

**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.**  
**May 19, 2016**

**Final Meeting Notes**

**Participants**

Alex Callender, Ecology  
Mindy Roberts, Ecology  
Sally Toteff, Ecology  
Chris Conklin, Fish and Wildlife  
Joy Polston-Barnes, Natural Resources  
Andy Haub, City of Olympia  
Bill Helbig, Port of Olympia  
Scott Steltzner, Squaxin Island Tribe  
Brad Murphy, Thurston County  
Amy Georgeson, City of Tumwater

**Enterprise Services**

Lindsey Aldridge  
Ann Larson  
Carrie Martin  
Ann Sweeney

**Floyd | Snider Team**

Tessa Gardner-Brown  
Christina Martinez  
Jessi Massingale, PE

**Meeting Purpose**

1. Discuss feedback provided by the Executive Work Group and Community on the April materials regarding Goals and Objectives, present the revised materials to provide an opportunity for “second touch” and additional feedback.
2. Determine the methodology for reviewing Best Available Science related to water quality and habitat for the Capitol Lake basin.
3. Review a compiled list of technical studies and agency reports that could be evaluated using the selected methodology.

**Notes**

**1. Welcome and Review**

- A. Participants introduced themselves.
- B. Floyd | Snider team reviewed the meeting purpose, agenda, and packet of materials.

**2. Process Updates from DES**

- A. Executive Work Group will have its “second touch” on Goals and Objectives and “first touch” on Best Available Science at the May 27, 2016 meeting.
- B. Funding and Governance Committee held its kick-off meeting on May 17, 2016.
- C. DES is continuing to discuss the idea of open meetings of the committees and anticipates a decision before the June Technical Committee meeting.

### **3. Feedback from Executive Work Group**

- A. Members of the Executive Work Group requested information from regulatory agencies to help evaluate best available science as it pertains to water quality and habitat in the Capitol Lake basin. Committee members discussed the best way to present the information to the Executive Work Group. Information from the regulatory agencies regarding these disciplines is well documented and available online. Information could be presented to the Technical Committee and the Floyd|Snider team could provide an overview of the presentation to the Executive Work Group. Alternatively, agencies could present directly at Executive Work Group meetings. Agency staff will consider further.

### **4. Goals and Objectives – Second Touch**

- A. Floyd|Snider reviewed Goals and Objectives with the committee for the “second touch” using the revised materials (Figure 3) to reflect input from the Technical Committee, Executive Work Group, and Community. The Technical Committee provided the following input regarding reframing some of the goals moving forward:
  - i. Modify economic impact goal to focus on overall economic impacts (negative and positive rather than negative impacts only).
  - ii. Focus on Supporting Healthy Salmon Runs (rather than recovery), or allowing Improving Fish and Wildlife Habitat to cover the goal of supporting healthy salmon runs.
  - iii. Focus on Supporting Aesthetics and Recreational Opportunities (rather than simply maintaining them).

### **5. Best Available Science Methodologies – First Touch**

- A. Floyd/Snider reviewed potential methods for identification of Best Available Science related to water quality and habitat for the Capitol Lake basin.
  - i. Definition of Best Available Science from the federal government.
  - ii. Review of available methodologies for evaluation of Best Available Science.
  - iii. Summary of three methodologies: Washington State Criteria, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Guidelines, and Internationally-Recognized Scoring System.
  - iv. Interest in ensuring the methodology does not add subjectivity and is not perceived as biased.
  - v. Consider defining peer review, including the experience and policy that the regulatory agencies have developed.
  - vi. Many of the members had experience with the Washington State criteria, noted the approach is specific in numerous areas, and thought it had good regional applicability.
  - vii. Question: Will the Washington state criteria be accepted by the federal permitting agencies? Response: Any of these criteria are a step beyond what is normally done in an EIS. Typically, the method for categorizing is not identified. This method would be more robust and would be acceptable.
  - viii. Preliminary consensus of the Technical Committee supported the Washington State Criteria with members wanting time to further review available methodologies and provide comments.

## **6. Best Available Science Document Review – First Touch**

- A. The group reviewed the list of reports compiled by Floyd | Snider concerning water quality and habitat in Capitol Lake that could be evaluated using the selected methodology as part of an EIS.
  - i. Discussion about what reports were applicable to include in a document review: clean-up reports on work done in the watershed, sediment reports, toxics reports, and Thurston County and LOTT monitoring reports. All of these would be good to document in a project archive list. Other reports for local restorations that might be good case studies may be good to note in a separate category of “Key Similar Projects.” The information could be documented in “spheres of influence”, such as the Deschutes first, what is known about the next sphere, i.e. South Sound, etc.
  - ii. Members agreed to review the list and provide any technical reports not yet on the list.

## **7. Next Steps/Action Items**

- A. Floyd | Snider: Send shared file system.
- B. All: Consider ways to best present technical information to Executive Work Group.
- C. Floyd | Snider: Consider formatting changes to Figure 2c to better balance responses.
- D. All: Send feedback on second touch of Goals and Objectives by June 2.
- E. All: Send feedback on first touch on Best Available Science by June 2.
- F. All: Provide technical studies, agency reports, evaluations, and other materials regarding Best Available Science by June 2.