



CAPITOL LAKE/ESTUARY COMMUNITY MEETING

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

Minutes

DES STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chris Liu, Director

Bob Covington, Deputy Director

Carrie Martin, Asset Manager

Ann Sweeny, Special Assistant

Jim Erskine, Communications

MEETING PRESENTERS:

Jessi Massingale, Floyd|Snider

Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jim Lengenfelder, Citizen

Bill McGregor, Port of Olympia

Greg Schundler, Citizen

Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services

Peggy Murphy, Citizen

Steve Trapp, DERT

Brad Murphy, Thurston County Resource Stewardship

Brianna Murphy, Citizen

Ilene LeVee, Citizen

Wendy Eklund, Citizen

Clydia Cuykendall, Citizen

Dennis Burke, Citizen

Sue Patnude, DERT

Hatley Carpenter, Citizen

Heather Fink, Citizen

Ed Crawford, Citizen

Wendy Steffensen, LOTT Clean Water Alliance

Jack Havens, Citizen

Joe Downing, Port of Olympia

Rick Antles, Citizen

Kim Lund, Citizen

Zena Hartung, DERT

Bill Sloane, Citizen

Hayley Gamble, Resident

Myra Downing, Citizen

Bill Hutchinson, Citizen

Karina Champion, Resident

Susan Zuelke, Citizen

Deb Nickerson, Citizen

Debbie Dunn, Citizen

Robert Holman, CLIPA

Virginia Beekman, Citizen

Skylar Linden, Citizen

Sarah Bredeson, Citizen

Ed Crawford, Citizen

John Sherman, Citizen

Denis Curry, Citizen

Gabrielle Gariepy, Citizen

Dave Peeler, DERT

John Newman, Citizen

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

Chris Liu, Director, Department of Enterprise Services (DES), convened the meeting at 5:42 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the second community meeting on Capitol Lake.

The community meeting provides a review of progress by the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group and an opportunity to receive information, learn about progress to date, and ask questions. The process is in the first phase of the long-term management of Capitol Lake. The first phase is scheduled to conclude in September with the development of a report by Floyd|Snider to the Legislature. Moving forward, the intent is to seek funding to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which would encompass

the second phase estimated to take two to three years to complete. The EIS process includes extensive public input, and would identify the long-term management option for Capitol Lake. Following completion of the EIS, Phase 3 would implement the selected a long-term option for Capitol Lake.

Carrie Martin, Asset Manager, DES, introduced Bob Covington, Deputy Director, DES, and Consultants Jessi Massingale and Tessa Gardner-Brown with Floyd Snider. The meeting's objective is to review the Phase 1 Implementation Plan, discuss the role of the community and material review cycle, review goals and objectives and stakeholder input from previous project documentation, and collaboratively identify goals for the long-term management of Capitol Lake through a facilitated discussion. The last community meeting was held in March to solicit input on public engagement throughout the process. Input from the March meeting indicated a desire by the community for facilitated discussions, presentations, and an opportunity to comment and discuss the information within a discussion/open house format. That feedback was incorporated within the overall process for community meetings.

Jessi Massingale and Tessa Gardner-Brown will share information on input received from the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group and the Technical Committee. Following a facilitated discussion, citizens are invited to complete a survey. The survey is also available online and can be accessed and completed by Friday, April 28 at the close of business.

Ms. Martin reviewed basic ground rules and acknowledged the importance of beginning the process with the community to enable a joint course of action as the process moves forward and information is released. Participants are encouraged to listen and be respectful of all opinions by others. Comments should be concise and remain on topic. To ensure adequate time to review all the topics and afford community participation, each monthly meeting will focus on a specific topic(s). Ms. Massingale will review specifics of the Phase 1 Implementation Plan. Because of the importance and value of community input, any information and feedback from the community will be shared with both the Technical Committee and the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group, comprised of governmental entities and the Squaxin Island Tribe. The three-group process (Technical Committee, Capitol Lake Executive Work Group, & Community Input) is critical to influence the final product for Phase I of the long-term management planning for Capitol Lake.

Ms. Massingale reported that many community members were able to attend previous Capitol Lake Executive Work Group meetings and are likely aware of the Phase 1 Implementation Plan. The Phase I Implementation Plan is intended to give a sense of the meeting cycle, flow of information, and provide a consistent opportunity to participate and provide feedback. As materials are released during the monthly cycle, the community and committees have a two-week period to provide feedback. Each community meeting includes a review of materials on the proviso element/monthly topic.

The process is designed to obtain information from the Technical Committee, Capitol Lake Executive Work Group, and the community to inform materials as they evolve to be incorporated within the Proviso Report. A parallel objective is increasing the efficiency of the EIS process by serving as the foundation for completion of the EIS. Each month a review of the materials will reflect how they have evolved and how they support Phase 2 efforts.

Ms. Massingale displayed and reviewed a flowchart outlining the project's Phase 1 timeline from March through December. The flowchart identifies all groups involved in the process. The Capitol Lake Executive Work Group includes elected officials from the Cities of Olympia and Tumwater, Thurston County, Port of Olympia, and a representative of the Squaxin Island Tribe. The work group reviews the

same materials presented during community meetings, enabling more than one opportunity for the community to hear the presentations.

The Funding and Governance Committee is comprised of members from each of the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group entities and includes subject matter experts such as city attorneys, city administrators, managers, or financial. Formation of the committee is currently in process. The committee is tasked to identify models for shared funding and governance of a long-term solution for Capitol Lake.

Members of the Technical Committee include agency and governmental representatives from Department of Ecology (ECY), Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), DES, Port of Olympia, City of Olympia, City of Tumwater, Thurston County, and the Squaxin Island Tribe with experience and knowledge in natural resources, agency, or city management relative to Capitol Lake.

Floyd|Snider is the consultant firm responsible for facilitating the input process, generating the materials, and completing the documentation.

The Sediment Management Panel is under formation. Membership may include individuals who are subject matter experts who have an understanding of the dynamics of sediment and sedimentation around Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet, and how the dam is managed and could affect a long-term management plan. Tribal representatives will have technical knowledge of studies completed to date. A geomorphologist consultant specializing in sediment transport modeling may also serve on the panel. The panel is responsible for the following:

1. Preparing a memorandum summarizing existing conditions on sediment accumulation and transport within Capitol Lake and the greater basin under existing conditions.
2. Scoping or defining the necessary evaluation or modeling work for completion in the future, as part of the Phase 2 EIS to assess sediment deposition and transport associated with future conditions under a range of management alternatives.

The panel is scheduled to convene its first meeting after all members are identified.

For the Technical Committee, each month a topic or proviso element will be presented. During the April cycle, the materials were presented to the Technical Committee on April 14. Technical Committee members reviewed and provided feedback on the materials. On the date of the Technical Committee meeting, a community input period was initiated for the materials, which are posted on the DES website to enable the community time to review the materials prior to the Community Input meeting on April 27.

Following initial feedback from the Technical Committee, the same information was presented to the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group on April 22 in conjunction with a review of the designated proviso element for April's review.

The Community Input meeting is a review of the same materials to close the "first touch" of materials with the two-week comment period ending Friday, April 28. In May, the cycle repeats with a "second touch" of the materials. "Second touch" materials are then finalized, summarized, and incorporated within the Proviso Report. There will also be a new "first touch" subject at each meeting.

The "first touch" topic in May is best available science. May materials will be available to the community on May 19 for a two-week comment period. The next Community Input meeting is scheduled on June 1.

The process affords everyone an opportunity to review initial topic information and track the material's evolution throughout the month-long process.

The goal in September and October is developing a draft Proviso Report to the Legislature. The report documents the process and the evolution of the materials to form the basis for the EIS process for Phase 2. Deadline for submission of the Proviso Report to the Legislature is December 30, 2016. The goal is to achieve meaningful progress on participation, and traction towards the long-term management of Capitol Lake, which may help to secure funding for a Phase 2 project EIS.

Public Comment

Dennis Burke questioned how the process culminates into a plan because there are two options of removing the dam and one that retains the dam, as well as a myriad of other options. The question is how those other options are factored. He cited the community values of spiritual and cultural values and others and asked how those values are relevant to the various options.

Ms. Massingale advised that the intent is queuing up for the next process. In order to construct a hybrid option, an estuary, or any other alternative, it's necessary to complete the public environmental review process of an EIS. The process surrounding the goals (community values) include consideration of the survey results with this month's input and essentially developing a new bar graph, as well as drafting purpose and need statements to assist in forming the basis of the EIS and permitting. As part of Phase I, a specific alternative would not be selected. Instead, the process is focused on highlighting community goals for a long-term management option and providing other information that could be used to select an option in the next phase. Additionally, the process is open to receiving input and ideas on all options. During June and July, the process will begin identifying a range of options. At this point, the process is not at conceptual design because selection of an option is not planned. Phase 2 would include selection of an option.

Mr. Burke questioned how the process weighs all the values of aesthetics, economic feasibility, and habitat, etc. The issue started with Capitol Lake violating the federal requirements for clean water. The Department of Ecology determined the only way to meet the requirement was removal of the dam. He asked how the team would weigh and integrate the requirements of the Clean Water Act 303(d) into the bar graph of community values. He cited them as pieces on a chessboard. He asked how the team would handle the pieces.

Ms. Massingale advised that the lists of values or goals were from the 1999 programmatic EIS public process and the CLAMP 2009 public process. The bar graphs are in relative order of magnitude of what the community conveyed was important. The values provide a sense of what matters to people the most. Not all goals are equal and weighted the same.

Joe Downing reported that while he is a Port Commissioner, he is speaking now as a private citizen. He thanked Ms. Massingale for the review of the materials. He referred to the graphic's yellow circles indicating, "Maintain recreational opportunities" and "Gain community support and broad agreement." Other information is dated from 7 and 17 years ago and both include support for the estuary with 46% and 63%. Those percentages represent major support for an estuary. However, he submitted that the sample is somewhat skewed. He submitted that it's not a real survey. Several individuals asked him to comment on his doorbell experience last year. He sent them an email indicating that during the campaign, they doorbelled from May through October 2015 and distributed over 4,000 flyers, knocked on that many doors, and engaged in many conversations about a wide range of topics. Only one or two people really engaged

in talking about favoring an estuary or getting rid of Capitol Lake. He was often asked where he stood on the issue and his response favored a swimmable, boatable Capitol Lake. His doorbell turf roughly included Tumwater, Lacey, Yelm, Tenino, and southwest Olympia. From that doorbelling experience, he believes he has a good handle on the heartbeat of the county. The lake is not an issue on the minds of a great majority of county residents. It's one of those issues where we expect our government to take care of it. Mr. Downing thought that ninety percent of the people in the county either favor the lake or have no opinion. Mr. Downing said he understands the Legislature provided DES with \$250,000 to carry out the study and believes it wouldn't take but \$5,000 to \$10,000 to do a survey to help answer the questions of what are the recreational opportunities and how do we gain community support (what do people want) instead of using somewhat dated numbers from a somewhat questionable survey. He believes there are some good people in the county who could put together a good survey and find out what the county wants. That would be valuable input. Mr. Downing added that he's also appreciative of the science within the process.

Ms. Massingale recommended transitioning to a review of the input from the Technical Committee and Capitol Lake Executive Work Group and then following up on questions.

Greg Schundler said he prefers not delaying his question as it pertains to the Elway Research Incorporated Survey from May 14, 2009 that was sent to all Olympia ratepayers for water. Thurston County could be a different sample of population. To be clear, 70% support doing what is best for water quality, fish, and wildlife, 15% support keeping the cost to taxpayers as low as possible, and 11% support maintaining the look of the lake. Furthermore, he visited the State Archives in Washington State and found two big boxes of documents dating from 1965 to present day. There is abundant information and interestingly, a survey every decade in the 1960s and 1970s. He is unsure whether the committee has considered the data. He offered to share photographs of the data. The notion of public opinion has been tested through independently validated surveys and that should be taken into account. He agreed from a statistical standpoint with Mr. Downing's point that it may be invalid data, as he studied statistics at Princeton University and the University of Washington for a master's degree. Additionally, Mr. Downing's survey is invalid and is not an official publication as referenced in his email. It's important to know that public research has been invested in these kinds of public opinion surveys and there is overwhelming support for "what is doing best for water quality, fish, and wildlife" (70%) and 11% maintaining the look of the lake and 50% supporting the lowest cost possible. It's important to ensure that everyone knows data exists in 2009.

Bill Hutchinson pointed out that the data is from the City of Olympia. Mr. Schundler identified the data as being from the City of Olympia.

Myra Downing questioned whether the lake option is still on the table. Ms. Massingale affirmed the option is one of many alternatives. In June and July, the schedule calls for identification and review of hybrid options. The directive specific to "hybrid" is from the proviso condition directing the identification of hybrid options. However, to ensure a thorough process (similar to an EIS), a range of options would be discussed, from status quo, to different hybrid options, to a full estuary, or a lake with improvement (sediment trap). At this time, no options are eliminated from consideration.

It's important to clarify that in terms of aesthetics, that goal is represented in the bar graph in relative order of magnitude of communications from the community at that time (1999 & 2009). It was important then and the current goal is to establish what's important today. The message isn't meant to convey that the values from yesterday would establish the future direction. The value of aesthetics is not biased towards either a lake or an estuary as the comments at that time spoke to community values of aesthetics

surrounding the lake, as well as the natural habitat and restoration of an estuary. Both those viewpoints are within the value of aesthetics. The graphs assist in setting the stage for understanding the current goals of all entities, communities, and stakeholders, and to shape and develop the purpose and need statements as tangible pieces to help prompt the EIS. In June and July, new information will include a range of options for comparison and discussion. That might result in the identification of a top option or options. However, the process is currently at a conceptual level. The EIS process and design identifies what's feasible and the real costs of each option. The community over the years has indicated it's important that the option should be economically feasible and cost effective and that it must make sense in terms of cost. The Phase I process is somewhat constrained in that respect because the designs of alternatives are not developed and therefore all questions cannot be answered. The intent is for stakeholders to help advance the process to the next phase, where design is further developed.

Bill Hutchinson said the information lacks any mention of the financial impact that could happen to all boaters within the basin if one particular option is selected. He believes that all the boating within the basin would be nonexistent. The economics of that situation are not represented. Ms. Massingale agreed that much of the information refers to "economically feasible" and it's reasonable to imply that it applies to an actual option and not necessarily to impacts on the local economy or tourism. Mr. Hutchinson noted that individual ownership of businesses would be affected, as well as boat owners and the Port. Ms. Massingale encouraged Mr. Hutchinson to include those concerns when completing the survey.

Mr. Burke asked whether the process is open to considering public health concerns and bacteria in the lake. Many other values could be added to the list of importance if people were aware of the consequences. Additionally, the process needs some kind of definition for the terms used in the process. For example, the term of "spiritual and cultural" needs to be defined. Conducting a survey is dependent on how the question is framed and how people are informed. Having a clear definition also aids in weighting the responses.

Karina Champion said she thought the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the broad values of the survey that people believe are important, as well as a continued discussion on the overall larger goals as opposed to discussing which particular options would or would not be considered.

Ms. Massingale affirmed it's the purpose of the meeting; however, some of the questions center on concerns about where the process is headed. The intent of the meeting is focusing the comments and discussion on the proviso elements. The goals are large and encompass so much. That's why it's important to review the graphics and how that information was reviewed by the Technical Committee and the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group. The information is used as the building block for the description for the environmental process and the purpose and need statements.

Gabrielle Gariepy said she and her teammates are working on a school project. She asked about the identity of the groups that want to change Capitol Lake to an estuary or retain the lake. Ms. Massingale said the list of stakeholder groups for an estuary or a lake is extensive. She identified the Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association (CLIPA) as an organization with knowledge and energy around the lake option. The Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DERT) is an organization that supports an estuary. There are other groups falling between the two options, such as the Olympia Downtown Association, recreational boaters, and all types of people with different interests.

Director Liu identified many of the stakeholders in attendance represent CLIPA and DERT. Ms. Massingale suggested meeting with individuals after the meeting to learn more about each group. Most community members are interested in ensuring that all impacts of any option are considered.

Briefing on Feedback from the Technical Committee and Capitol Lake Executive Work Group

Tessa Gardner-Brown expressed appreciation to participants for attending and engaging in the process. Regardless of the outcome of public opinion, it's important to receive all feedback, as well as for DES and Floyd|Snider to hear what the public has to say, which is the intent of the meeting.

A major goal of the process is ensuring input. It's important that all stakeholders receive the information, as well as receiving information from previous meetings. There likely will be a consensus on some ideas in terms of the public's interests. The Technical Committee is evaluating the technical and detailed scientific studies. All those efforts are reviewed with all stakeholder groups as part of a transparent process.

The first conversation began at the Technical Committee meeting on April 14. The Phase 1 Implementation Plan was reviewed with members. Technical Committee members expressed support of the process and it's anticipated that future working sessions will be highly productive. The timeline was reviewed with the committee with no substantive initial feedback. However, committee members have the same opportunity to provide comments by April 28. The focus of the committee's discussion centered on the goals and objectives for the long-term management of Capitol Lake using Figure 3 as a starting point. Members were asked as official stewards of the resource what goals and objectives should be considered. The primary point of the discussion was ensuring the consultant team considers the resource from a watershed perspective because the system is connected. For example, when managing flood risks, there should be an acknowledgement of the flood risks from the Deschutes River and from sea level rise in Budd Inlet and its impact on the Capitol Lake system. Members discussed primary themes from the research to identify the goals for the long-term management of Capitol Lake. Members stressed that in addition to environment and infrastructure, economics should be included on the list, which reflects earlier comments by participants, as well as from the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group. Members wanted to ensure sustainability was also included on the list and that any option should be sustainable. Members stressed the importance of ensuring all public comments and feedback are well represented moving forward and recommended highlighting public feedback in Figure 3 by including aesthetics and expanding the scope of maintaining recreational opportunities. Members also considered that some of the goals listed within Figure 3 were objectives. Members discussed moving from highlighted goals and considered necessary steps to achieve the goals. One example was improving water quality and how to measure success. The committee suggested revisiting the goal at the next meeting to fill in the blanks and to identify how the goal could be measured. One form of measurement could entail checking the box when the body of water meets state water quality standards. The committee agreed that many of the goals are interrelated, such as improving ecosystem functions because it would have a positive effect on water quality.

The information from the Technical Committee meeting was shared with the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group on April 22. Those meetings are open to the public. The meetings are held in different rooms dependent upon the availability of meeting space. Information on meeting dates is posted at www.des.wa.gov under the Capitol Lake link.

Members of the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group engaged in a process-related discussion and reviewed meeting documentation from the previous meeting. The work group received a similar briefing on the outcome of the Technical Committee meeting. Members discussed the potential of opening all committee meetings to the public. DES and the work group are discussing the option and working through the details. Members also discussed the logistics for additional presentations to the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group from stakeholder groups involved in the process over time.

Members of the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group also provided comments on Figure 3 and reiterated the importance of including economics and that it should be a consideration for all long-term management options. The work group also agreed that the public's interest in maintaining or expanding recreational opportunities and the value of aesthetics should be included in Figure 3. Members also wanted to ensure the graphic accurately conveyed the goals that meet the directive of the proviso because a large part of the process is fulfilling that direction by providing a report to the Legislature describing the process and progress. Figure 3 also currently includes some existing conditions as a way to acknowledge them. Members discussed options for representing the information differently. Some of the goals are more heavily weighted because they are supported by current law, such as meeting state water quality standards.

Ms. Gardner-Brown invited participants to provide feedback at the Community Meeting since the input would be shared with the Technical Committee and the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group.

Previous Input on Goals for Long-Term Management

Ms. Massingale reviewed several graphics reviewed by the Technical Committee and Capitol Lake Executive Work Group. The information provided the foundation on what's been communicated from the community and stakeholders from the past. As part of the current process, the information will be updated to reflect current opinions and desires.

Ms. Massingale reviewed and described Figure 1 of a timeline of events related to Capitol Lake and evolution of goals and objectives. The graphic focuses on major events that impacted long-term goals, such as the closure of the lake to public swimming in 1985, listing of the lake on the 303(d) list, and identification of invasive species. The bar graphs represent what the public communicated in 1999 and 2009. The graphics provide a context of existing conditions that matches with that specific timeframe. For example, in 1999, sediment management was ranked lower because not as many people were communicating that sediment was an important long-term goal for the lake basin. It likely wasn't ranked as high because the last dredge in Capitol Lake was in 1986. By 2009, over 20 years after the last dredge, the community was more mindful of sediment accumulation and management and interest increased the ranking. One of the challenges as the phases move forward is recognition of the importance of considering existing conditions relative to various options and potential impacts. If one of the recreational opportunities is to have the ability to swim in the lake, sediment management may not be as important as improving water quality. Determining the option and how the option addresses those goals will be important.

Mr. Schundler remarked that he has been digging into the issue for the last several years and there is no good data about performance – not from DES because they were formed in 2011, as the lake was managed by the Department of General Administration as well as by State Parks for a time. There is no visitor data other than a few surveys from the 1970s about what people like to do in the lake. Swimming was among them, as well as boating. It's important to consider the relative importance of this process, but there is very little visitor data. He was a coauthor of an outdoor recreation study for the State of Washington that was completed at the request of the Governor with funding of \$90,000 from the Legislature with \$40,000 of the funds from State Parks. He stressed the importance of having visitor numbers. He has collected information from every state, federal, private, county, and municipal agency in the State of Washington for \$90,000 for 10 months. He doubts that the state agency could produce that quality of work. He completed the work because he cared and he stayed up during the night working on the study and calling people and trying to get visitor data from the entities. Some entities have gates and had visitor data. In other places, it was much more difficult. He asked whether there is a data collection system to gauge the current status. He asked about the opportunity costs of not having boat access to the lake. He commented on the years of delay in the process where consultants sit with their above average salaries while he and his friends remain unemployed working two to three jobs to stay afloat in this economy. He questioned

the timing of storefronts closing in downtown Olympia while waiting for a 260-acre water body in the middle of the state capitol of Washington to have boat access. It's possible to rent boats. There are completely viable solutions to allow recreational access to the water body. Enough is enough as it's been 50 years that the lake has had water quality issues and access issues. Not 50 years, but since 2009 and every passing year. It's another year that his generation has to deal with the economic liability and the climate change liability of the town flooding. He stressed the importance of acting now and not delaying a solution.

Ms. Massingale invited the speaker to provide the survey information to DES. The consultant team is seeking similar studies and the information would align well with next month's review.

Mr. Schundler offered to meet with Ms. Massingale to review the data. He offered to host a party at his house and invited everyone to view the data. He invited everyone to visit gregschunderslideshare.net to obtain more information. He's visited with CLIPA and others to obtain as much information about the issue because he cares. The community doesn't have 50 years to wait on the issue. Enough is enough! Look at the numbers, Capitol Lake is over. Restore the estuary period!

Facilitated Discussion of Goals for Long-Term Management

Mr. Burke said that one of the first questions of the EIS process would be the definition of the baselines. The process needs to define the baseline for each of the values. Economics, for example, doesn't cost anything other than DES completing some studies. Odor is another. He questioned whether there are any odor problems. Historic preservation is another. What is the status of historic preservation? Is habitat impacted adversely today in terms of habitat restoration? What's needed to enable people to understand the process or judge the process is establishment of the baselines. It would then be possible to identify the baseline and ask people for input on whether it's important to them to improve it.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said the EIS is an evaluation of impacts to the natural and built environment, which requires a baseline. The baseline enables evaluation of options for comparison. That process will be a part of the EIS. It was part of the earlier processes as well. The goals were derived from community input provided during previous processes because it was important to understand what the community was conveying at that time. It wouldn't be in the best interest to initiate this process with a blank slate. Presenting information about what's been said in the past and the expression of public interest at that time is important. The bar graphs are reflective of that information. That process will continue to be pursued throughout this effort through opportunities to provide information online and then through the legally required process of a project EIS in Phase 2.

Mr. Burke commented that if someone conducts a survey, it would be necessary to inform the people as to what the baseline is otherwise the answers are meaningless.

Ms. Downing agreed the ideas are excellent and she's appreciative of the passion. However, she asked for consideration for sharing of time to afford everyone an opportunity to speak.

Ms. Massingale pointed out that based on current understanding and input from the community, the shared interest in terms of the eventual outcome of the lake is that most people would like to see something happen because there have been many starts and stops. This process will be challenging, since the effort is somewhat constrained because it's not the EIS process. The EIS process includes the technical studies and establishes the baselines to compare design of options and answer the meaningful questions. The important aspect of the current process is receiving all input to construct the building blocks to form the basis of the EIS, which could also shorten the EIS process. Regardless of your desired outcome, the

objective is advancing to Phase 2 to complete an EIS to enable design, permitting, and construction. Each month, the team will present information in terms of how it can be used and what it may mean for Phase 2.

Debbie Dunn asked for a description of the physical boundaries of Capitol Lake and whether it includes Heritage Park and the area of Tumwater falls in the south basin. Ms. Massingale advised that the process involves several aspects. One is the management of long-term lake improvements. Many long term options overlap and encompass the entire watershed, such as improving water quality or controlling sediment. Today, absent a design of options, the physical boundary hasn't been defined. However, the goals and comparison of options will expand the boundary beyond the lake. It can be assumed that any future long-term option must consider a system-wide approach with a caveat that the outcome is dependent upon the design.

Sue Patnude shared that the original estuary prior to the construction of the dam included a 2,000 foot opening at the mouth of the river to Budd Inlet. That configuration was in place prior to the construction of Olympia. The Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study in 2009 recommended restoring the estuary with an opening of 500 feet. Science is available on sediment hydraulics and transport. She mentioned an email sent earlier mentioning Dave Nicandri, formerly with the State Historic Museum, who cited during recent old brewhouse meetings that the Deschutes Estuary is the only estuary on Puget Sound where freshwater falls dump into a saltwater basin. It's a very unique and spiritual place for the tribes who lived and survived on the food provided by the area. Much of that historic information should be included during the process.

Ms. Massingale explained that the Sediment Management Panel's task is to review current information about sediment management and transport within the system and identify evaluation options. In the list the panel will review of existing data, it will be important to include the feasibility study and the technical basis for the physical boundary based on the hydro dynamics of the system.

Ms. Patnude noted the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study was published by the US Geological Survey's Journal of Science.

Karina Champion asked about specific information the team is seeking from the public. Ms. Massingale recommended providing comments on the graphics during the meeting as the graphics would be included within the Proviso Report for documentation. However, the current set of graphics only capture the past. The most important feedback is on the goals and objectives to assist the team in developing the purpose and need statement. For example, participants should identify what matters most to them, the goal, and how they would measure the goal by providing additional details they believe the process may be lacking. Next month, a purpose and need statement will be presented. The current process ultimately leads to the draft of the purpose and need statement to enable the team to help tee up the EIS.

Jim Lengenfelder pointed out major information lacking in Figure 3 as the items in blue transition to items in yellow. The information lacks goals on economic impacts.

Ms. Massingale described the evolution of Figure 3 as each stakeholder group reviews and provides feedback. The intent of the graphic is funneling all available information to afford discussion opportunities by all stakeholder groups. Figure 3 consolidates what the community has previously communicated as important. Those values were transitioned to major themes of environment, infrastructure, and community. Economics were grouped within the community theme and will be flushed out separately based on feedback. The yellow circles distill the information further to address the ultimate project goals. Figure 3 will be revised based on input from all stakeholder groups. Additionally, some reflect the

objective of the process rather than a goal. The yellow recurring goals will be reviewed as ways to measure success.

Mr. Lengenfelder commented that the blue goals of existing project documentation pertaining to aesthetics, historic preservation, and Heritage Park appear to disappear within the yellow recurring goals. Ms. Massingale said the intent of the graphic was distilling the information to a level to prompt discussion. She invited participants to submit comments, especially if the distilled elements appear to lack too much information and should be expanded.

Mr. Lengenfelder said he's already completed the survey. The material wasn't provided in time for him to provide additional comments before the April 28 deadline. Ms. Massingale advised that the material was posted on the website. However, if the direction isn't clear, the information will be revised to clarify that direction.

Mr. Schundler commented on the worst case scenario. The state logged and a made a bunch of money to place a bunch of marble on a hill. He questioned what it reflects in terms of everyone's culture, values, society, and the future. Could it be that the 1% members of the Yacht Club sit on the other side of the dam, and special interests and labor unions through the Port of Olympia sit on the other side of the dam and have been colluding for decades? Could that be the worst case scenario? He has data that he was hoping to present. He is very upset, as this is very real to him. He is unemployed and is very upset that the Olympia tourist economy is the worst in the Northwest, as well as data to reflect that Olympia has less in outdoor recreation and employment per capita in the state. He has all the data and he has presented it and emailed it and is waiting for it to be posted on the website. He questioned whether the entities have the wherewithal to manage the situation. That's the worst case scenario, but he could be wrong and he is hopeful that someone has the data to correct his assumptions, because if not, that would be terrible.

Mr. Hutchinson said he first learned about the meeting and the process two days ago when he received an email from a group. There are thousands of people who carry on daily life who have not heard anything about the process. There has been no outreach to them in any way, shape or form. There haven't been any postcards sent or information published in the newspaper. No work has been completed to outreach anybody except for a small group of people who have been involved in the process for a long time. Many people all over the county would be interested in the information.

Ms. Massingale described the outreach process DES and entities have utilized for public outreach. She encouraged participants to provide recommendations for improving public notification.

Claudia Cuykendall pointed out that the Port of Olympia was established in 1922 and existed for 29 years before Capitol Lake was established. She doesn't view the process as a conflict between an estuary and the Port or an estuary and a lake. What's required is finding common ground and ways to enable all the things Budd Inlet and the region need, to include the Port, fish passage, and habitat. She encouraged people not to make demands but identify some common ground. Sediment is increasing because there is more agriculture upstream than in 1922. She doesn't view the objectives as unsolvable problems or mutually exclusive options.

Ms. Massingale commented that it may be possible to balance interests by discovering ways for shared funding or governance. It may be possible to identify the transport of sediment and manage it to the extent it doesn't increase the maintenance regime needs of the community and Budd Inlet. There are potential solutions, which is why the conditions in the proviso focused on the hybrid options as it envisions a solution that could be a balancing point.

Ms. Gardner-Brown commented that the team wanted to ensure that the goals included in Figure 3 were not partial or preferential to any one specific option. The goal is seeking common ground in that everyone would want to see an improvement to water quality. Those are the conversations that will help develop the purpose and need statements, which will serve as the document for the later action.

Mr. Burke referred to the recurring goal of reducing flood risks as reflected in one of the yellow circles in Figure 3. One of the reports listed on the website was the model on climate change increases and sea level rise. The model reflected that there was no difference between a dam and no dam. He understands that the City of Olympia has released another study. He asked for inclusion of that study on the website. In terms of warmer climates and sea level rise, the impact will be felt in all areas of the state creating the need for working jointly to solve the problem. He doesn't believe that it's relevant to this process.

Ms. Massingale replied that Andy Haub with the City of Olympia provided similar input in that flood risks are not necessarily reduced by either option, but that managing flood risks from future sea level rise is the issue to be managed. The process is not necessarily grappling with the details of sea level rise; however, an EIS process could evaluate climate change and what it might mean for a future alternative. Mr. Haub recommended revising the goal to reflect the City's work and understanding of the flood risk.

Robert Holman expressed appreciation for the way the process has proceeded as his prior concerns initially pertained to the exclusion of CLIPA and DERT and other groups from the process. He now understands that the groups will be included and will be provided with some information from the Technical Committee in the next cycle. It's critical, as there is much new information available that wasn't available in the 1999 and 2009 processes. It's critical that the information is provided to the community because it's a dramatic change. Another parallel study is underway by the Department of Ecology on the entire Deschutes watershed. The department completed the study on the upper Deschutes and is now focusing on Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet. The department is examining some of the same issues that this process will consider. One decision by the department recently is not pursuing bacterial or dissolved oxygen levels in Capitol Lake, as the department doesn't believe they are significant issues. He suggests that water quality in Capitol Lake is fine and the lake is swimmable. Water quality in Capitol Lake is such that in the last 14 years by Thurston County standards, it's possible to swim in the lake despite the problems with invasive species and other issues. That decision changes ideas and the Department of Ecology is now recognizing dissolved oxygen is not an issue; however, it may be in Budd Inlet, and bacteria is certainly not an issue. That information should be provided to the Technical Committee.

Ms. Massingale said next month, the topic on best available science will include information on several different methodologies that are used to evaluate best available science. The process will identify which one makes the most sense for this particular effort and for Capitol Lake. However, other information will be presented on the compiled list of what is available for water quality and habitat. Participants will be asked to provide input on the method and whether other studies are available that haven't been identified.

Ms. Champion commented that her students who are attending the meeting, learned about the community meeting while reading an article in *The Olympian* newspaper. She suggested pursuing publication of the meetings in the newspaper, as well as the *Tacoma Tribune* because many residents living in the south county area subscribe to the Tacoma newspaper. She recommended utilizing a structure similar to local community meetings to effectively outreach to the community as opposed to sending a mail piece.

Dave Peeler remarked that he agrees with Mr. Holman to some degree in terms of the studies underway by the Department of Ecology. Each group emphasizes different aspects of the study results. In addition

to the Capitol Lake Executive Work Group receiving presentations from DERT and CLIPA, he recommended that the work group should receive a presentation from the Department to Ecology rather than through the Technical Committee. Additionally, another overlaying goal is the ecosystem and the Puget Sound Partnership, which has established goals and objectives and measurable targets for Puget Sound. The Partnership has established many goals at the ecosystem level likely in excess of 20 goals with each having a measurable target. Some of those goals include estuarine habitat restoration, salmon run restoration, shellfish restoration, and water quality restoration. He is mentioning the work because when considering what the state will do with Capitol Lake and the Deschutes estuary, part of that effort should help towards the recovery of those goals. One of the things that should be considered in the overarching larger picture is South Puget Sound. The process might be able to use some of the targets and sub-targets as part of the measurable milestones for this project.

Wendy Eklund affirmed there are many important and larger issues to be addressed during the summer. However, the listing of aesthetics, which speaks to two different goals, makes it difficult to grasp. In terms of the goal for historic preservation, she said she's uncertain what it means, as there is the old brewery and bridge or the original inhabitants. She asked what historic preservation means and whether online information is available describing historic preservation. Ms. Massingale said the value/goal hasn't been defined as it was extracted from previous processes.

Ms. Gardner-Brown acknowledged the comment as important because all the comments serving as the basis of Figure 3 blue buckets are available online based on public comments that were reviewed and extracted. There should be recognition of the old brewhouse, which is legally recognized as a landmark. As the process proceeds to the next step, it's possible to incorporate some of the comments reflecting the importance of historic preservation to provide context for the goal.

Ms. Eklund commented that historic preservation in terms of importance appears to be shrinking as other issues begin to increase in dominance. Although it's a minor issue, it's confusing when asked to rank unfamiliar values. Ms. Massingale acknowledged that the comment is important and deserves follow up.

Ms. Downing echoed similar concerns as she identified recreation in terms of boating only because as a boater, she didn't recognize the lake for swimmers. She is hopeful that the process considers values beyond the lake, as sediment management is a huge issue for boaters. She finds it personally offensive that she has been attacked because she has a boat. As a retired state worker, she is certainly not rich. When discussions speak to restoring the lake to its natural condition, she doesn't believe it's possible and questions using that as a point of reference. She moved to Olympia because of the lake. After driving through Olympia and viewing the lake, they decided to move to Olympia. The economic vitality of Olympia is tied to the lake.

Ms. Champion suggested focusing outreach to youth. Several youth groups are completing water quality testing within the Deschutes and Nisqually estuary for the last decade or more. South Sound Green is one group and has conducted testing of a site twice annually for the last 11 years. There are also area schools participating in all different areas, which would be a great resource.

Mr. Schundler said there is much complexity and confusion that he is hearing and he apologized for losing his temper. However, visiting the historical archives and realizing that the issue is where it was in 1965 is frustrating. A simple solution to this problem and to his problem is a permit to rent boats on Capitol Lake beginning in summer 2016, as he would be able to secure appropriate investors to pay for the proper Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife sanitation procedures that are completed in Oregon at the mouth of the Columbia River. In terms of mud snails, the snails are present across the country and they

have not prevented boating. It's an issue that transcends the outcome of an estuary or a lake hybrid. It is time because canoes and kayaks can be allowed and while the process is figured out in terms of goals and objectives, the community can move on and enjoy the summer in Olympia, Washington with unparalleled use in a unique outdoor recreational experience that is hard to find elsewhere in the world. The best comparable is Charleston, South Carolina with a tourism economy 14 times that of Olympia. The number one employment sector is food and beverage services and accommodations. The CFO of the Port didn't include that context in his analysis of the Port. Again, he has slides on the information. The direction must be changed dramatically for so many reasons, but it would be easy if he were afforded with a permit, as he would have a job.

Ms. Massingale thanked everyone for attending and encouraged everyone to fill out the survey and provide additional comments.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Ms. Massingale adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m, allowing 10 minutes for an open house forum for participants to review the poster boards and submit written surveys.

Prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net