

Cowichan Watershed Board Meeting

DRAFT Minutes

Mon. Jan. 29 2018

9:15-11:30 am

Location: CVRD Board Room



Co-Chair: CVRD Chairperson Jon Lefebure

Participants: Chief Seymour, Ian Morrison, David Slade, David Anderson, Klaus Kuhn, David Froese, Debra Toporowski, Darin George, Tim Kulchyski, Ross Forrest, Laura Brown,

Regrets: Lori Iannidinardo

Guests: Dr. David Priekshot, Technical Advisory and Working Group members; other guests. (Open to the public.)

1.	Welcome	Co-chair	
2.	Approval of Agenda	Moved by Ian; 2 nd Laura. Defer #10 Communications update to next meeting.	Approved.
3.	Approval of Minutes of Nov. 27 th 2017. Business arising from Minutes.	Moved by Laura; 2 nd Deborah.	Approved.
4.	Correspondence and announcements	See list below.	Information
5.	Quick review of Cowichan Watershed Co-Governance Workshop #2	Tom presented a summary of the 2 nd "Watershed Co-Governance Conversations" workshop held Jan 25 in Cowichan Bay. See meeting materials link .	
	Review and confirm "Checklist" of recommended improvements to Governance Manual.	Tom presented a summary of the shorter-term CWB governance improvements recommended by the workshops via Governance Manual. See meeting materials link . The recommended changes have been divided into two categories <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative (checklist) • Substantial that need more discussion/development Request approval to move ahead with drafting edits to the Governance Manual as per the checklist.	Motion to endorse changes to Governance Manual as presented. Moved by David Slade; 2 nd Darren George. Carries. Action: Tom to send a letter to convey thanks to Province for work to address low flows in Koksilah last summer in response to our request.
	- Discussion RE Koksilah emerged from item above	Discussion: -Klaus questioned the usefulness of including the Koksilah in our boundary if we can't control flows there like we can in the Cowichan. Seeking clarification on what CWB can do about	Action: Tom to send a letter, include technical reasons why it was so successful Action: Add Chinook

		<p>it.</p> <p>-Tom replied that CWB can and has successfully improve conditions in the Koksilah via the other targets, such as water quality and habitat. We also have had success in improving flows by urging MFLNRO to take action via new WSA powers to protect critical flows, which they began last summer.</p> <p>-Jon added that we already have successful experience with visiting farmers to talk to them about E.Coli observed and impact on water and shellfish in Cow Bay. 12 farmers signed up for Environmental Farm Plan to start to address that and 3 of those have used the EFP funding to subsidize major farm improvements. \</p> <p>-Klaus agreed with inclusion of Koksilah with this additional information.</p> <p>-Tim expressed appreciation and respect for the work of FLNRO in the Koksilah last fall. The work is complex and aims to develop a model to see what it would take, and how much staff would be needed, to study riffles and impacts of water withdrawals. Water extraction in the Koksilah has a huge impact at that time of year, comprising 30%-40% of flows. When farmers were asked to cut back, there was an immediate difference observed in flows in river. Huge benefit. Kudos to province for following through and taking low flows on Koksilah seriously.</p> <p>-Jon suggested we send a letter to province to convey our thanks. Agreed.</p> <p>-Tim suggested we all look at video footage in stream in the pools above Cowichan station with about 100 Chinook. Agreed to review on future agenda.</p>	<p>footage in Koksilah to future agenda.</p>
6.	<p>Strengthening our consensus decision-making model. Considering some options</p>	<p>Jill presented information about different considerations and models of consensus. See meeting materials link. Key points discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ways that dissent can be expressed and recorded within a consensus model. E.g. standing aside; recording a dissenting opinion; blocking decision. 	<p>Action – send link to all board members and ask for opinions. Board to respond in 2 weeks. Jill/Tom to bring options and proposal to next Board meeting. Action – training in consensus for new board</p>

	<p>- methods to address dissenting views through further discussion; possibly deferring decisions to allow time to revise proposals</p> <p>- what happens when someone “blocks”? Should we define a threshold of % consent needed before triggering ‘Roberts Rules’? (e.g. unanimous minus 1? 2?)</p> <p>- whether repeatedly “blocking” decisions should be grounds for removal from the group on the basis that the individual does not share the vision of this group.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>-Broad support was expressed for the importance of welcoming and expressing dissent opinions.</p> <p>-Klaus expressed appreciation for clarity around different options for recording dissent within a consensus model. As long as there is a possibility to object and have it recorded then consensus model is fine. Either this option or Roberts Rules is fine with him.</p> <p>-Jon supports the option to revert to Roberts Rules but don’t ever hold it against people if they object.</p> <p>-David S suggested we implement a 2/3 majority under the Roberts Rules option.</p> <p>-Laura inquired why the change was needed as we always seem to reach a decision.</p> <p>-David S replied that our Governance Manual specifies that we use a consensus model but it’s not well defined.</p> <p>-David A clarified that consensus doesn’t mean unanimity</p> <p>-Tom added that the system’s not broken but we need some clarification for better comfort of everyone.</p> <p>-David F – won’t be there for decision but wants to record that he disagrees with removing Board members for blocking decisions as that would be undemocratic.</p> <p>Action - Jill to circulate materials for further input and draft revisions for next meeting. General agreement that:</p>	<p>members.</p>
--	--	-----------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If someone objects or stands aside, that should be recorded in the minutes. - Setting a threshold for consensus as everyone minus 1 or 2 would be good to allow decisions to proceed under consensus rather than Roberts Rules - If we have to go to Roberts Rules, support for super-majority of 2/3. - Repeated blocking is not grounds for removal a member from Board 	
7.	CWB work plan - 2017 year-end review and draft 2018 work plan.	<p>-Tom presented a progress report on 2017 workplan and a draft 2018 workplan. See meeting materials link.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>-Klaus inquired for clarification on what progress is expected RE Shaw creek</p> <p>-Tom replied that there was interest in acquiring the parcel of private land through a land trust.</p> <p>-Jon clarified that the development application is still pending.</p> <p>-David Slade pointed out that Joe Saysell’s letter encouraged the province to acquire the property.</p> <p>-Tom asked whether the Board values the workplan and whether he should continue to produce these, or if a different format was desired.</p> <p>-Ian responded that it shows how complex your activities are. Requested an abbreviated version semi-annually.</p> <p>-David S expressed appreciation for staff “paddling like hell on our behalf; calm on the surface.”</p>	<p>Action: Tom to circulate 2018 workplan for discussion and support at next meeting. Add to February agenda/</p> <p>Action: Staff to produce abbreviated version of workplan semi-annually.</p>
Working Group Reports			
8.	Water Conservation – Capture the Rain Campaign update	Nora Arajs presented. See meeting materials link .	Information
9.	Water Quality / Estuarine Health a) WQ testing – early results? - CRF work	David Priekshot presented very preliminary results of water quality testing this summer and fall. See meeting materials link .	Information

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Samples taken in Lower Cowichan (including Somenos & Quamichan, Lower Koksilah, Cow Bay freshwater tribs and Cow Bay/Genoa Bay marine sites. -Only reporting on freshwater today. -Testing for E. Coli, phosphorous, turbidity -Couldn't get all 5 samples in Cow bay tribs due to lack of flow during summer months -Somenos/Quamichan/Lower Cowichan - E.Coli summer sample in Bings creek in summer was distressingly high. This creek wasn't tested in previous years but will add in future. -Phosphorus – some very high results. -Turbidity – lots of variation. Some samples hundreds of times higher than the target. -The results are valuable because they can help us target different recommendations for different parts of the basin to deal with water quality issues. -Lower Koksilah samples mixed results but better than 2015 sampling. – might be an indication of success compared to last study. -Phosphorus levels above standards in most samples -Showed a map from 1800s (1859) to show how– Bings Creek never entered Somenos Lake; Koksilah and Cowichan very integrated in lower watersheds; Quamichan Ck flowed into Somenos Ck. Water moves very differently now. 	
	<p>b) Coastal Restoration Fund work</p>	<p>Tim presented on behalf of Cheri Ayers. See meeting materials link.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Flows today are a concern. Cowichan River flow was 440 CMS this am; now at 470 CMS and continuing to rise. (Note: Peaked at 540) -Challenge to get through year 1 funding by March 31, especially because we 	<p>Information</p>

		<p>haven't received funding yet.</p> <p>-Northwest Hydraulics Consulting (NHC) is the consultant for the estuarine restoration component of the work.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>-David F inquired about downstream impacts of causeway breach on North Arm? Will there be less water there if it's diverted through the breach?</p> <p>-Tom kudos to DFO that this funding includes the science behind the process before the project starts. Allowing us to get most strategic bang for buck by closely considering options and pros and cons of each. Looking closely at sediment movement and what would be needed for long term maintenance as these channels infill. NHC identified 7 connectivity places historically that served Chinook.</p> <p>Jon asked whether all the sediment moving down river is filling in the Bay overall.</p> <p>-Tim replied that yes this is happening in the North arm in particular – meters and meters of fines and gravels. We are constantly excavating and the gravel bar extends into Cow Bay (large brown areas on map)</p> <p>-Tom added that this is also a natural and productive process within natural bounds, and that the shallow estuary area is effective for fish.</p> <p>-Tim noted that the project is also working with SeaChange on eel grass recovery.</p>	
10	Communications update	Deferred.	Add to next agenda.
11	Other	None.	Information
12	Adjourn.	Next meeting Feb 26 th 9:15am	Adjourned 12:40

Correspondence and announcements:

January E-News circulated Jan 16th.

Letters and replies shared from Friends of Cowichan River between Minister of Fisheries, BC Premier and Ministers.

CWB/VIU Speaker Night Feb 22 – David Polster

Co-Chairs will be meeting with Ministers Donaldson (MFLNRO) and Heyman (MoECC) on Feb 22

Cultural Connections workshops – encouragement to attend – meaningful and educational opportunity
Speaker in Victoria – Australian indigenous water law.