



Technical Committee
Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Planning
1500 Jefferson Street SE, Room 2330, Olympia, Washington 98504
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
October 20, 2016

Meeting Notes

Participants

Rich Doenges, Ecology
Cristiana Figueroa-Kaminsky, Ecology
Chris Conklin, WDFW
Monica Shoemaker, DNR (via WebEx)
Kristin Swenddal, DNR
Andy Haub, City of Olympia
Bill Helbig, Port of Olympia
Brad Murphy, Thurston County
Dan Smith, City of Tumwater

Enterprise Services

Lindsey Aldridge
Ann Larson
Carrie Martin
Gabrielle Stilwater

Floyd|Snider Team

Tessa Gardner-Brown
Jessi Massingale, PE

Public Observers

Dennis Burke
Jack Havens
Bob Holman
Dave Peeler

Meeting Purpose

1. Discuss the revised September materials regarding relative range of costs for components of the long-term management options, including feedback from the Executive Work Group and the Community.
2. Review and discuss the Draft Proviso Report.

Notes

1. **Welcome and Agenda Review**
 - A. Floyd|Snider team reviewed the meeting purpose, agenda, and packet of materials.
2. **Process Updates from DES and Review of Ground Rules for Observers**
 - A. Reviewed ground rules for community members choosing to observe Technical Committee meetings.
 - B. Executive Work Group will have its “second touch” regarding relative comparison of costs for options and will review the draft proviso report at their meeting on October 28.
 - C. Hold December 16, 2016 for the Year-In-Review meeting.

3. Second Touch on Relative Comparison of Costs for Options; Feedback from Executive Work Group and the Community

- A. Floyd|Snider discussed changes to the Relative Comparison of Costs for Options document.
 - The Managed Lake CLIPA Sub-Option was updated based on input from the option proponent. Dredging quantities were reduced to be comparable to the Restored Estuary Option, and is intended to produce shallower lake conditions than the Managed Lake Option. The Percival Creek Extension was also removed from the Managed Lake Sub-Option;
 - Based on the recommendation of OFM, the net present value of maintenance costs that was being considered at the suggestion of a community member was removed;
 - Notes were altered to include input from the Executive Work Group and the community to better clarify the cost comparisons.
- B. Because of the changes to the Managed Lake CLIPA Sub-Option, Figures 7a and 7b were also updated to reflect the new understanding of the option. Floyd|Snider reviewed the changes to the Overview of Alternate Options (7a) and the Reported Consistency with Goals (7b).
- C. Committee Members suggested that the revised Managed Lake CLIPA Sub-Option had not been through the same level of stakeholder review, with these newly proposed substantive changes, as the rest of the options.
- D. The figure needs further labeling to state that there is a high degree of uncertainty in the graphic until further design and technical analysis is completed.
- E. Is it documented that the two managed lake options describe very different kinds of lakes? Floyd|Snider reviewed the updated graphics in Figures 7a and 7b that describe the updated option. The Technical Committee recommended that a note is added to Figure 8, “See figures 7a and 7b for description of these options.”

4. Update on Review of Best Available Science

- A. Scott was not able to attend the meeting and provide a comprehensive update. Instead, the committee covered the Best Available Science as part of the overall look at the Draft Proviso Report, and described the approach to complete the review, where three categories were used: “yes,” “no,” and “uncertain.”

5. Review and Discuss the Draft Proviso Report; Review of Sediment Management Information and Report Section

- A. Floyd|Snider provided an orientation of the Draft Proviso Report and responded to comments and questions.
- B. The Purpose and Need Statement can be found in two places: in the monthly materials in Section 3, and in the appendix with materials for Phase 2.
- C. The Committee recommended that text is added to the Proviso Report to clearly document the change in the CLIPA option, as many of the earlier portions of the work and comments in Appendix C will still refer to the previous “Percival Creek Extension” option. This will be important to avoid confusion by readers.
- D. There was a discussion of how the options are categorized. “Existing” options are those from the CLAMP work and “Alternate” options include the DELI hybrid and the Managed Lake CLIPA Sub-option. Both of these categories are shown in the main body of the report, with associated graphics in the Figures section. The four “New Concepts”, which were not as fully developed are also documented in the report, with associated graphics in the Appendix.

- E. How does Herrera’s review of sediment reports connect with the cost graphic? Jeff Parsons reviewed the table of reports, and specifically assessed the USGS modeling report and its validity and applicability for future use. He did not do technical analysis or look at the changed dredge volumes, so there is not a connection between his work and the cost comparisons.
- F. Floyd |Snider reviewed the figures and tables, specifically updates to Table 3, with revisions suggested by the Executive Work Group, the Sediment Table, and Appendices, specifically Appendix C showing the visual representation of the “New Concepts.”
- G. Committee members were asked to provide comments by November 3. Tessa will resend the share file link.

6. Review of Action Items and Next Steps

- A. All: Proviso Report comments due Nov. 3, 2016
- B. All: Year-In-Review Meeting: Dec. 16, 2016, 9:30 a.m. at 1500 Jefferson Street