



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.
July 19, 2016

Meeting Notes

Participants

John Doan, City of Tumwater
Megan Duffy, Natural Resources
Ed Galligan, Port of Olympia
Steve Hall, City of Olympia
Rich Hoey, City of Olympia
Shawn Myers, Thurston County
Ray Peters, Squaxin Island Tribe

Enterprise Services

Bob Covington
Searetha Kelly
Carrie Martin
Ann Sweeney,
via teleconference

Consultant Team

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

Meeting Purpose

1. Review and discuss comparison of various district models.
2. Review and discuss attributes needed for the success of any model (developed at June meeting).
3. Compare approaches to attributes.
4. Discuss options for Proviso Report and how to convey each government's "degree of support."

Notes

1. Welcome and Introductions

- A. Paul Dziedzic welcomed participants to the meeting.
- B. Participants introduced themselves.

2. Review Meeting Purpose and Agenda

- A. Paul Dziedzic reviewed the Meeting Purpose, Goals, Agenda, and Next Steps/Action Items from the June 21, 2016 meeting.

3. Process Updates

- A. There will be no technical committee, executive work group or community meetings in August. The meeting topics will be combined with next steps for the September meeting series.

4. Update on Action Items from June Meeting

- A. DES sent out the information on the Chesapeake Bay Governance Model to all committee members.
- B. DES is trying to get someone from the Chesapeake Bay project to speak to the committee.
- C. Thurston County provided the following requested information (some at the meeting and some as a follow-up):
 - i. Number of billable parcels in Thurston County: 121,953
 - ii. Total assessed value in Thurston County: \$27.898 billion
 - iii. Number of billable parcels in the Deschutes Watershed: 30,162
 - iv. Total assessed value in the Deschutes Watershed: \$8.7 billion
 - v. Thurston County is currently levying .04 cents per \$1,000 in assessed value for the Conservation Futures Levy.
 - vi. Thurston County also collects a Conservation District assessment of \$5.00 per parcel, as authorized in RCW 89.08, which specifically includes “sediment damages” and harbors. The total Conservation District assessment for 2016 is \$537,000.
- D. City of Olympia does not have a copy of the draft legislation for drainage maintenance districts. DES will check with Senator Fraser’s office.
- E. DES drafted a chart comparing various district and other models to be discussed on today’s agenda.

5. Review and Discuss Comparison of District Models

- A. Ann Sweeney summarized the comparison chart and explained that in most cases different models were created for specific needs. There are many different models -- some models are for funding, some for governance, and some include both. The models presented in the table help to see the different aspects that may be possible. Pieces of various options could be combined into something that would work for Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed.

6. Review and Discussion Attributes of a Successful Model

- A. The committee agreed to begin with the Attributes and see if these are the elements needed to support a workable model.
- B. The committee reviewed the Attributes by discussing each item in detail and asked questions and clarified thought processes.
- C. The committee needs to be comfortable with the Attributes so they can be used as elements of a future model.
- D. How are contributors to the problem defined?
 - i. What is the problem? Water quality, sedimentation, other?
 - ii. Contributors: All parcels in the watershed, the State of Washington (created the dam), stormwater customers of the cities.
 - iii. Much of the sediment coming down the river is naturally occurring, what percent?
- E. How do you define benefits of the project to understand the appropriation of cost, such as which entities would pay for sediment dredging, etc.?
- F. Conversation regarding those who benefit (list does not identify degree of benefit) – Port of Olympia and its customers, LOTT rate payers, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Ecology (acting for the people of the state), Olympia Yacht Club and marinas, visitors to

- the Lake and Capitol Campus, tribal governments, and anyone who uses the Puget Sound. The committee agreed that it really depends on the long-term management option.
- G. Should costs be assigned differently between contributors and those that benefit? Should financing be shared? Equity includes having stakeholders at the table too. Equity should not always be tied to dollars (maintenance fees and taxes). Need shared distribution of costs. Shared funding is a concept within the Attributes.
 - H. A framework should be developed including beneficiaries, contributors, and the State's role. Recognize the existing framework of RCWs that impact Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed.
 - I. Tessa Gardner-Brown explained that there are three requirements for funding:
 - i. Funding for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) – This process will review temporary and operational impacts and benefits of the project through the lens of the built and natural environment. It will look at ways to reduce the impacts while engaging coordinating agencies and the public. The EIS allows you to document the short and long-term impacts. Also helps you identify/reduce potential impacts. Usually there is not an analysis of funding and governance models in this process. It looks at baseline conditions and how they would improve or decline based on the option. The ultimate objective would be to have the least negative impact on the natural and built environment.
 - ii. Design, permitting and initial construction costs
 - iii. Long-term maintenance costs
 - J. The group discussed the Attributes list further and suggested revisions.

7. Compare Approaches to Attributes

- A. The models could be more clearly defined after the EIS has been completed and a management option determined.

8. Discuss Options for the Proviso Report and How to Convey Each Government's "Degree of Support"

- A. The committee discussed its thoughts on the meaning of "general support".
- B. Any proposed governance model needs to take into account its relationship to existing statutory requirements and be developed within the statutory framework. The state Department of Natural Resources has a responsibility for the state's tidelands that must be carefully considered. The State Capitol Committee has approval authority for changes on the Capitol Campus.
- C. The final option chosen, and thus the extent of the costs, will have a large influence on what a funding and governance model will look like.
- D. There is benefit to keeping recommendations at a high-level, consistent with where the technical and executive work groups are in their work with regard to what is unknown and what is still to be determined.
- E. There seems to be general support for the conceptual, high-level Attributes. This list can act as a starting point for a future model.

9. Discuss Next Steps/Action Items

- A. DES will make the suggested revisions to the Attributes list and distribute to members.
- B. DES will develop a draft Funding and Governance section for the Proviso Report, to be reviewed by the committee members prior to the August 16 meeting and discussed at that meeting.

10. Next Meeting – August 16, 2016

- A. Review and refine draft Attributes list. Come to agreement on conceptual model attributes.
- B. In light of existing statutory authority, roles, and responsibilities – how will a model be incorporated into existing structures?
- C. Discuss draft Proviso Report section on Funding and Governance.

11. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.