voluntary Stewardship Program  
Meeting Notes - Workgroup Meeting #17  
August 17, 2017 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
North Yakima Conservation District Office**

In attendance:

Eric Bartrand, WDFW  
Justin Bezold, Trout Unlimited  
Betsy Bloomfield, CCC  
David Child, Joint Board  
Stuart Crane, Yakama Tribe  
Laurie Crowe, SYCD  
Lynn Deitrick, Yakima County  
Rodney Heit, SYCD  
Bill Eller, WSCC  
Byron Gumz, Yakima Co

Frank Hendrix, Ag Industries  
Heather Kosaka, Ecology  
Eric Olson, Honey Bees  
Evan Sheffels, WSFB (phone)  
Arden Thomas, WWT  
Gail Thornton, YCCA  
Mike Tobin, NYCD  
Kerry Turley, Yakima Audubon

Project Staff: Neil Aaland, Lisa Grueter

Other: Jean Mendoza

Welcome and introductions:

Facilitator Neil Aaland opened the meeting at 1:00 pm and asked attendees to introduce themselves. In response to a question, David Child said to list his affiliation in the work plan as “Yakima Basin Joint Board”.

Public Comment: Jean Mendoza, Friends of Toppenish Creek, said the agriculture in the lower valley is different from Upper Valley. In the lower valley, the issue is keeping 60 animals per acre of land. She also noted that the work plan seems to defer to the GWMA work plan; she is not sure if the GWMA plan will be done by the end of this year. She also noted the GWMA plan is only looking at nitrates in groundwater; not all the data collected has been analyzed.

Review Changes to Work Plan from August 3 Meeting

Lisa Grueter led this discussion and reviewed the changes made in the draft work plan. She looked primarily at the participation matters. More information has been added on how the work group was formed. Information was also added on how land on the Yakama Reservation would be addressed, in response to Technical Panel questions. Bill Eller asked about meeting notes and agendas; these will be uploaded to the Yakima County VSP website. He also mentioned the interest by the Technical Panel in web links to other plans, and suggested including web links within the document.

The work plan will be available as a web document on the Yakima County website, and links will be included.

Other changes discussed included:

- Added 90.38 to list on page 41
- TP wanted Yakama reservation included in information on page 48; also added information on fish passage barriers as part of baseline conditions. Stuart Crane reviewed this discussion and does not agree with the characterization of regulatory authority over deeded land on the reservation. The first paragraph will be removed, and it will be noted that both Conservation Districts currently provide services on the reservation as requested, and will continue to do so.
- David Child asked about the barriers shown on page 54; he thinks irrigation districts don't have any barriers. Lisa will take them out of the table and note the data.
- In chapter 7, more narrative was included on implementation. Gale wonders what constitutes an "expert panel"; this just provides the work group an opportunity to seek input from organizations of its choosing. More description of that will be added.
- Eric Olson mentioned more pollinator habitat used to be prevalent. This will be added.
- More discussion was added on page 99 about participation with NYCD and SYCD to identify priorities, who they would work with.
- David Child asked that the term "wasteway" be added to specific channels shown on map 7.7
- Mike Tobin looked at exhibit 7-9, page 100, and thinks the TP wants to know the strategy. We need to be able to show immediate successes. In terms of likely sub-basins, he looks at starting with Wenas as #1, given the county's initial identification of that basin as a priority. Then move to others; he noted NYCD is already working in the other listed watershed. Wide Hollow should be on its own; Lisa made that correction. The listing of acreage/size will help him prioritize
- Laurie Crowe said she first looked at the sub-basins, but everything fits. Not necessarily in a priority order, she will work in all. Lisa will clarify; the far right column explains their list of potentials.
- Information was added on page 114 on what information imagery would provide
- In response to TP questions about how data would be used, section 8.3.4 now includes three different scenarios
- Additional narrative was added to section 8.3.5 explaining how the priority of Wenas Creek is implemented

A variety of changes were made to Appendix G, the adaptive management matrix. Lisa reviewed the "monitoring responsibilities" at the bottom of each page. The two CDs agreed that they would be the holder of the survey monkey tool; Berk Consulting will give them a training session.

It was noted that the RC&D may have a role in administering the funding. This will be sorted out soon.

Neil reviewed the proposed motion printed on the agenda. Betsy moved that motion, Mike Tobin seconded. There was no opposition to the motion; the work group agreed by consensus to forward the work plan to the Conservation Commission for their review.

Neil noted the Technical Panel has tentatively scheduled its review for September 29, with another meeting in October. He will e-mail the work group with information on how to attend, either in person or through a webinar.

Lisa reviewed the proposed implementation budget. Mike noted that funding beyond that provided through the VSP budget will be needed.

The meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.

**Next meeting:**

- No further meetings are scheduled at this time, pending discussion with the Technical Panel.