

**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.**  
**June 16, 2016**

**Notes**

**Participants**

Anise Ahmed, Ecology  
Rich Doenges, Ecology  
Cristiana Figueroa-Kaminsky, Ecology  
Sally Toteff, Ecology  
Lydia Wagner, Ecology  
Chris Conklin, Fish and Wildlife  
Joy Polston-Barnes, Natural Resources  
Swenddal, Kristin, Natural Resources  
Andy Haub, City of Olympia  
Bill Helbig, Port of Olympia  
Scott Steltzner, Squaxin Island Tribe  
Brad Murphy, Thurston County  
Dan Smith, City of Tumwater

**Enterprise Services**

Lindsey Aldridge  
Carrie Martin  
Gabrielle Stilwater  
Ann Sweeney

**Floyd | Snider Team**

Tessa Gardner-Brown  
Christina Martinez  
Jessi Massingale, PE

**Public Observers**

Dennis Burke  
Robert Holman  
Jack Havens

**Meeting Purpose**

1. Discuss feedback provided by the Executive Work Group and Community on the May materials regarding Best Available Science related to water quality and habitat, including methods for evaluation and list of technical reports; present the revised materials to provide an opportunity for “second touch” and additional feedback.
2. Review draft Purpose and Need Statement and example statements for context.
3. Discuss identified hybrid options for future management of Capitol Lake for substantial improvement in fish and wildlife habitat and ecosystem functions, maintaining a historic reflecting pool and adaptive management strategies, per the proviso.

**Notes**

**1. Welcome and Agenda Review**

- A. Participants and observers introduced themselves.
- B. 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” on Best Available Science and “first touch” on Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Identification of Hybrid Options at the June 24, 2016 meeting.
  - C. Presentations from community members occurred in May and will occur in June in conjunction with Executive Work Group meetings.
  
3. **Feedback from Executive Work Group and the Community from First Touch of Best Available Science**
  - A. The Executive Work Group concurred with the Technical Committee on the preferred methodology to review best available science.
  - B. The Community had mixed comments. Some people preferred the objectivity of the WAC method, while others saw benefit of added latitude provided by the other two methods.
  - C. Community members may provide additional documents for consideration on a list or bibliography.
  
4. **Best Available Science – Second Touch**
  - A. The Technical Committee discussed its preference to be able to review the documents according to the state methodology as part of the Phase I process, yet recognized that DES is not funded to support a detailed review for Best Available Science using the method recommended.
  - B. The document list should be titled “List of Technical Documents” or something similar. It hasn’t been vetted as “Best Available Science” yet.
  - C. Members have been asked to provide feedback on the peer review policy briefing and provide any additional technical documents by June 30.
  
5. **Draft Purpose and Need Statement – First Touch**
  - A. Floyd | Snider team reviewed samples of Purpose and Need Statements used by other organizations.
  - B. The Technical Committee reviewed the draft Purpose and Need Statement.
    - i. Discussed the benefits of a condensed version of the draft Purpose and Need Statement. Consider removing the two middle paragraphs that are currently included for context and consider retaining only the opening and closing paragraphs that focus on the problem. Some members thought brief statements work better. The middle two paragraphs could be included as background information in another part of the Environmental Impact Statement.
    - ii. Rebalance the draft Purpose and Need statement so the primary focus is the environmental function of the Capitol Lake basin, and not as much on the community or recreational aspects of the area. This may reflect the proposed approach from a few committee members, where the goal would be to manage “an economically and environmentally sustainable resource.”
    - iii. Ensure that the watershed is reflected in the draft Purpose and Need statement, which could be remedied by expanding “Capitol Lake basin” to include Deschutes River/Budd Inlet, or by describing Capitol Lake in the larger context of its relationship with the Deschutes River/Budd Inlet. For example, this could take shape through discussion of

- the positive and negative impacts of Capitol Lake on Budd Inlet. The “Capitol Lake basin” cannot be in isolation from what happens up-stream and down-stream.
- iv. Reflect the cultural and historical importance of the area; specifically change the resource reference to “Deschutes River” in the sentence regarding importance predating construction of Capitol Lake.
  - v. Consider whether the existing project title (Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Project) correctly captures the intent of this work, and/or expand title to include Deschutes Estuary (Capitol Lake/Deschutes Estuary Long-Term Management Project). Perhaps the “Lower Deschutes River” would be a better description.
  - vi. Because the draft Purpose and Need statement describes the lake in its current state it implies that the future state is also a lake; therefore, need to re-balance the text to not imply the managed lake option.
  - vii. The historical use of the basin area pre-dates the existence of the lake only; there is long history of the Deschutes watershed that needs to be captured.
  - viii. It may end up being two different versions of the Purpose and Need statement.
  - ix. Keep in mind that the Purpose and Need Statement is used to narrow the options. If the statement is too broad, it will not be helpful.
  - x. Important to capture the problem that needs to be solved and the benefit the community seeks.
  - xi. One suggestion to use for the wording was “Determine an economically and environmentally preferred management method action to create a regional aquatic resource amenity which meets regulatory requirements and is also a useful and sustainable public resource.”

## **6. Identification of Hybrid Options – First Touch**

- A. The Technical Committee reviewed the visual representation of existing hybrid options and the table of hybrid option components.
  - i. Introduced and discussed three hybrid options offered to date: Dual Basin, Dual Estuary/Lake Idea (DELI), and Percival Creek Rechanneling.
  - ii. The Key Option Components figure highlights what is different between the hybrid options.
  - iii. The components table could be set up differently to present a more balanced view of the options.
  - iv. In July the process will add the non-hybrid options, the managed lake and restored estuary.
  - v. Nutrient harvesting will be further explored in July as a possible component of other options.
  - vi. The state Department of Fish and Wildlife’s interest is to attempt to eradicate the New Zealand mud snail as part of any option and active management strategy.
  - vii. Certain items may be needed regardless of the option, i.e. eradication of New Zealand mud snail, meeting state and federal water quality standards, mitigating sea level rise, etc.
  - viii. The table is a mix of physical descriptions/components and how they link to goals, which is somewhat confusing. Members recommended adding descriptions to the graphics page rather than using the table now.

- ix. There should be a way to show the goals of the process and how each option meets the goals in order to see which best supports the proviso. The proponent of each hybrid could do a checklist.

**7. Next Steps/Action Items**

- A. Floyd | Snider: Work on a revised draft Purpose and Need Statement(s).
- B. All: Send feedback on second touch of Best Available Science by June 30.
- C. All: Send feedback on first touch on draft Purpose and Need Statement by June 30.
- D. All: Send feedback on first touch on Identification of Hybrid Options by June 30.
- E. Floyd | Snider: Revise the Hybrid Options graphics prior to Executive Work Group or Community meetings.
- F. Floyd | Snider: Send a summary of the Technical Committee feedback to committee members for review and concurrence prior to presentation of Executive Work Group on June 24.