

Funding and Governance Committee
Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Planning
1500 Jefferson Street SE, Room 3229, Olympia, Washington 98504
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
May 17, 2016

Final Meeting Notes

Participants

Stave Hall, City of Olympia
Rich Hoey, City of Olympia
Ed Galligan, Port of Olympia
Shawn Myers, Thurston County
John Doan, City of Tumwater

Enterprise Services

Kim Buccarelli
Bob Covington
Chris Liu
Carrie Martin
Ann Sweeney

Consultant Team

Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd | Snider,
via teleconference
Christina Martinez, Jacobs, facilitator

Meeting Purpose

1. Launch a committee to support the Executive Work Group on funding and governance objectives outlined in the proviso for Capitol Lake long-term management.
2. Present the Phase I Implementation Plan, with a discussion of process and schedule for work occurring in 2016, and the role of the Funding and Governance Committee.
3. Begin to identify current models for funding and governance.

Notes

1. Welcome and Review

- A. Participants introduced themselves.
- B. DES welcomed participants and noted the importance of this kick-off meeting of the Funding and Governance Committee.
 - i. Encouraged the group to think creatively and not to limit its thinking, but to use a variety of examples to help develop an ideal model for short and long-term solutions.
 - ii. Highlighted the P3 (public-private partnership) model and federal block money as potential areas to consider.
 - iii. Facilitator Martinez reviewed the meeting purpose, agenda, and proposed ground rules.

2. Review of Proviso and Implementation Plan

- A. Reviewed proviso elements 1(e) and 1(f) related to funding and governance.
 - i. Referred to information gathering and report preparation involving community engagement.
 - ii. Reviewed the Phase I Implementation Plan that identifies the committees, their roles, and timelines.

- a) Described a two touch process with two reviews built into the process for the Technical Committee, Executive Work Group, and Community.
- a) Draft Proviso Report to the state Office of Financial Management by early December 2016.
- b) Final Proviso Report to the Legislature by December 30, 2016.
- c) Funding and Governance Committee is on a separate track with updates to the Executive Work Group monthly. The schedule also includes a discussion of funding and governance at the fall meetings of the Executive Work Group and Community.
- ii. Suggested role to help identify governance and funding models.
 - a) Conceptual options and the degree of community support
 - b) One time cost for construction
 - c) Long-term cost for operational/maintenance (possibly 40 to 50 years)
 - d) Consider how options or recommendations for funding and governance will align with a potential environmental impact statement (EIS) process.

3. Current Management Model; Framework for Costs

- A. DES explained the current management model.
 - i. DES manages the current Capitol Lake through a 30 year lease with the state Department of Natural Resources, which owns the tidelands (1998 to 2028). DES owns some of the land around the lake including Heritage and Marathon Parks.
 - ii. As part of the Capitol Campus, Capitol Lake is under the jurisdiction of the State Capitol Committee.
 - iii. Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee provides guidance and recommendations to the State Capitol Committee.
 - iv. The state Legislature is the current authorizing entity and approves funding.
- B. Capitol Lake Alternatives Analysis provided estimated cost ranges for a 50-year timespan (as of July 2009), to give the group a rough-order-of magnitude of costs.
 - i. The data will need to be updated to reflect current costs and conditions for whatever alternatives are considered under an EIS.
 - ii. Assumptions will need to be reviewed.
 - iii. Suggest considering total cost of ownership.
 - iv. The CLAMP Recommendations Report did not develop a sediment management plan or a funding and governance model.

4. Discussion of Proviso Elements for Funding and Governance

- A. DES reviewed the RCW's referenced in the proviso (RCW 36.61 Lake and Beach Management Districts and RCW 90.72 Shellfish Protection Districts)
 - i. Thurston County and the City of Tumwater collect revenue for districts like these (Henderson and Nisqually shellfish protection districts, Black Lake, Long Lake, Scott Lake)
 - ii. Suggestion to consider authorities that exist for counties and consider if there are county-wide benefits that would make a county-wide approach reasonable.
- B. Suggestion to look at the results of work underway for Chesapeake Bay – the company running that project has an operation in Seattle.
- C. Suggestion to take a watershed approach.
- D. Suggestion to identify “Our Story” to understand the purpose to help identify funding options.
 - i. History and design of the lake.
 - ii. History of funding or lack of funding

- iii. Understand current level of maintenance.
- E. DES will share links to specific information regarding history from the DES website.
- F. Funding Model Examples (Group Brainstorm)
 - i. Watershed Management District
 - a) Water Quality and Sediment Management
 - b) Combined model or separate models
 - ii. Conservation Futures Program Model (see RCW 84.34.200)
 - iii. Lake Management District Model
 - iv. County-wide Taxing Authority/LID. Consider payment versus benefits
 - v. Port-wide Taxing Authority
 - a) Example: Levy for Sediment Management
 - vi. Columbia River - Joint venture between Oregon and Washington Ports
 - vii. LOTT– Independent nonprofit organization controlled through an intergovernmental agreement between Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, and Thurston County. LOTT provides the service and cities collect the revenue to pay LOTT. LOTT has no taxing authority.
 - viii. Thurston County Public Utility District has county-wide taxing authority and a water quality mission.
 - ix. Flood Management Model
 - x. Salmon Recovery Funding Board Funding Model
 - xi. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services Coastal Program
 - xii. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sport Fish Restoration Program
 - xiii. Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund
 - xiv. Washington Wildlife Recreation Program
 - xv. Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program
 - xvi. Aquifer Protection District (Spokane County Model)
 - xvii. Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account
 - xviii. See Floyd|Snider report for other funding sources.
- G. Question regarding if some other entity could manage Capitol Lake. DES noted the required involvement of the Department of Natural Resources as owner and Legislature as the authorizing environment. DES referenced state-owned property in Skagit County known as North Cascades Gateway Center as an example of a collaborative planning effort between the state, local government, tribal government, and the community with a shared vision to eventually transfer the property to local control. DES is open to options that may differ from status quo.
- H. Ideas to Consider Studying
 - i. Consider financial stacking. A variety of options may work together.
 - ii. Model should be self-sustaining.
- I. Suggestion to have the Chesapeake Bay project consultants attend an upcoming Funding and Governance Committee meeting.
- J. Discussion of whether the Technical Committee and Funding and Governance Committee meetings should be open to the public.

5. Next Steps/Action Items

- A. DES: Send email to the committee with links for history of Capitol Lake.
- B. Shawn: Research the models used by Thurston County to share at the next meeting.

- C. Steve: Look for draft legislation by Senator Karen Fraser for drainage maintenance district; (or DES will call Senator Fraser's office).
- D. DES: Create a matrix framework to organize funding and governance areas of interest to the committee.
- E. All: Fill in the matrix and return to DES/Carrie who will compile for review at the next committee meeting.
- F. DES: Consider Chesapeake Bay project for a future committee meeting (or a joint meeting with the Executive Work Group).

Funding and Governance Committee
Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Planning
Matrix
May 23, 2016

	Name of Conceptual Model
Description of Conceptual Model	
Long-term management option this model pertains to: Lake, Hybrid and/or Estuary	
Objectives of Governance	
Objectives of Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Capital Costs • For Operational and Maintenance Costs 	
Who are the Participants and/or Significant Stakeholders in Governance? (Who should make up the Governing Body?)	

<p>Who are the Participants and/or Significant Stakeholders in Funding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Capital Funding • For Operational and Maintenance Funding 	
<p>What is the Authorizing Environment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting • Ownership • Legislative • Other 	
<p>How is Success Measured?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-sustaining • Other 	
<p>What is the Degree of Support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Support • Legislative Support • Other Support 	
<p>Other</p>	