

Chelan County Voluntary Stewardship Program
VSP Advisory Committee meeting
Tuesday, January 30, 2018
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

The meeting began at 1:00 p.m. Facilitator Neil Aaland asked each participant to introduce themselves and reviewed the agenda. Mike Kaputa asked Heather Bush if Ecology has any VSP guidance from its perspective; Heather said they have answered specific questions about the relationship between VSP and CAOs.

Public Comment

No members of the public were present to offer comment.

Follow-up from last meetings' "next steps"

- Contacting packing houses: we need a list of data points to ask them (e.g. acres involved, location, certified under food certification programs, how many growers were certified). Britt will ask tomorrow at the meeting he is attending about willingness to provide the information. One idea is to reach out to the certifying bodies. There are 3 or 4 within the state, and they might be willing to aggregate information. Mike Kaputa has meetings set up with Manson, Blue Star, and will check with them. He asked if some growers do not go through a packing house; there are some who direct sell or go through farmers markets. Lisa can come up with a draft list of questions to ask the packing houses.
- Imagery: Neil noted that he had included the Yakima guiding principles in the e-mail for this meeting. Jim Bartelme noted that there may be people locally who, like Yakima, have concerns about how aerial imagery will be used. Lisa reviewed the guiding principles. Mike K noted that people may not be aware of the extent to which imagery is already used in the county. Lisa asked Graham if he can check with WDFW staff member Matt Muller to ask if the change analysis will be tailored as we would want. Workgroup members agreed to email Neil with their thoughts on what should be included in a similar statement regarding use of imagery for Chelan.
- Outreach by NRCS: Mike Cushman said there is a document outlining what NRCS is allowed to do regarding local projects like VSP – see attached Bulletin (WA 180-18-01). If we want any of their information, it's likely we'd have to do a FOIA request – not because they won't provide, but this way the state office can gather the data, which would be faster than what they could get accomplished locally. Jim suggested asking how they report their data, might be difficult to compare. They'd need to know what level we'd need, e.g. HUC 10 level.
- Biennial and 5-year report outlines: Lisa reviewed the purpose, as we discussed in December. Britt thinks the outlines seem reasonable; the first cycle will be telling. Mike C thinks it will be good to have guidance for the CD in how to submit information for the reports. Regarding ag viability trends, the plan is non-bonding on that topic. The key will be whether there have been any initiatives to address ag viability.

Baseline information update (as requested in December)

Updated information was provided in the mailout for the meeting. Lisa reviewed this and noted it was by basin. It's updated to bring in new information regarding ownership. Jim asked why the

federal and state governments owned parcels; Lisa explained it is based on the definition of ag activity and those government parcels had activity fitting the definition. She also noted it is unlikely that the workgroup would prioritize its limited funding for those parcels. Neil noted we're not asking for any decisions on this, but just giving information. Britt thinks it will be useful to have a transition plan (when Lisa and Neil are no longer providing support).

What is being done for implementation?

Mike K thinks the county has already been doing work that qualifies for enhancement. He needs to think about how best to capture that. It would be good to describe these actions in writing to serve as an example. Jim noted that some related projects are being done but use other funding. That could still be captured. He also noted that we need to show actual work done on the ground to demonstrate success.

Mike Cushman handed out an outline describing the organizational framework of VSP implementation as outlined in the VSP Plan.

Britt thinks we need to add some specificity and assign \$ to the actions.

Mike Kaputa wants to work with Lisa on the budget assumptions; the county is happy to do mapping and change detection. He also suggested having Ron Shultz participate by phone next meeting to discuss what the shift to implementation means after the plans are approved. Mike Cushman said more participation from citizens and growers is needed (on the workgroup).

At the next meeting, we need to discuss outreach. Look at the Benton outreach strategy as an example.

Neil and Lisa will work with the county and the CD to better describe their roles.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.

Next steps:

1. Neil will send around Doodle poll for January meeting
2. Lisa will draft a set of questions for the packing houses.
3. Graham will check on how much the change analysis can be tailored for the needs of the workgroup, and will ask Matt to come to the next meeting.
4. Workgroup members to e-mail Neil with their thoughts on what should be included in a statement of principles for use of imagery (for the VSPO workplan).
5. We should discuss outreach at the next meeting.
6. Mike and Lisa work on describing the tasks in the budget more specifically.
7. Neil contact Ron Shultz about participating in the next meeting by phone.
8. Neil and Lisa work with county and CD to clarify their roles in implementation.

Attendees:

Jim Bartelme, Supervisor, CCD
Heather Bush, Ecology
Mike Cushman, Cascadia Cons. District
Britt Dudek, CDFB
Graham Simon, WDFW

Other attendees;

Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Mike Kaputa, Chelan County
Lisa Grueter, Berk Consulting
Hillary Heard, Chelan County
Erin McKay, Chelan County