



CAPITOL LAKE/LOWER DESCHUTES WATERSHED COMMUNITY MEETING

**Jefferson Building
Conference Room 1213
1500 Jefferson Street
Olympia, Washington 98504
July 27, 2016
5:30 p.m.**

Meeting Minutes

DES STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bob Covington, Deputy Director
Carrie Martin, Asset Manager

Ann Sweeny, Special Assistant
Curt Hart, Communications Director

MEETING PRESENTERS:

Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jewel Goddard, Citizen
Greg Schundler, Citizen
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Dennis Burke, Citizen
Rosemary Gilman, Citizen
Steve Shanewise, DELI
Mark Dahlen, Citizen
Keith Dublanica, GSRO/RCO

Sue Patnude, DERT
Robert Holman, CLIPA
Dave Peeler, DERT
Dominick Reale
Karuno Johnson, Citizen
Bob Wubbena, CLIPA
Roger Burgher, Martin Marina

Introductions, Meeting Purpose, Meeting Format, Ground Rules, and Community Role

Deputy Director Bob Covington, Department of Enterprise Services (DES), convened the meeting at 5:41 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the community meeting on Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed Long-Term Management Planning.

Deputy Director Covington reviewed the meeting agenda:

- Second Touch on Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Overview of Input Received
- Second Touch on Identification of Hybrid Options and Overview of Input Received
- First Touch on Review of Existing and Hybrid Options
 - Feedback from the Technical Committee and Executive Work Group
 - Discuss Consistency with Goals
 - Identification of Data Gaps
 - Brainstorm Components of Options

Deputy Director Covington advised that the next community meeting would be in October. No August meetings are planned.

Second Touch on Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Overview of Input Received

Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider, reviewed changes to the draft Purpose and Need Statement based on feedback from the Technical Committee and the Executive Work Group. The rationale for developing a

Purpose and Need Statement now is to take the goals and objectives developed during initial meetings and translate the information into a statement that can be ready to use during a future environmental review. The Executive Work Group reviewed the statement and recommended including more context, which had been previously included in an earlier draft, but removed based on feedback from the Technical Committee. Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed the revised Draft Purpose and Need Statement.

Ms. Gardner-Brown added that the draft doesn't speak directly to the "Capitol Lake" but rather it reflects a watershed approach based on consistent comments that the system is interconnected.

Ms. Gardner-Brown invited comments on the draft statement.

Dennis Burke commented that "nutrients" are lacking in the statement, as nutrients are the crux of the problem. Although sediment carries nutrients, the key element is nutrients, which promote plant growth causing low dissolved oxygen. He asserted that "nutrients" should be included in the statement; otherwise, it doesn't acknowledge the problem.

Ms. Gardner-Brown explained that the approach for the Purpose and Need Statement is a high level statement to form the basis for the detailed environmental analysis. The statement speaks broadly to improving water quality in terms of nutrients and phosphorous but doesn't contain the finer details.

Mr. Burke replied that the statement is slanted because it speaks to sediment, which is extremely important but not the solution to the problem. Sediment management is a partial solution to the problem. It's important that the statement speak to the heart of the problem. Secondly, he would like to see language that speaks to maximizing the benefits of the resource. The resource is not defined and perhaps some descriptive language should be included to define the resource. Sediment is a resource; however, sediment must be factored in many different ways. Freshwater sediment near I-5 could be extracted and developed into good topsoil, which would have tremendous value, but it depreciates as it travels to the lake and accumulates toxic materials and loses value. When saltwater intermingles with sediment, the value is significantly comprised. The addition of Budd Inlet toxins creates sediment with a liability. There should be some language addressing the value of sediment. The goal should be maximizing the value of the resources, i.e., recreational or fixed assets (sediment). It could help to significantly lower costs. For example, the state wastes tons of paper each day, which is a tremendous disposal cost. It's impossible to generate renewable energy in terms of anaerobic digestion without nutrients. Blending the nutrients with other waste generated by the state could produce a tremendous economic stream. Language should be included about increasing the economic value of these resources and making choices based on those values. It's important to make choices that would maximize the economic benefit and significantly reduce costs.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said it appears the recommendation includes two issues of ensuring the statement reflects nutrients, as well as acknowledging that the resources can provide economic benefits, such as potential economic benefits of nutrient harvesting.

Mr. Burke noted there are many resources from nutrients, sediment, and recreation that could produce economic benefits to the community.

Dave Peeler, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DERT), said he believes the three paragraphs within the Purpose and Need Statement are well written and flow nicely. However, there were some conflicting comments by the Executive Work Group at its last meeting with one member's comment to delete

“restore” while another member preferred retaining “restore.” DERT supports retaining “restore” because much restoration is needed. There are efforts by the state and local governments on a number of water quality concerns upstream, including sediment. He suggested the statement should reflect those other efforts and plans to help reduce sediment loading down the river from erosion. Additionally, it might be helpful to differentiate between passive and active recreation uses within the second paragraph of the statement. Many people often have difficulty understanding passive uses. Passive uses include walking around the lake and aesthetically viewing the resource but it doesn’t include actively engaging with the resource, such as fishing, sailing, and boating. Many people confuse active and passive uses of the resource, both of which can have economic value.

Ms. Gardner-Brown agreed that noting the difference between passive and active use is a good suggestion in terms of recreation from a public use and activity perspective, as well as water quality, which considers primary use and secondary use. The suggestion is consistent with the other additional goals.

Sue Patnude said the language in the second paragraph referencing water draw-down and back-flushing control lacks any mention to chemicals that were used in the early 2000s to control milfoil. Chemical use might be additional information to include in the statement. In terms of economic value, a strong ecosystem service value should be considered. Sediment may be difficult to address, but it’s also important for tidal and salt marsh formation and carbon sequestration. The statement should include language addressing ecosystem service values.

Ms. Gardner-Brown asked whether ecosystem service value could be represented regardless of the selected long-term management option. Ms. Patnude affirmed that it would be important to reflect regardless of the option.

Bob Holman remarked that Commissioner Downing also pointed out the importance of sediment and suggested it should be included within the first sentence. He agreed with that suggestion. In fact, the inclusion of sediment within the second sentence of the first paragraph tends to reflect more of an afterthought. One of the discussions pointed out how the Proviso doesn’t directly address sediment. However, sediment is a reality that must be addressed regardless of whether it was addressed by the Proviso. Sediment is first and foremost while invasive species relative to sediment management are lower on the list because of its impact on the system. Most of the invasive species have self-corrected and the New Zealand mud snails are not as serious as reported. Including sediment as one of the key elements is important. Secondly, Commissioner Wolfe spoke to reintroducing the original second paragraph to provide historical context with respect to what’s occurred on the lake. He supported that suggestion as well.

Ms. Gardner-Brown concurred about the importance of sediment management. The team can continue to review the first two sentences. Additionally, the connection between sediment and eradication of the invasive species speaks to the way language is structured in the second to last sentence in the statement, which can also be reviewed by the team.

Steve Shanewise pointed out that language at the end of the second paragraph is conflicting because it speaks to Capitol Lake continuing to be an important recreational resource while the presence of invasive species resulted in the official closure of all public uses in 2009. The use of the waterbody continues to be restricted today and conflicts with the second paragraph. He questioned how the lake could an important recreational resource if it’s completely closed for recreational access.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said the issue speaks to Mr. Peeler's suggestion that there are two different types of recreational uses with passive uses associated with walking around the lake, birding, and picnicking, which are still active, and primary uses that touch the water, such as boating or swimming, which are restricted. She offered to review the draft to clarify. Mr. Shanewise recommended revising the sentence to state, "Capitol Lake continues to be an important regional and passive recreational resource." The second to the last sentence in the second paragraph could also be revised to reflect, "The presence of invasive species resulted in official closure to all active recreational uses." Ms. Gardner-Brown agreed the suggestion was a good clarification.

Ms. Patnude noted Mr. Shanewise's comments are important as the statement leads to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. Only facts should be included in the Purpose and Need Statement. Any language that doctors the statement shouldn't be the focus. Passive and active recreational and invasive species are all important and should be addressed in the Purpose and Need Statement.

Ms. Gardner-Brown invited everyone to review the statement to ascertain whether all important issues are reflected and submit written suggestions by the close of business on July 28. The team reads all comments and strives to ensure the statement is reflective of a consensus.

Mr. Holman remarked that since the lake is closed today, it doesn't negate the lake as a resource. The lake has been a resource in the past and could be in the future for swimming, boating, and all in-water activities, as well as for passive activities. It wouldn't be inconsistent to indicate that the lake is a recreational resource. Invasive species will be present regardless of the management option selected. It's important to correct all species problems today, as those activities are not dependent upon the selection of a long-term option. He encouraged the team not to consider invasive species as the criteria for which option would be selected, but it should be included as criteria for improving the water body.

Mr. Burke echoed similar comments. The choice of words could weigh in favor of one option versus another. For instance, passive recreation could weigh heavily on the options of walking around the lake or estuary while active recreation could weigh towards maintaining the lake for boating and fishing. He suggested not including a selection and retaining only "recreation." The key is maximizing the benefit of recreational uses in terms of the economic value.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said the conversation surrounding passive versus active and the characterization of the recreation has been an interesting issue. Feedback from the Executive Work Group, as well as the input from this review will help the team when revising the document.

Second Touch on Identification of Hybrid Options and Overview of Input Received

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed the materials and changes since the first touch. A graphic of an overview of existing long-term management options for Capitol Lake as a product of the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) process or identified recently by the community was shared with attendees. The intent of the Proviso is to identify hybrid options. The graphic is an overview providing a high level snapshot of the various options. The options include:

- Dual Basin Option developed from the CLAMP process or Alternative D in the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study
- Dual Estuary/Lake Idea (DELI) proposed by a community member. The primary difference is the size and the structure around the reflecting pool. The reflecting pool is larger at approximately 48 acres compared to 39 acres in the Dual Basin Option. The separation between the pool and the estuary is different with a freshwater reflecting pool compared to a saltwater reflecting pool. The

approach for sediment management is different. The team received several other options that are similar to the DELI Option with variations. Those options may be reflected in a larger scale, in the second touch material package.

An additional sheet supplemental to the hybrid options reflects the existing options, as well as a managed lake sub-option. The Managed Lake and the Restored Estuary options were identified during the CLAMP process. The Restored Estuary option was developed by both the CLAMP process and the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study. The Managed Lake Sub-Option: Percival Creek Rechanneling and Salmon Habitat Rehabilitation Plan was categorized as a sub-option because it encapsulates the Managed Lake option but it adds an addition of a rechanneled Percival Creek and proposes a new streambed west of the relocated Deschutes Parkway.

A variation to the Restored Estuary and the Managed Lake option were submitted as high level comments and are included as Notes #3 and #4. Note #3 is a conceptual variation of the Restored Estuary option and includes active sediment management through installation of an adjustable weir at the north end of the South Basin. The weir would capture sediment upstream of Budd Inlet and could be coupled with downstream maintenance dredging and installation of infrastructure, such as a jetty, to minimize sediment deposition near Port facilities. The option was proposed by a member of the Executive Work Group.

Another concept is the Managed Lake Sub-option provided through public comments. The option fills part of the existing lake to create a greater park resource.

Many of the conceptual ideas included in the notes were from brief comments submitted by the public. The options have not been through technical analysis or examined for permitting feasibility.

Bob Wubbena, CLIPA, reported he attended the last Executive Work Group meeting. Several members attempted to put a level of evaluation and detail behind the various options. He complimented Ms. Gardner-Brown on how she handled the discussion. The CLIPA Capitol Lake Sub-Option uses all the same technical data that the CLAMP used during its process. CLIPA also had an extensive team of professionals who advanced the concept to the next level. There is no question about the level of detail that was analyzed during that process. He recognized that some of the other sub-options for hybrids are concepts that likely didn't have the same level of analysis. One way to assist everyone in understanding is by considering that only two viable options exist: either leaving the dam or removing the dam. All other comments associated with those options are essentially a design consideration for each option. The estuary option removes the dam with all other elements becoming sub-options. The state's studies completed by the CLAMP process speak to the same amount of background information. When CLAMP recommended the two concepts, a small group of people arrived at a recommended strategy for the Estuary and the Managed Lake option from the same studies that CLIPA used in its recommendation. The EIS would review all sub-elements to avoid environmental and economic impacts or enhance recreation. He suggested the consultant team should consider separating the two options of either retaining or removing the dam and the sub-elements of both. The CLAMP Managed Lake is a hybrid of the technical data produced by the CLAMP process. That's what creates confusion for many people. Consequently, some of the ideas included as notes may have been documented as part of the state-funded study, but never brought forward. The entire terminology of hybrid options creates a nomenclature that isn't defined. He suggested formatting the information by either retaining or removing the dam options, as the final documentation of cost between the two options is the huge cost of infrastructure necessary for either removing or retaining the dam, as many of the sub-options are essentially environmental considerations.

Ms. Gardner-Brown acknowledged the interesting point of representing the hybrid as a sub-option to a restored estuary. The comments appear to be consistent with the directive in the Proviso. The hybrid option in terms of how the executives perceive the alternative is the marrying or the combination of the reflecting pool and restoration of the pre-existing resource. She noted that the reference to the data and analysis addresses other points. During the Executive Work Group meeting, the same materials were reviewed with feedback on restructuring the presentation of the materials so that those options and conclusions preliminarily reviewed that received an extra level of analysis are presented together. That essentially would include the Managed Lake, Restored Estuary, and the Dual Basin options as one set of options that have been truth-checked and more information is available on the options than the options that were derived during the initial review of ideas incorporated within the other options. It's likely the consultant team will restructure the information, as it's important to identify that the conclusions by CLAMP are important to advance and shouldn't be ignored.

Mr. Wubbena said his comments have been misunderstood, as his intent was that the CLAMP options that were put forward were selected by a small group and were never approved by anyone other than the CLAMP Steering Committee. Those options should have no more standing than the CLIPA Managed Lake option because the CLIPA team completed as much or more analysis than the CLAMP process. The work by CLIPA is the same data that CLAMP used. Additionally, CLIPA utilized the Corps of Engineers work completed after the CLAMP process, which was a study completed in 2012. That information provided much more data, and from that standpoint, CLIPA data have more analysis than CLAMP data. Providing the CLAMP options with any more standing has no basis other than for a few people's opinions.

Ms. Gardner-Brown apologized for misunderstanding. Mr. Wubbena replied that CLIPA did not use CLAMP data but rather data from the state study because there is a difference.

Dominick Reale said there are many people interested in trying to restore Capitol Lake to the estuary that it once was. Many people who consider themselves environmentalists automatically assume that returning a resource to its pre-Columbus state would benefit the environment. However, he's seen evidence to the contrary in the form of ducks. When visiting Capitol Lake in the winter, he counted 3,000 or more ducks in Capitol Lake. The ducks are feeding, diving, and moving around within the system and are obviously finding what they need to eat whether its vegetation, fish, or mud snails. Whatever it is, the notion that returning it back to its original state is an environmental plus and everyone would be relieved of any responsibility to consider baseline conditions, is in error. The SEPA and NEPA process must consider baseline conditions. He would like to protect the ducks and would like the situation that exists with Capitol Lake as a shallow, freshwater lake next to a flyway as more important environmentally than many acres of mud flats. The idea of an estuary sounds good because many estuaries are good, but many estuaries in the South Sound tend to drain to nothing more than a channel and don't have holding water or provide much holding habitat for the creatures that everyone is hoping to save in the estuary. The result is a mud flat with nothing but algae. The snails are invasive and everyone wants to get rid of them, but it would be very difficult to do. Invasive species are difficult to eradicate. It likely could be proven that humans have done more damage than the snails and are likely harder to get rid of. Therefore, it's necessary to consider the draconian measures to take to try and eradicate snails and the toil it would take on the environment. Dr. Milne offered the idea that Capitol Lake is a treatment unit for many of the ailments flushing down the Deschutes River, such as sediments and solids and perhaps chemical and biological degradation of nitrates and phosphates. The Department of Ecology's study models dissolved oxygen that would be expected with or without the dam. The worst case scenario of a few numbers of a three-dimensional pixels model reflecting a higher dissolved oxygen limit speaks to a very weak case, as it doesn't reveal much and indicates that it isn't a strong phenomenon that's measured and doesn't amount to much. He questioned

whether the study really looked at the amount of sediment that would flush out if the dam was breached. However, it would lower dissolved oxygen considerably.

Ms. Gardner-Brown referred to written comments submitted on the wintering and feeding of ducks in Capitol Lake. The consultant team reviewed and considered those comments. The consultant team also agrees that the baseline should be considered. Ms. Gardner-Brown said her work history includes SEPA/NEPA environmental analysis. She worked on projects and understands the importance of considering a baseline. The baseline provides the method for analyzing conditions and changes, which would be completed as part of the SEPA analysis. The Proviso does not specifically call for an effort to study baseline conditions, but it would be completed in the future Phase 2 process as part of the EIS process. In terms of the estuary and holding water, the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study concluded that 75% of the time, the area currently occupied by the reflecting pool would maintain a reflecting pool through tidal action. The Deschutes Feasibility Study Cost and Design Estimate that provided this information was issued in 2007. The primary author is Moffatt & Nichol. The Technical Committee has discussed the eradication of the mud snail. The Department of Fish and Wildlife is a member of the Technical Committee. During the meetings, WDFW members have conveyed that any management option would include eradication of the mud snail. The information has been included in the graphics as a Note stating that there will be efforts to eradicate the New Zealand mud snail, as well as a footnote that clarifies the step is a key option to any of the management components by the coordinating official from WDFW.

Mr. Reale asserted that it might not be feasible. Ms. Gardner-Brown said she's uncertain as to the answer but the issue would be included as a work item.

Mr. Burke pointed out that there is no discussion of nutrient harvesting. He presented over 40 pages of detailed analysis and cost estimates and it appears to have disappeared. Ms. Gardner-Brown replied that the consultant team prepared another table of information. The intent of the table is to document other elements that could be applied to any or all of the options to increase consistency with project goals. Nutrient harvesting is listed as an option that could be considered for any of the alternatives. The note specifically identifies how nutrient harvesting would improve water quality and ecological functions within the watershed. The consultant team agreed the proposal should be further reviewed.

Jewel Goddard commented on the process of public comment and public input. He suggested the process would likely want to reflect involvement by the wider community. He encountered great difficulty in finding the location of the first meeting he attended. Most public meetings are held at the Olympia Community Center. He expressed appreciation for the work completed but wanted to comment on the process. He recommended advertising the meeting so the public is informed about the meeting and the location. He only learned about the meeting from another individual who is involved. Using public input or public comments for this particular process could be considered a sham. It's likely the effort would want to involve the public.

Ms. Gardner-Brown agreed public involvement is important. During the development of the process, key stakeholder groups were identified for equal standing. Those groups include the Executive Work Group, Technical Committee, and community stakeholders. The Executive Work Group is comprised of representatives from the City of Olympia, City of Tumwater, Thurston County, Port of Olympia, and the Squaxin Island Tribe. The Technical Committee additionally includes staff from the Department of Ecology, WDFW, and the Department of Natural Resources. All members were encouraged to post information on agency websites. Many of the agencies include links on their respective websites to help publicize the effort. Materials are also linked on the DES website.

Mr. Goddard said the efforts are nearly incidental. His plea is to conduct the meetings in downtown Olympia so that citizens are informed about the meeting. If wider public input is the desired goal, the effort will only attract those who are the most interested.

Ms. Gardner-Brown added that all public input through the formal community input submissions online would be included as an appendix to the Proviso Report.

Ms. Patnude stressed the importance of promoting the community meetings, as well as setting a realistic expectation because many people believe the process will solve the problems. The intent is to produce the Proviso Report. There are many unknowns associated with the next step of an EIS if the Legislature doesn't fund the effort.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said although the Proviso requires public participation, there is nothing in the Proviso that speaks to this process as usable for a future EIS. During the review of all documents, she did not find any reference to a Purpose and Need Statement. It's not possible to complete an EIS without a statement. The smaller and collective efforts of this process will springboard or provide a platform to reflect that the effort is prepared and should receive funding to pursue an EIS. The effort has been intentionally thoughtful about what has been released and whether all the work can be used for the EIS.

Ms. Patnude agreed everyone is doing a good job. However, it's important to convey to the public what the process means. Local meetings often afford opportunities for feedback and input more successfully while state processes are typically more challenged. Advertising the meetings can be a difficult process.

Mr. Peeler pointed out how the meeting is competing with speeches by the President and Vice President of the United States and how that competition impacts meeting attendance. Since the process is utilizing various diagrams from various sources, the diagrams should be standardized for equal characterization between the different options. He disagreed with a previous comment, as most people believe there are an estuary or lake, and that the middle hybrid options are a reflection of both. It makes sense to continue with that type of approach even though there may be significant differences. As previously indicated, some of the elements could be applied to different options. It would be useful to highlight those elements that could be interchangeably applied to other options. In terms of the comments with respect to baselines, invasive Europeans had created thousands of acres of freshwater habitat in Puget Sound lowlands, mountains, and in eastern Washington for water fowl while also destroying 85% of all estuarine acres in Puget Sound. In terms of baselines, he suggested going back approximately 150 years. It is tremendously difficult to restore estuaries once they have been destroyed. The state will be lucky if 30% of what's been lost is restored. This area is a large part of the estuary system that is possible to restore. The true baseline for the EIS would need to consider the comparatives in the broader Puget Sound or Puget Sound lowlands. Future sea level rise will be great with the increase forecasted to be over nine feet in the next 40 years. He cautioned against statements of enhancing the berm along Heritage Park to protect from flooding because of the unknowns at this time unless it pertains to flooding from the river.

Mr. Goddard said that by having a general public meeting, many opinions are offered versus what the effort has been striving to attain by seeking facts from data. He read Dr. Milne's report and subsequent reports. Dr. Milne must have devoted hundreds of hours of his time to develop the reports. He said he can respect scientists as their input is worth a lot. In the past, he owned a house on a lake and moved and purchased another home elsewhere. What attracted him to the area was the beautiful necklace around the lake. When he first arrived, he became involved in the CLAMP process. CLAMP's math on the cost to remove the dam was highly inaccurate. Since then, the figures have been revised upwards significantly.

During the CLAMP meetings, a representative attended from the Squaxin Island Tribe while other political members often rotated. The Tribal representative was very skilled in controlling the group and it was always towards his preferences, which may have accounted for the final determination.

Mr. Burke asked what could be done about the Washington State Department of Ecology studies on water quality parameters. The primary parameter was dissolved oxygen. The Department did not address all the other water quality issues. The Center for Disease Control has a website for toxic algae. The situation in Florida is now occurring in Puget Sound with the advent of toxic algae in Henderson Inlet that kills young salmon. It's a huge issue that is not addressed in the Department of Ecology's focus on dissolved oxygen and no focus on nutrient problems from Capitol Lake. Opening the flood gates would expose Puget Sound to the nutrients. Last year, the state experienced huge episodes of fish kills in the Pacific Ocean. He asked whether there could be some feedback, as the Department of Ecology is taking a narrow telescopic view and only looking at dissolved oxygen. He suggested looking at all water quality parameters. If the adoption occurred of what the Department wants today by removing the dam, he questioned the outcome in 10 years when other issues arise. It's been an historic trend with LOTT when it originally installed its wastewater plant and secondary wastewater treatment plant leading to fish kills when it first became operational. LOTT installed the nitrogen removal plant and discovered the issue was still present leading to the construction of satellite plants that take partially treated waste and discharge it to drinking water aquifers, which will lead to further problems because of assorted toxins. There has to be some kind of overview of water quality and bringing in all the elements.

Mr. Shanewise referred to the comments on water quality in Capitol Lake. The previous speaker is right as there are thousands of water fowl that use the lake. When back flushing of the lake was discontinued in 1999 that allowed submersed vegetation to remain and flourish, which is the food source for ducks. Most of the water fowl relocated from the Black River system when the feed in Capitol Lake became available. The visual fetch on Capitol Lake is much greater than on the Black River. There used to be thousands of ducks on the Black River, which have subsequently relocated to Capitol Lake. He is fairly certain that if Capitol Lake is removed, those birds would relocate to the Black River, which is now a refuge.

Ms. Patnude asked about the possibility of combining the DELI and Dual Lake options. Mr. Shanewise was the original proposer of the Dual Basin option during the CLAMP process. She suggested combining the two options.

Ms. Gardner-Brown agreed that there are many similarities between some of the options that are under review for the hybrid options, and the options could be combined in a future design process. She hadn't previously considered combining those two options.

Ms. Patnude said that when the eventual EIS occurs, she assumes the options would be programmatic and that all options would be studied.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said it speaks to determining which elements work more effectively between the two and ways to maximize the recommendations from both options. The team is considering a project-specific EIS. The programmatic EIS evaluated several options in 1999. The intent of this EIS is to select a management option.

Mr. Holman said his impression following the last Executive Work Group meeting was that there were some members who were trying to narrow the field to give CLAMP's three options preeminence over anything the community had proposed. That runs counter to the Proviso because it encourages a public

process for community ideas. By its nature, those ideas can't be vetted to the degree that the \$2 million CLAMP study was vetted. He encouraged the team not to give those ideas second class citizenship. Although not fully vetted, they are a sincere effort by the community to play a role. The team and DES is attempting to come up with a process that includes the community and a process that the community can accept. He also tends to agree with Mr. Wubbena that there really are only two options of a dam or no dam. The dual basins do not include a dam, but rather the amount of the North Basin would be preserved for a small reflecting pool. In essence, all dual basin options are a subset of an estuary because 80% of the volume would still be an estuary. It really is one or the other with some options. He encouraged the team to consider structuring the options in a way that not only shows the CLIPA proposal as a sub-option of a managed lake but that the dual options are sub-options of an estuary. Mr. Peeler is also right about sea level rise. It's possible to discuss whether the dam provides some flooding protection, which it does to some degree, but sooner or later, the City of Olympia will need to face the issue of sea level rise. The City has voted to save the City. There would need to be some kind of barrier or tide gate in the future if sea level rise occurs. The existing system provides some flood protection. In the future, it's possible a larger system would be needed to provide more flood protection, which leads to the question of why the system would be removed only to be replaced with a bigger system in the future. There also has been much discussion surrounding the vetting of the CLAMP studies. While it's true that much money was spent on studies, a number of things have changed and it's important to recognize that many of the assumptions by CLAMP have changed. The fact that water quality in Capitol Lake is good for swimming wasn't recognized by CLAMP. The intent is not re-creating CLAMP because it was essentially a failed system with three of the jurisdictions not supporting the recommendation that subsequently wasn't moved forward by DES for a variety of reasons. He cautioned against re-creating CLAMP but rather to seek community input on other options and take advantage of new information and not lose the new information that could change the entire picture.

First Touch on Review of Existing and Hybrid Options

- **Feedback from the Technical Committee and Executive Work Group**
- **Discuss Consistency with Goals**
- **Identification of Data Gaps**
- **Brainstorm Components of Options**

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed a table of intended consistency with project goals for all hybrid long-term management options. The intent of the table was taking goals and objectives that were formulated as part of the initial April meeting series and providing a narrative of how the various options would be consistent with those goals. The information reflects two approaches. Information from existing documents from the CLAMP process and the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study was used to populate the table. Additionally, the team reached out to community members for some key options and reflected that information; however the information was not verified by DES. A disclaimer in red type was added to the top of the table stipulating the information wasn't vetted. The team worked closely with the proponents of the other options. For the Restored Estuary option, the team worked with DERT, and also ensured that the narrative was consistent with the conclusions from the CLAMP process and the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study. DERT authored the language in the table, which is consistent with CLAMP and feasibility studies. The intent of the table is to compare the options to the goals rather than to the other options. Ms. Gardner-Brown encouraged attendees to submit additional comments no later than close of business on July 28.

The last table serves as a discussion piece to prompt more discourse on different approaches for elements of any long-term management option. Components within the long-term management options that should

be considered to increase consistency with project goals would be included within the table. Several elements included on the table were received throughout the process.

Mr. Burke commented that nutrient harvesting includes two components through the continuous removal of sediments at the south end of the lake and resold as top soil. He asked whether the elements could be revised to reflect a cohesive process and questioned how he might provide a presentation on the benefits of nutrient harvesting.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said the purpose of the table is to serve to further the conversation about nutrient harvesting and other elements before the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee discussed the option during a meeting. A year in review meeting is scheduled on December 16, which would include the Executive Work Group, Technical Committee, and the public to review all the work completed to date for preparation of the Proviso Report, as well as time for a facilitated discussion.

Greg Schundler asked whether public opinion is important to Floyd|Snider or the committee at this time. He cited the example of whether the public were to vote on the options and if those votes would be part of the process. Ms. Gardner-Brown said the process was established with three primary stakeholder groups, as described earlier. All feedback from the three stakeholder groups are reflected in the materials. The Technical Committee is providing resource agency background, the Executive Work Group serving as the high level policy group, while the community is the user of the resource. The process is a balance of the three groups.

Mr. Schundler said the last public survey of water ratepayers expressed overwhelming support for fish health. His concern is that despite his attempts to convince people who would like an estuary restored to attend, most of them don't attend. Consequently, their voices are silent. Even attending the meetings is an economic privilege and if the committee and Floyd|Snider is serious about gauging public opinion, he asked for additional review of the Elway Research Study from 2009, which was a questionnaire with overwhelming support for an estuary. The hybrid is a false compromise. He asked that the Executive Work Group pursue an independent professional process to gauge the community's perspective.

Ms. Gardner-Brown replied that the process is not to select an option or to vote on an option. Rather the direction is to engage the public and identify additional hybrid options and present the range of options with the intent to move forward to an EIS process to screen and select a preferred alternative. Stakeholders are the method that has been utilized to solicit the different options.

Mr. Peeler suggested that some of the language in the options speaking to "would minimize" or "would improve" should be changed to reflect "may minimize" or "may improve" as many of the options were not analyzed. He also recommended separating, "Improvement of stormwater conveyance system and Heritage Park berm" within the discussion table as they are two different unrelated elements that should be examined separately. Aside from the initial dredging of sediment, there have been comments about the options for considering sediment traps, weir, or jetties that could deflect or trap sediment creating a separate category of options for controlling sediment.

Ms. Gardner-Brown affirmed that the Technical Committee and the Executive Work Group raised similar issues. The technical committee requested separating stormwater conveyance and Heritage Park berm. Rather than considering the components, the Executive Work Group suggested that the goals should be aligned with the components to help achieve the goal.

Mr. Schundler asked about the public outreach efforts to publicize the opportunities for public comment by DES. He asked whether DES has utilized social media, radio, and newspapers.

Ms. Gardner-Brown recapped the information about public outreach. Members of the Technical Committee and Executive Work Group are either resource stewards or representatives from jurisdictions and agencies. Those members have been engaged to help disseminate the information about public input opportunities. For example, the Squaxin Island Tribe included a link on its website linking directly to the DES Capitol Lake page. Each member of the committee was asked to provide similar links. Each jurisdiction also have email distributions.

Mr. Schundler offered to distribute flyers in downtown Olympia. He commented on the decrease in attendance at each community meeting.

Mr. Shanewise asked why the Capitol Lake icon disappeared from the DES webpage. Curt Hart said he would follow up.

Mr. Schundler expressed interest in receiving information on web traffic to gauge the effectiveness of the process to solicit stakeholder feedback.

Mr. Peeler referred to the options table and suggested the goal that speaks to minimizing long-term costs really speaks to direct and indirect costs associated with most of the options. He cited several examples of direct and indirect costs.

Mr. Schundler recommended notating which options might not align with state and federal priorities for funding.

Ms. Gardner-Brown thanked everyone for their comments. The next community meeting is scheduled on October 5.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Ms. Gardner-Brown adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m.