



**Funding and Governance Committee
Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Planning
1500 Jefferson Street SE, Room 2229, Olympia, Washington 98501
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
August 16, 2016**

Meeting Notes

Participants

Ed Galligan, Port of Olympia
Shawn Myers, Thurston County
Ray Peters, Squaxin Island Tribe
Kristin Swenddal, Natural Resources

Enterprise Services

Bob Covington
Searetha Kelly
Carrie Martin
Ann Sweeney

Consultant Team

Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
Paul Dziedzic, Dziedzic and Associates
via teleconference

Meeting Purpose

1. Agree on high-level conceptual model attributes.
2. Review and discuss how a model could be incorporated into existing structures.
3. Discuss the draft Funding and Governance section of the Proviso Report and how to convey support.

Notes

1. Welcome and Introductions

- A. Tessa Gardner-Brown welcomed participants to the meeting and introduced herself.
- B. Participants introduced themselves.

2. Review Meeting Purpose and Agenda

- A. Tessa Gardner-Brown reviewed the meeting goals and purpose.

3. Review and Discuss Revised High-Level Attributes List

Discuss How a Model Would Be Incorporated into Existing Structures

- A. Tessa reviewed the 10 items on the Attributes List and opened the floor for comments and suggestions.
- B. The committee reviewed and discussed the comments sent by John Doan, as he was unable to attend the meeting.
- C. A suggestion was made that the committee identify partners that are a necessary part of future funding and governance. Participants agreed that there may be value in adding partners, but it could also add to the model's complexity. Participants agreed to not rule

out future additional partners, to keep the door open for potential new partners in the future, but not to identify all potential future partners at this time.

- D. Does the committee agree on Conceptual Model Attributes? How would a model be incorporated into existing structures?
 - i. Participants supported including the Attributes List within the Proviso Report. Those present voiced support for the Attributes as currently written.
 - ii. The group discussed how a model could be incorporated into existing structures and statutory requirements. Participants decided proposing a model was premature. A future funding and governance model is too dependent on the determination of a preferred management alternative and its immediate and long-term costs. It would be presumptive at this point to identify a model and would be better to leave the options open.
 - iii. The Attributes are a good foundation for funding and governance moving toward a future Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The work on an EIS and work on funding and governance are interrelated processes. The EIS will include comparative costs, which will inform the funding and governance models. The EIS will guide toward a sediment management strategy and provide information regarding long-term management approach and cost that would inform the effort to develop a model for future funding and governance.

4. Discuss Draft Proviso Report Section on Funding and Governance

How can a section in the Proviso Report convey each government's "degree of support?"

- A. All of the identified state, local and tribal partners are at the table and actively participating, which demonstrates support for this on-going discussion. All are as supportive as possible without knowing future costs.
- B. All have shown general support to continue to be involved through future processes.
- C. The group wished to express its desire to look for a way to show a balance in the report that makes clear that they will all continue to work together to come to the best resolution while managing potential effects or commitments of shared funding.
- D. Strong support was voiced for continuing the work in a parallel effort to the EIS. This would allow a funding and governance group to research different options and components. As the EIS provides more definition for a long-term alternative, options for funding and governance models could also be narrowed.
- E. A suggestion was made to develop draft language for each proviso element – funding and governance.
 - i. Proviso element (e) shared funding: The Funding and Governance Committee voiced general support for continuing to stay engaged in this process and to continue working together on a concurrent effort to determine shared funding options as an EIS process moves along.
 - ii. Proviso element (f) shared governance: During the Phase 1 work, the Funding and Governance Committee looked at various existing models and structures for governance. The group will consider what comes from the EIS process and will develop a unique model to fit unique requirements in the Lower Deschutes Watershed. While there is not one model that can be identified now, participants

are committed to continuing to research components that could be combined to develop a workable shared governance structure to fit the future management alternative determined by the EIS work.

5. Discuss Next Steps

- A. Getting to the EIS. The Legislature would need to approve the funding request in order for the EIS process in Phase II to begin.
- B. Revised Funding and Governance section of the Proviso Report (Section 4) out to participants for review. DES will provide a red-lined draft version showing the changes.
- C. Sync on timeline/schedule.
- D. The committee will continue to work together.
- E. General support and commitment to move forward in a collaborative fashion.
- F. Chesapeake Bay Model can be shown in the list of suggested models, instead of discussed in the text, to focus text on on-going commitment and list of attributes.
- G. DES shared highlights of a meeting with Puget Sound Partnership. Puget Sound Partnership may be able to help with future resources for this effort depending on the chosen alternative; the Partnership's Action Agenda addresses restoration work.
- H. Members were reminded to brief Executive Work Group members to make sure there is concurrence with the Funding and Governance Committee's recommendations and an understanding of direction.
- I. The next meeting is scheduled for September 20 from 9:00 until 11:00 a.m. This will be the final meeting of the group prior to submission of the Proviso Report to the Legislature and the Office of Financial Management.

6. Discuss Action Items

- A. All – Agreed to reconvene at the September 20 meeting. (Ray Peters will join meeting via teleconference.)
- B. DES – Revise draft section for Proviso Report (incorporate conclusions from discussion and redistribute for review).
- C. DES – Follow up with state Department of Ecology on Lewis County's role within the Deschutes Watershed.
- D. DES—Discuss plan for briefing legislative members.
- E. Shawn – Look up Lewis County parcel count and value within watershed.
- F. All – Brief Executive Work Group members.

7. Next Meeting – September 20, 2016

- A. Confirm all members' agreement on the Attributes list.
- B. Discuss and refine draft Funding and Governance section for the Proviso Report.
- C. Develop plan for continuing Funding and Governance work in parallel to an EIS process.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 a.m.