



Meeting Minutes
Nisqually River Council Meeting
March 16, 2018
Northwest Trek Hellyer Center
Information: 360.438.8715

Attendees:

Council Members:

Dan Calvert – Puget Sound Partnership
Molly Carmody – City of Yelm
Amy Cruver – Pierce County Council
Matt Curtis - WDFW

Gary Edwards – Thurston Co. Commission
Amber Martens – JBLM
David Troutt, chair – Nisqually Indian Tribe

Citizens Advisory Committee Members:

Allie Denzler – CAC
Howard Glastetter – CAC
Ed Kenney – CAC
Fred Michelson – CAC

Karelina Resnick – CAC
Marjorie Smith – CAC
Robert Smith – CAC
Lois Ward – CAC

Guests:

Celinda Adair – Thurston County
Roger Andrascik – NLT/NSS
Dustin Bilhimer – Dept. of Ecology
Chris Ellings – Nisqually Indian Tribe
Conrad Ely
Florian Leischner – Tacoma Power

Rachael Mueller – NW Trek
Melanie Pearson
Jim Reistroffer – NLT/NSS
Etsuko Reistroffer – NLT/NSS
Ashley Von Essen – Nisqually Indian Tribe

Staff:

Brandon Bywater – NRF
Justin Hall – NRF

Emily McCartan – NRF
Sheila Wilson – NRF

1. Call to Order, Introductions, Approval of Minutes and Agenda

David called the meeting to order at 9:25. It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. The minutes were approved, as was the agenda for the day.

2. Committee Reports and Updates

Advisory Committee Reports

Citizens Advisory Committee – Lois Ward

The CAC has been working on a letter to send to Tacoma Power regarding winter levels at Alder Dam. Copies are available at the meeting or from staff. The CAC hopes that the Council will decide to endorse the letter and send it to Tacoma Power to request they make minor adjustments to the height of the dam to prevent possible flooding along the river. The CAC welcomes comments and would like to discuss and answer questions at next month's NRC meeting. The CAC is also planning for upcoming elections in

May/June and also discussed the Thurston County Nisqually Subarea Plan, orca recovery, and Atlantic salmon net pen farming.

David responded regarding the TPU letter, noting that the NRC heard a presentation from Florian in November. TPU is a voting council member. There is not a pressing regulatory decision or permit issue in front of us that would require us to move quickly through this discussion, so rather than starting with an exchange of letters between council members, David suggested coming up with a list of questions for TPU from CAC and/or NRC members. We would ask TPU to provide a briefing in response to address the operations, limitations, and choices for dealing with those issues. Lois indicated that the CAC would welcome that opportunity. Fred stated that he felt there wasn't adequate time at the November presentation to follow up on some of the issues raised in the letter, and would like the chance to do that. Howard agreed that the letter is a starting point for dialogue. Florian suggested that it would be helpful to frame questions around the goals/outcomes we are looking for – i.e. lower flooding, less frequent flooding, nothing spilled over the dams, etc. – rather than suggesting specific management options. The letter as drafted has some technical accuracy issues, but if TPU understands the goal, they can help present options to address the underlying concerns. TPU is bound by its license, but if they know what desired outcomes are, can help figure out how their operation can help work towards those. David asked the CAC and NRC members to send questions to Emily. We will work with Florian to work out an agenda or several in coming months to establish what problems we're trying to fix, and the potential trade-offs of possible solutions.

Chair report – David Troutt

- The Legislature included \$550,000 in WSDOT budget to study I-5 traffic situation between Mounts Road (Exit 116) and Exit 99. Next step will be convening a stakeholder group. The ultimate fix for this area will be billions of dollars. The Tribe is recommending serious consideration of a bridge to improve salmon habitat and river migration, which the group and WSDOT seem to support. Process will move quickly, with September deadline for WSDOT budget proposal.
- David met with Ecology last month to start updating watershed plan for funding related to the *Hirst* bill. Nisqually is one of two watersheds in the state designated as ready to go under this new framework, meaning plans need to be updated by February 2019 to propose projects to mitigate for exempt well usage. Historically, mitigation has always been gallon-for-gallon onsite, but this process is also meant to deal with summer stream flows throughout the watershed. For example, could propose mitigating impacts in Muck Creek with actions in the Mashel. Planning group will reconvene next week to look at potential impacts and project opportunities. Eventually that will come back before NRC, although the existing 2514 planning unit (governments and water utilities) is the lead, not the NRC itself. Roger asked if extended harvest rotation could be part of the proposals, and David said it could, if we can show increased flows. The advantage of being ready to go early is that we could have a head start in meeting planning requirements to secure project funds.
- Governor signed an executive order on Tuesday creating a task force on orca recovery. Task force will have work groups on prey, toxics, and noise. David expects to be appointed to the Prey group, working on salmon recovery issues. Task force will have a

two-year window to make recommendations for short term, midrange, and long term action plans. Should see opportunities for Community Forest, salmon recovery, revamping of I-5 corridor in the next few years.

Staff report – Emily McCartan

Emily is continuing to work with the subcommittee on the NWSP Status Report project. She attended the Thurston County Subarea Plan open house on March 3 and will be staying involved in that process as well.

Allied Program Reports

Nisqually Land Trust – No report this month. The NLT Auction is tomorrow, Saturday 3/16.

Nisqually River Education Project – Sheila Wilson

Student GREEN Congress is less than one week away. 450 students registered and volunteer slots are still available. Great turnout for Eye On Nature training yesterday, preparing for field trips with 750 students at the Refuge. 45 people showed up and more than 2/3 of volunteer slots are already full for field trips through June. Eight days of Nisqually Nearshore field trips are booked. Planning some invasives field trips with 10 classes to pull ivy and blackberry.

Nisqually River Foundation – Justin Hall

The NRF has hired a new bookkeeper, Harold Schmidt, in a shared position with the Land Trust, SPSSEG, and Pacific Shellfish Institute. We'll get a lot more time for the same amount of money. Justin spent 8 days in DC with AgForestry. A big takeaway was that one reason that legislation is difficult is that members have to spend most weekends fundraising back in district, so they don't get to know each other and build relationships. Staff turnover and lack of institutional knowledge is also a challenge.

Community Forest – No report this month.

Salmon Recovery – Chris Ellings

- Nisqually is part of an ongoing grant study looking at factors that influence how many Chinook a delta system can support, from area/density to bioenergetics and habitat connectivity. The Nisqually delta produces plenty of calories and prey. It's still not as connected as we'd like it to be due to I-5 and development in the valley, even though restoration projects have helped. We are not truly realizing the full potential of our delta yet, which ties into the effort to re-wild stock of hatchery Chinook to better take advantage of this habitat. This study will help us compare data with other deltas in the Sound to understand the ideal number of juvenile Chinook a delta could house in a rearing season. In Nisqually, based on current conditions, the delta should be able to successfully rear over 2 million naturally-occurring fish. That means the delta is not going to inhibit our opportunity for recovery. However, we also have a large hatchery program, which releases 4 million fish a year in one very intensive pulse through the delta, at the end of the peak for naturally occurring fish. We don't yet fully understand how that may be restricting the delta's capacity to rear natural fish. Hatchery production is essential for both harvest and recovery goals, and this study should help us address "H-

integration”: integrating hatchery with habitat and harvest needs, ideally by tailoring hatchery production based on what we learn about the caloric and space capacity of the delta and the needs of natural fish. We want to stay focused on the objective of science-based management, rather than using this to just say “hatchery production is bad.” David added that this study has lots of impacts for all the work we’re doing in the Nisqually, Sound, and on orca recovery. Learning that estuaries have these limits suggests that just cranking up hatchery production may not be beneficial. Need to create more habitat in estuaries, but also think about ways to operate hatcheries to maximize survival and conditions of fish that benefit orca, fishermen, and salmon.

- Chris met yesterday with DNR and WDFW about McNeil Island shoreline restoration. Agencies have put together a great portfolio of potential projects, including pocket estuary restoration. The Aquatic Reserve only includes the southern half of the McNeil shoreline, so this is an exciting opportunity to hopefully restore the entire thing. Hope to fund the whole package together. Matt said we should look for projects starting in the next open work window, after July.
- Gary informed the Council that Thurston County has identified \$4 million for culvert replacements this year, with 3,000 possible culverts eligible and 7-10 miles of additional stream. Selection was winnowed down to 5 total replacements, with seed money left for follow-up next year. None of the selected culverts directly affect the Nisqually watershed, but would like to see the NRC be involved next year. He suggested inviting Project Manager from Public Works, Trevin Taylor, to come give a briefing on the whole process at a future NRC meeting. Gary also spoke with NW Fisheries yesterday regarding copper, which is detrimental to salmon, and raised concerns about whether there was a complete cleanup at McKenna after a railroad spill of copper sulfate in the 1970s. Justin said he believed because of the Centralia powerhouse, they were able to dewater most of the river during the cleanup.
- Ashley provided an update on the SRFB grant rounds. Lead entity received 12 letters of intent for potential projects that could move forward, totaling just under \$3.5 million. Allocation is usually around \$1.8 million. Applications are due April 1st and Ashley will present the projects to the NRC once she has the final lists. Site visits scheduled for 5/14.

3. **Nisqually Subarea Plan** – *Celinda Adair, Thurston County Long-Range Planner*
<https://www.slideshare.net/Nisqually/thurston-county-nisqually-subarea-plan-update>
The Nisqually Subarea Plan is a planning and land-use document established in 1992, created by the county with citizen and community input. It established 12 goals for policies to drive where growth and development should happen. The Subarea Plan is an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan, and development code and regulations are created based on those policies. The plan identifies the Nisqually Subarea (from the river/county line to Meridian Road/St. Clair Cut Road, including the bluffs and McAllister Springs, as a unique area warranting its own plan due to its rural character and environmental features. The County is required to update the Comprehensive Plan every 8 years (ongoing now). Subplans are reviewed every 20 years. When the subarea plan was written, Thurston didn’t have county-wide zoning, so it was landmark at the time. The update process is just beginning. Community involvement is key so that county staff and Board of Commissioners can respond to what the community wants. Next steps are:

- Gather data on expected population change (~550 additional people moving into subarea between now and 2040). Current zoning (1 dwelling/5 acres) would accommodate that, but community may not want to see it built out to that extent.
- Gather community input (key guidance for how to proceed – at this early stage, don't anticipate that the community's vision has substantially changed from the original plan, but want to address community needs and goals):
 - Open House – held March 3rd, attended by 81 community members. Meeting was at the Nisqually Community Youth Center and had a great welcome from Hanford McCloud. Used open-ended boards and comment boxes. General input was that the original 12 goals were still relevant. One major common thread was traffic concerns. May relate to WSDOT study.
 - Celinda is visiting stakeholder groups, starting to recognize familiar faces!
 - Online comment form should be live soon to allow continuous input.
 - Community Focus Group application form will also be online soon. Want to get broad range of perspectives represented as we start looking at potential studies/options. Logistically, will need to limit the focus group size, but will have a running record of everything discussed at focus group, and anyone can attend meetings.
- Staff will review community input and draft options that align with county policies.
- The draft plan will go through review process with the county planning commission, including public hearings.
- The planning commission will make recommendations, then staff will undertake SEPA review process.
- Board of Commissioners will review the final plan, have a hearing, then adopt.

Timeframe:

- Spring 2018 – internal review, public outreach, form community working group and begin holding working group meetings.
- Summer-winter 2018 – CWG meetings and Planning Commission review
- Winter 2018/2019 – Subarea Plan adopted

Ways to get involved:

- Sign up to receive email or text updates:
<http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/nisqually/nisqually-sub-area-plan-update-get-involved.htm>
- All resources will be made available online:
<http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/nisqually/nisqually-sub-area-plan-update.htm>
- Email feedback to Celinda directly, no need to wait for draft proposals or hearings to send input: adairc@co.thurston.wa.us
- Volunteer for Community Working Group:
<http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/nisqually/nisqually-sub-area-plan-update-community-working-group.htm>
- Attend outreach events and public hearings (schedule announced online/over email)
- Review and give written/hearing feedback once draft revisions are out

Related project: Recycled Asphalt Pavement (RAP) Use

- Lakeside's application asked the county to change the prohibition on RAP so their facility could process it. The policy is currently undergoing the review process and an

independent consultant has been hired. The county rules cannot apply just to one specific facility, so the policy has to be reviewed for all possible gravel mines, not just for Lakeside. However, any change would not issue a blanket approval for RAP. Lakeside or any other company would have to put in a permit application for review if the prohibition is changed.

- This analysis is currently separate from the subarea review process because Lakeside requested and therefore funds the RAP study. The Planning Commission could recommend that they be combined in the future. If they come together, the asphalt study would no longer be funded by Lakeside and the county would pick up the tab. David was involved in selecting the consulting firm.
- Link online: <http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/comp-plan/comp-plan-docket-cpa-item-11.htm>
- Gary noted that he is often asked why we're doing this. The county has been subject to expensive litigation in the past because of mistakes in how policies like this were handled. It's not necessarily about changing the outcome, but need to make sure the process is correctly followed.

Questions:

- Is the subarea plan like a neighborhood covenant? (Can prohibit things allowed within the larger jurisdiction, but can't allow something the jurisdiction prohibits)
 - Sometimes you can also pilot things that aren't present in the rest of the county. Can't go against a standing policy, but if they're silent on the matter, a subarea can go forward with other ideas.
- Is it a problem that only one consulting company answered the RFP?
 - It was posted twice and only one company applied. It's not a problem because they followed the same selection process and met the criteria – if they hadn't, they wouldn't have been selected. Don't know why there weren't more applicants.
- If there are no changes to the subarea plan, will the County Commissioners then adopt it anyway as an update?
 - Yes, there are some technical clean-ups (correcting references to obsolete ordinances, etc.) even if no substantive changes happen.
- If the subarea plan continues with the existing recommendation that there is no recycled asphalt allowed, would the RAP review then stop?
 - Yes, essentially. We would have to consider possible options at the time.

4. Puget Sound Nutrient Reduction – *Dustin Bilhimer, Department of Ecology Water Quality Program*

<https://www.slideshare.net/Nisqually/puget-sound-nutrient-source-reduction-project>

This project started with dissolved oxygen issues in South/Central Puget Sound in 2006-2008. The existing model wasn't telling us everything we needed to know, are now using the Salish Sea Model developed by Ecology and other partners over the last 10 years. Working to answer questions about human sources of nutrients and their impact on Puget Sound water quality with a goal of developing and implementing a nutrient reduction plan to meet Puget Sound dissolved oxygen (DO) criteria by 2040.

- Project phases:
 - Communicate and share science with public and stakeholders
 - Collaboratively develop a nutrient implementation strategy

- Implement nutrient reduction actions that meet WQ goals
- What are nutrients and why are they a concern? Nutrients in marine waters are mostly nitrogen, along with organic carbon. Nutrients feed algae and other microorganisms which initially create more oxygen, but ultimately settle on the bottom and decay, resulting in DO deficits Science indicates we are adding too many nutrients to the Puget Sound system.
- The project is aligned to water quality standards for both Ecology and the Puget Sound Action Agenda, specifically the goal levels for DO, which is crucial to healthy fish stocks. Current modeling shows that at certain times of year, it's hard to meet Ecology's DO criteria in some areas, even without the impact of human nutrient sources. Some of the criteria can only be assessed by modeling.
- Ed asked if there were changes in nutrients noted last year when West Point Treatment plant broke down.
 - That plant provides secondary water treatment, which isn't primarily about reducing nutrients to begin with. King County's findings focused on the area of the spill. Long-term Puget Sound data shows some changes from the normal expectation – hard to pin that on West Point specifically, but working on some modeling exercises. One station measured a 17-year high in DO, which can also be bad.
- Fred asked why are there different standards for different areas of the Sound.
 - Freshwater standards are different, because we expect to see changes as we get out into marine waters.
 - The criteria have low expectations for one corner of Commencement Bay, likely just because of the reality of conditions there.
- Not ready to create a total maximum daily load (TMDL) listing for nutrients yet, but working towards a similar idea with impaired waterways designations and possible follow-up actions. The goal is to reduce human nutrient sources so that they are not lowering DO levels by more than 0.2mg/L below the criteria for a given area.
- The largest source of nutrients in Puget Sound is natural marine exchange with the ocean. Human-caused sources of nutrients in Puget Sound include stormwater, land use activities (forestry, agriculture, development, onsite sewage systems, gravel pits), and marine activities (net pens, vessel discharges, sewer outflows). The project aims to represent these sources in the Salish Sea model so we can assess how changing them would impact overall water quality. Circulation of water in Puget Sound is also important: droughts increase the human burden on water quality. Less inflow-outflow from the ocean, shallower basins, less river flow all lead to higher concentrations of nutrients/pollutants.
- Seasonal changes in nutrient loading patterns differ between wastewater treatment plants (fairly constant) vs. river discharges (vary a lot). Wastewater accounts for 80% of overall nutrient loads over the summer and about 60% of the total annual load.
- Fraser River is the largest watershed contributing to Salish Sea and a dominant force in circulation. It's in the model. Gary asked about the impact of sewage from Victoria. Some of the dynamics of the circulation pattern mean that source is less impactful than sources within Puget Sound, but it is important and addressed in the model. Ecology collaborates with peers in BC to use their data in our model.
- What can we do about human-caused nutrients?
 - Lowering inputs

- Improving/restoring watersheds' ability to address nutrient flux – same things helpful for salmon rearing are also helpful for water quality.
- Algae blooms in Puget Sound are an effect of nitrification. They accompany increasing jellyfish populations and dinoflagellates resulting from high nutrient concentrations and are harmful for shellfish populations. Macro algae (like eelgrass beds) is also a problem in nearshore habitats. Effects at all levels of the food web, shifting the balance from silica-favoring plant microbes to nitrogen-preferring dinoflagellates (a “nuisance algae” with less food value for salmonids and forage fish.) The result is less diverse ecological communities.
- The ocean is largest source of Puget Sound nutrients, resulting from deep ocean currents at the global scale. That’s not going to change. However, modeling shows that additional nutrients (nitrogen and carbon) from human sources in Puget Sound are depleting DO more than allowed. Impacts are greatest in bays and inlets with long residence times - the longer water sits, the longer it has to lower oxygen. Accounting for human impact, some areas don’t meet DO standards (<0.2 mg/L below natural levels) for over 250 days/year.
- Wastewater treatment plants are the largest contributor to human-caused nutrient loads. With expected population growth, loading will nearly double by 2070, if there are no upgrades to treatment processes to reduce nitrogen. If we upgraded every facility, it would halve the amount of load from the present.
- Watersheds are also a major nutrient source, and expected to increase due to changes in land use and impervious surface cover. Need to think holistically about watershed solutions that can increase their ability to process nutrients before reaching the Sound.
- Marine water quality, including DO, is a vital sign for PSP. Nutrients are a cross-cutting issue, not just a DO impact. Reducing nutrients improves most vital signs. Want to move forward in the context of Puget Sound Recovery process.
- Next step: convening a Public Advisory Committee Process. Want to get a broad set of stakeholder groups involved, expecting 60-80 participants. The group will discuss regulation targets, implementation strategies, and monitoring plans. It will work concurrently with a smaller cross-cutting group focused on the Puget Sound Action Agenda. We’re looking at \$1B in wastewater treatment upgrades, so want to make sure we get a worthwhile investment. Estuary Restoration is a big component in nutrient cycling, so may also have some meetings at BFJNNWR. The Nutrient Forum will meet monthly, starting in April. Contact Dustin if you’re interested in participating.
- Ecology is doing two phases of computer modeling, looking at various changes (just watershed vs. just marine sources) and how significant they would be. After that, will run scenarios to optimize outcomes, looking at what is economically feasible. Will be talking about nutrient permits and looking at TMDL models in other states (such as the Chesapeake region), as well as thinking in terms of holistic watershed-level approaches, both to reduce human contributions and restore watershed functions.
- Project timeframe:
 - Nutrient Forum convenes – April 2018
 - Forum and workshops – through spring 2019
 - Begin modeling – through 2021
 - Finalize implementation strategy document – early 2022
 - Begin implementing – 2022
 - Continuously feed back into PSP Action Agenda to track improvement suggestions.

5. **Nisqually Food Sovereignty Report** – *Caitlin Krenn, Nisqually Community Garden*
<https://www.slideshare.net/Nisqually/nisqually-indian-tribe-food-sovereignty-assessment>
The 2017 Nisqually Food Sovereignty Report is an assessment of the Tribe's food system, including river, garden, wild game, gathering traditional food, and grocery stores. The study was conducted via a wide-ranging community survey, focus groups, and interviews with program managers. Link to the report online: <http://www.nisqually-nsn.gov/files/5815/1076/7612/NisquallyFoodSovereigntyAssessmentReport2017.pdf>

- The current reservation is one-third of the original land granted to the Tribe in the Treaty of Medicine Creek. Tribal members have rights to gather plants and shellfish in usual and accustomed areas outside the immediate reservation (designated marine area.)
- Food Provider Profiles
 - Salmon Harvest Program – mission to ensure there's enough fish in the river for people to fish, coordinating with state and federal partners. Tribal members participate in two fisheries:
 - Ceremonial and subsistence (C&S) harvest. Ceremonial use is for traditional tribal ceremonies, subsistence is for personal consumption by tribal members and their immediate families. C&S set by the Boldt Decision.
 - Commercial fishery, for sale. There are 30 boats captained by tribal members that fish regularly.
 - The tribe operates two hatcheries to support these fisheries.
 - Species:
 - Chinook – Nisqually Chinook is one of largest Treaty Chinook fisheries in Puget Sound. Wild Nisqually stock is extinct, but hatcheries working to develop a re-wilded run. Normal weight is about 11 pounds. Hard to keep fishing on them because they are protected by ESA, but Tribe works hard to produce enough to sustain fishery.
 - Pink – run every 2 years. Can be huge runs (almost one million fish in 2015). Fishermen aren't usually targeting pinks because they are smaller and their meat is not considered as good. No hatchery production.
 - Coho/silver – not a major commercial species because of smaller fewer numbers. Produced in tribal hatcheries.
 - Winter chum – most important food run for the Tribe. Nisqually chum have the latest run on west coast, one of latest in the world, important for sustenance through the winter. Impacted by seal/sea lions. No commercial fishery in 2016, small in 2017, but can still continue C&S. Entirely wild, no hatchery production.
 - Hunting – open game management units in usual and accustomed (U&A) area.
 - Regulations also set by Nisqually Fish Commission (elected).
 - ~20 people in Tribe hunt elk and deer regularly.
 - Can't sell it, all used for C&S.
 - Wild shellfish
 - Most shellfish tidal areas were bought by commercial growers in the 1800s and 1900s. Remaining shellfish beds in the U&A are inaccessible by foot, so most tribal members don't have good access to gathering shellfish for their families,

because you have to have the commercial equipment to get there anyway. Most harvest is for commercial. About 80 people who harvest shellfish commercially, and 6 people who harvest for C&S.

- Geoduck is the Tribe's most important commercial harvest now, surpassed salmon. 90% is shipped overseas to China and Hong Kong where they sell for a premium.
- Tribal administration's role in traditional foods:
 - Fish Commission, overseeing fishing and hunting.
 - Operate She Nah Nam Seafood to enable tribal members to keep prices consistent and allow Casino/Tribe to purchase locally, keeping the value chain within the tribe.
 - Shellfish farm, growing oysters and clams shipped nationwide.
 - Operate Community Garden program to grow food for community and hold education programs about traditional foods and medicines. The garden is at the old Braget Farm (400 acres total, 3 acres currently farmed).
- Survey results in the Food Sovereignty Report show interesting data about who in the Tribe knows how to fish, hunt, or gather, who is actually doing it, and who wants to learn but doesn't know how. Food sovereignty as a concept is about reclaiming the Tribe's ability to sustain itself with traditional foods.
- Questions:
- Does food harvested at the garden go to the reservation?
 - Everything grown on farm is distributed directly to the Nisqually community. It is not a commercial enterprise. The garden supplies a farm stand on the reservation from June-September, but deliver year-round (March-December) to elder center, daycare, and HeadStart kitchens. Families come out and harvest at the garden. There is more demand than the garden currently produces. Expanding into new 8-acre parcel soon. The current 3-acre farm grows approximately 7-10,000 pounds of food per year.
- Does the garden grow native plants?
 - Small traditional plant display garden, but most really important traditional plants can't be grown in a garden – princess pine, basketry plants grow in woods/mountains, mountain huckleberries don't grow well at sea level. The Tribe has an MOU with Mount Rainier National Park for tribal members to gather traditional plants in the park. Contested issues on both sides, but overall the Tribe has a good relationship with the NPS. Tribal members can also get permits to harvest on Fort Lewis, which is where camas is available. Discussion around organizing trips to get people out to areas where they can harvest traditional plants, but have to be sensitive of protecting cultural knowledge about sites that not everyone wants to be publicly known.
- Are there health concerns around mercury with fish consumption?
 - David – NIT and other tribes have done some work with the Governor to change water quality standards to protect people who rely heavily on fish and shellfish from mercury levels.
- What percentage of food production in the Community garden is organic?
 - Totally organic methods (not certified but only use organic techniques).

6. The meeting was adjourned at 12:11.