Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: bruhart@
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 4:24 PM
To: DES Capitol Lake
Subject: Capitol Lake

I favor maintaining a well managed Capitol Lake.

Bruce Hartley

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: cjcuyken@
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2016 9:17 AM
To: DES Capitol Lake
Subject: Draft Provisio Report

It should be pointed out that the Managed Lake CLIPA Sub-option takes advantage of the natural process of wetland formation around river outfalls. Let's not undo the gift that Nature has given us in response to the State's failure to dredge Capitol Lake since 1986. Clydia Cuykendall, Olympia, WA

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: Dennis Burke <waeng@ >
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2016 10:39 PM
To: DES Capitol Lake
Subject: Missing Reference Documents.

I just completed reading the draft report. That report includes many communications and e-mails from interested parties. Unfortunately I did not find the documents I sent to DES describing the nutrient harvesting and sediment reclamation option. Those documents should be presented in a manner similar to other presentations.

Sent from my iPad

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: Dennis Burke <waeng@ >
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2016 10:46 PM
To: DES Capitol Lake
Subject: Missing Documents

Shouldn't references to the documents I presented describing "nutrient harvesting" be included in the report. I can find no reference in the report to the documents. They should be included. They can be found at:

http://des.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/images/SiteCollectionImages/AboutDES/projects/Capitol_Lake/CapitolLakeHybridPlan-DennisBurke.pdf

Dennis Burke
Sent from my iPad

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: Robert Wubbena <rwubbena@ >
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 9:53 AM
To: Covington, Bob (DES); Martin, Carrie R. (DES); Jessi Massingale; Tessa Gardner-Brown
Cc: Jack Havens; Denis Curry; Bob Holman; Allen Miller
Subject: Fwd: Summary Meeting DES/FS/CLIPA Oct 10

Thank you for meeting with us yesterday to discuss expectations, clarifications of intended next steps, and how we can better collaborate in the development a long term plan for the Deschutes Urban Watershed with a focus on Capitol Lake's long term management plan.

We are summarizing some of our understandings of the discussion today.
If you have a different understanding, we need to revisit the issues of concern so that we both share the same expectations.

!) CLIPA's Managed Lake Option. Our email of September 29 (Apology for expressing frustration) correctly outlines an abbreviated description of the CLIPA Managed Lake Option. We confirmed today that the Percival Creek Extension (or shortcut through the bridge on the Deschutes Parkway) is not part of our basic Managed Lake Plan. The Percival Creek extension should be identified as a potential benefit to ALL options. The CLIPA Managed Lake Plan includes the same pre dredge as you assume for the Restored Estuary, retention of the Dam and Fish Ladder with no changes to the structure of the Lake shores except where you assume the dredge material might be placed, and then post dredging of the North Basin with an installed low cost dredging maintenance plan (pre permitted) every ten years. Spot dredging in the mid basin and Budd bay inlet would be selective and may or may not occur in the future.

2) CLIPA's Managed Lake --Benefits Comparison as outlined in our email of October 5, 2016 should follow #1 above---the Benefits of the CLIPA Managed Lake Option. This item by item rewrite that is shown along with the DES/FS summary of the Restored Estuary should replace the previous document that FS prepared in discussions with CLIPA/Havens.
The previous document prepared by FS/CLIIPA/Haven is not wrong, it just is too limiting now that we understand what DES/FS intentions are for its use. This rewrite by CLIPA is consistent with our discussions at the meeting.

3 Relative Cost Comparison Bar Charts. The Sept 22 Chart for the CLIPA Managed Lake will be completely replaced with one that better represents the summary in the above 2 paragraphs/emails. Suggested at the meeting is that DES/FS needs to be very clear how they developed the "BASE CRITERIA" for all bar charts to enable discussion about the variability of the chart assumptions. If CLAMP 2006 data is the baseline, then DES should call attention that some items due to time value of money may differ if the "upfront costs are in 2006 vs 2016 or
2025 construction dates---vs 2075 (50 years in the future) the bar charts may be misleading on its impact to the community to fund. The CLIPA Managed Lake Option tried to simplify this comparison by selecting the same dredging volume and time as much as possible. This means that it is the upfront capital costs and the "benefits comparison" that are the drivers to compare alternatives---not the future maintenance dredging---which will essentially be the same for both key options.. Only cost of the actual dredging will be the key debate and this will likely change significantly over the 50 year timeline due to adaptive management changes.

4) Mitigation Costs. We understand the technical reasons why FS applied the 8% mitigation cost to some options but not others. We suggest that there are other valid reasons to adjust some of the costs for one option but not the other, but if your start making those value judgments for one cost item, we can argue that others apply. We suggest that it be applied to all and then you can footnote why it might not apply in some cases. This leaves the comparison based on what is constructed and adjusted later for possible regulatory or best practice that may not apply in the future.

Same for the cost of dredge disposal. The volume should not vary--this is a design element--but the cost of disposal is a wide open variable. Show the low, medium, high for all options with a footnote on what some of the variables that MAY affect the future disposal options. You can do you by showing the worst case for all and then a cross hatch differential at the mid and low cost with the
variables that MIGHT affect the decision. This take FS out of the
role of deciding today what might happen 30 or 40 years from now.

5) Time value of money, as discussed could use a simple discounting process for each ten years if you want to show the full 50 year horizon.

6) We understand from DES that the Project Boundary to include at a minimum the entire Urban Watershed from Pioneer Park to Priest Point Park where the collective impacts are initiated or ended. DES is part of the community and the Lake is part of the Urban watershed. We all own part of the entire watershed.

--
Bob Wubbena

Olympia WA

rwubbena@

--
Bob Wubbena

Olympia WA

rwubbena@

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: Robert Wubbena <rwubbena@ >
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2016 1:36 PM
To: Jessi Massingale; Tessa Gardner-Brown; Covington, Bob (DES); Martin, Carrie R. (DES)
Cc: Jack Havens; Denis Curry; Bob Holman; Allen Miller; Sweeney, Ann E. (DES)
Subject: Fwd: Capitol Lake Phase 1: Figures updated per CLIPA option changes
Attachments: Figure 7a Overview of Long-Term Management Options 2016-1013.pdf; Figure 7b Review of Management Options Table 2016-1013.pdf; Capitol Lake_Consistency with Goals_DRAFT_2016-0630.docx; Capitol Lake_Consistency with Goals_DRAFT_2016-0630 (3).docx

Jessi, here are CLIPA's recommended edits to your recent updates. We have attempted to follow your guidelines. The changes by you and the following will substantially modify your Bar Chart Relative Cost Comparison. We will be prepared to work with the CLAMP Restored Estuary costs as a base if this is the base you are using. Please let me know if you have any questions on our Option.

TO THE NEW GRAPHIC (DES SWITCHED OUT THE DRAWN GRAPHIC WITH THE AERIAL PICTURE--WE SAID OK)

1) Opening paragraph add at the end----"---a freshwater wetland/marsh would naturally develop in the South Basin and along the shores of the Mid Basin".

2) First Bullet. Change to Read: "Retains existing Tide Gate and Fish Passage in its existing configuration"

3) Second Bullet: "Initial dredging in North Basin and river channel of Mid Basin; with maintenance dredging in North Basin"

4) Third Bullet: :Clean up dredging in Budd Inlet to ensure that recreational, commercial, and community uses for open water boating will be available at the least cost"

5) Fourth Bullet: Use of North Basin for public swimming and other freshwater recreation.

6) Last paragraph - edit as " The primary difference between the Managed Lake CLIPA Sub-Option and the CLAMP Managed Lake Option is related to dredging quantities and transitioning the Mid Basin to a wild life reserve. (continue with the remainder unchanged.

7) Modify the label on the Middle Basin to read " Middle Basin a freshwater reserve"

CONCEPTUAL LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT OPTIONS COMPARISON

Improve and Support Water Quality: add at the end of the current DES draft "Annually harvest plants in mid basin.."

Improve and Support Sustainable Ecosystem Functions: No change to new DES draft

Improve and Support Fish and Wildlife Habitat: insert in first line--
"existing salmon and brown bat population, ducks ---", the remainder stays the same.

Control Invasive Species; No change to new DES draft

Improve and Support Sediment Management: change to read "Initial dredging in Lake North Basin and river channel dredging in Mid Basin; maintenance dredging from fixed hydraulic dredge . "----the rest stays the same

Manage Flood Risk : Insert "when" in between ---high tides "when" the Deschutes River flood stage and high seawater levels coincide------the remainder stays the same as the new DES draft

Improve and Support Recreational Opportunities: add after "---small boat recreation in the North basin;"----" enhances water contact recreation throughout urban watershed".

The rest of the comparisons stay the same as the new DES draft is presented.

We look forward to seeing the revised Bar Chart by Floyd Snider.

--
Bob Wubbena

Olympia WA

rwubbena@

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: Robert Wubbena <rwubbena@ >
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2016 4:51 PM
To: Tessa Gardner-Brown; Martin, Carrie R. (DES); Jack Havens
Subject: Fwd: Capitol Lake Phase 1: Figures updated per CLIPA option changes

Thanks, and I think we can make this work. I have responded after each of your suggestions in ALL CAPS to make it easier to find our comments.

TO THE NEW GRAPHIC (DES SWITCHED OUT THE DRAWN GRAPHIC WITH THE AERIAL PICTURE--WE SAID OK)

1) Opening paragraph add at the end----"---a freshwater wetland/marsh would naturally develop in the South Basin and along the shores of the Mid Basin". We will do this. However, the reason we removed or hadn't used the term "marsh" is because in this area, the term is typically used for a saltwater ecosystem. We thought that might add confusion, when the Sub-Option proposes freshwater. Do you agree? If so, we could say "a freshwater emergent wetland would naturally develop..." (An emergent wetland refers to a system composed of non-woody vegetation.) Or just "a freshwater wetland," to avoid technical terms that most people aren't familiar with.

YOUR EDITS LOOK GOOD TO US. GO WITH YOUR EDITED LANGUAGE

2) First Bullet. Change to Read: "Retains existing Tide Gate and Fish Passage in its existing configuration" The intent of this bullet is to focus on whether or not the option proposes to retain or remove the dam. If we add "and fish passage" then that changes the statement focus, and we'd have to be consistent across the sheets. So we would add "and removes barriers to fish passage" to the Restored Estuary and Hybrid Options. It's my opinion that it is cleaner to keep it as we have it – just focusing on retain/remove dam. And then we can the benefits to fish, etc. in the associated table. I'm open to feedback now that you understand the approach.

AGREE WITH YOUR SUGGESTION TO LEAVE IT WITH YOUR WORDING, LEAVING FISH PASSAGE OUT OF IT.

3) Second Bullet: "Initial dredging in North Basin and river channel of Mid Basin; with maintenance dredging in North Basin" Sure, we'll make this change.

OK

4) Third Bullet: :Clean up dredging in Budd Inlet to ensure that recreational, commercial, and community uses for open water boating will be available at the least cost" Cost and cost comparisons are covered in the cost comparison graphic, and we're not getting to any comparisons across options in these sheets. One question for you, the statement here doesn't include cleanup dredging in the Middle Basin, should it? We had included the Middle Basin as part of the proposed cleanup dredging based on your email from 10/5.

TAKE "LEAST COST OUT OF OUR EDITS".

WE BELIEVE THAT IF WE ARE TRANSITIONING INTO A WETLAND TYPE ENVIRONMENT IN THE MID BASIN, WE DO NOT NEED TO DO AS MUCH CLEAN UP
DREDGING---JUST THE RIVER CHANNEL. HAVING SAID THAT WE ARE TRYING
TO ALSO KEEP THE COMPARISON ON PRE DREDGING BETWEEN THE RESTORED ESTUARY AND THE CLIPA MANAGED LAKE AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO MINIMIZE PRE DREDGING AS BEING AN ISSUE OF COMPARISON.

SINCE WE DON'T KNOW HOW TO GUESS WHAT THE PRE DREDGE WILL BE LIKE ON DIRECT COMPARISON, THE MID BASIN CLEAN UP IS REALLY ONLY RELATED TO SEDIMENT DISPOSAL ASSUMPTIONS IE UPLAND DISPOSAL VS IN LAKE DISPOSAL---NO ONE REALLY KNOWS WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN. WE THINK THE NZMS, AND THE INVASIVE SPECIES CAN BE HANDLE DIFFERENTLY THAN TRUCKING IT ALL TO OREGON. SO WE SAY THE CLEAN UP VOLUME AND LOCATION (BY SUB
BASINS) IS THE SAME---THE COMPARISON AT THIS TIME IS NEUTRAL. SO WE CAN GO EITHER WAY AS LONG AS THE PLACE OF DISPOSAL FOR THAT BASIN/INLET IS THE SAME..

5) Fourth Bullet: Use of North Basin for public swimming and other freshwater recreation. Sounds good, we'll keep that bullet as is per this confirmation.

OK

6) Last paragraph - edit as " The primary difference between the Managed Lake CLIPA Sub-Option and the CLAMP Managed Lake Option is related to dredging quantities and transitioning the Mid Basin to a wild life reserve. (continue with the remainder unchanged. Sure, we can add the transitioning of the Middle Basin. Should we use "freshwater wetland" as the descriptive term? See my comment in response to item 1. Also, "wildlife reserve" is a term used for lands with protected status. The current land ownership is with the people of Washington State, and managed by Washington Department of Natural Resources. Many nuances, I understand, and doing my best to help.

AGREE AND THANKS

7) Modify the label on the Middle Basin to read " Middle Basin a freshwater reserve" See comment above. We could relabel to "Middle Basin with freshwater wetlands along shoreline?"

AGREE

CONCEPTUAL LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT OPTIONS COMPARISON

Improve and Support Water Quality: add at the end of the current DES draft "Annually harvest plants in mid basin.." Let's see how we can get those words added while keeping to the 35 word count. Here are two options that could work, or you could propose something that keeps to
35 words:

1. Maintains Capitol Lake for trapping contaminants flowing into

the lake from the upper watershed; retains Capitol Lake/Tumwater Falls saturated dissolved oxygen levels for lake ecosystem species; annual harvests plants in the Middle Basin

2. Manages Capitol Lake as a "natural treatment system" for
trapping contaminants flowing into the lake; retains Capitol Lake/Tumwater Falls saturated dissolved oxygen levels for lake ecosystem species; annual harvests plants in the Middle Basin

LET'S USE YOUR SECOND WORDING. LOOKS GOOD TO ME.

Improve and Support Sustainable Ecosystem Functions: No change to new DES draft Ok

Improve and Support Fish and Wildlife Habitat: insert in first line--

"existing salmon and brown bat population, ducks ---", the remainder stays the same. Ok, we'll just take out the words "large little" and get existing salmon in. That keeps this at 35.

AGREE

Control Invasive Species; No change to new DES draft Ok

OK

Improve and Support Sediment Management: change to read "Initial dredging in Lake North Basin and river channel dredging in Mid Basin; maintenance dredging from fixed hydraulic dredge . "----the rest stays the same Ok

OK

Manage Flood Risk : Insert "when" in between ---high tides "when" the Deschutes River flood stage and high seawater levels coincide------the remainder stays the same as the new DES draft Ok

OK

Improve and Support Recreational Opportunities: add after "---small boat recreation in the North basin;"----" enhances water contact recreation throughout urban watershed". Similarly, here is my thought on how we can add this while remaining at or below 35 words:

1. Enhances water contact recreation throughout urban watershed
from Tumwater Falls to Priest Point Park including kayaking , bird and duck watching; returns swimming and small boat recreation in North Basin; avoids recreational boating impacts

YOUR WORDING IS OK WITH US

The rest of the comparisons stay the same as the new DES draft is presented.

LOOKS LIKE WE ARE IN AGREEMENT WITH THE EDITS. THANK YOU FOR MAKING THIS HAPPEN AND HELP CONVEY THE MESSAGES WE INTENDED----YOU DID GOOD.

We look forward to seeing the revised Bar Chart by Floyd Snider.

--

Bob Wubbena

Olympia WA

rwubbena@

--

Bob Wubbena

Olympia WA

rwubbena@

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From:	Dave Peeler <davepeeler@ >
Sent:	Thursday, November 03, 2016 1:21 PM
To:	Martin, Carrie R. (DES)
Cc:	Sue Patnude; Jessi Massingale; Tessa Gardner-Brown
Subject:	DERT comments on CLIPA Managed Lake Sub-Option
Attachments:	DERT Response to CLIPA Managed Lake SubOption.docx

Carrie, attached are DERT's comments on the most recent CLIPA proposal for a managed lake. We will also be submitting separate comments on the draft final report, including the new Funding and Governance and Sediments sections.

Thanks for considering our comments.

Dave Peeler
President
Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team

November 3, 2016

To: Carrie Martin, DES

From: Sue Patnude and Dave Peeler

Re: DERT Response to the CLIPA Managed Lake Sub-Option

Thank you for accepting our comments on CLIPA's latest proposal for Capitol Lake. In general, we find that the CLIPA proposal makes many claims for its benefits without any supporting data, studies, or information. This is also not a "hybrid proposal" any longer, and as was stated at the most recent Exective Work Group meeing, has simply become a sub-option for retaining the lake, with assumptions that are slightly different from those used by CLAMP. As such, it no longer fulfills the Legislative requirement that DES identify additional hybrid proposals and therefore should not be included in the DES Final Report. At best, the few differences CLIPA has added should be added to the draft final report in Table 3, Potential Additional Components of Long-Term Management Options, and they can be used during the EIS process as part of the range of potential components to be considered.

Specific comments on elements of their proposal:

1. Although nothing in the most recent proposal entails any actions that would tend to improve water quality in the lake or in Budd Inlet, CLIPA's comments in the accompanying graphic claim that:
   "recreational, commercial, and community uses for open water boating will be available" [we presume they mean in Budd Inlet].
   Of course, these uses are available now and will be available under any of the options presented by DES in the report, so this is not singular to their proposal and should be noted as such.

   "use of Capitol Lake for public swimming and other freshwater recreation" will be possible.

There is no documentation whatsoever for these claims, and in fact the available scientific information from the WA Dept. of Ecology shows just the opposite. Nothing in their proposal would alleviate the problems that are causing the closure of the lake to these uses.

2. The revised table showing how their proposal would meet the various objectives is similarly flawed.
    a. Improve and Support Water Quality: There is no information available to show that water quality will be improved by this option, especially in Budd Inlet. Dredging to a shallower depth than proposed by CLAMP will ensure that poor water quality conditions continue in the lake (although we should note here that Ecology's studies have shown no amount of dredging in the lake would actually improve lake water quality).
    b. Improve and Support Sustainable Ecosystem Functions: The purported "linkage" of "the natural urban ecosystem and freshwater aquatic species for a healthy ecosystem, education and recreation program amidst 285,000 community members" belongs in a public relations piece, not a technical document issued by DES. There is no basis for this statement whatsoever. Capitol Lake is not a natural ecosystem; it harbors several invasive freshwater aquatic species which should be eradicated, not protected; and an ecosystem education program can be designed around any of the options under consideration by DES. In addition, this is not an environmentally sustainable option, i.e., it is not nearly as self sustaining as an estuary would be.
    c. Improve and Support Fish and Wildlife Habitat: Retention of the 260-acre freshwater habitat to support existing salmon and brown bat population(s) is of dubious value, since the real shortage of habitat necessary for salmonid health is of the estuarine variety, not freshwater lakes. Healthy salmon populations are directly linked to healthy estuarine systems (*Ecology of Salmonids in Estuaries around the World: Adaptations, Habitats, and Conservation*, Colin D. Levings, UBC Press, 2016). Poor water quality in the lake and the lack of an area of seawater and freshwater mixing in the lake (as would be provided in an estuary) result in very poor existing habitat for salmon. In addition, bats can and do feed over estuarine and riparian areas.
    d. Control Invasive Species: There is no information or basis for any of the claims made for this option. If the NZ Mud Snail could survive in marine waters, it would already have migrated into Budd Inlet. Instead of preventing the spread of the several freshwater invasive species that currently inhabit the lake, this option would ensure they continue to reproduce there. While there may eventually be a treatment for and reuse of the dredged sediments from the lake other than landfill disposal, that remains to be seen and is simply a hope at this time.
    e. Manage Flood Risk: The purported benefits of this option to ameliorate flooding during high river flows and high tides is small and ephemeral at best, given the small storage volume available in the lake, projections of higher intensity rainfall events,

increasing sea level rise and higher high tides. The best that can truthfully be said about the ability to escape significant future flooding in downtown Olympia is that the community needs to develop a long term, comprehensive adaptation and mitigation plan that is far broader in scope than removal or retention of the 5th Avenue Dam, or prepare to abandon a large portion of downtown and the Port peninsula.

f. Improve and Support Recreational Opportunities: There is nothing in this proposal that would positively affect recreational opportunities. It would instead continue the current poor conditions that cause the lake to be off limits to public recreation.

g. Improve and Support Aesthetics and Visual Quality: We hate to repeat ourselves, but there is no basis to support their contentions for this objective. Also, "wildlife and habitat watching" is of course available under all of the options under consideration.

h. Support and Maintain Historical and Cultural Resources: There is no basis provided for their contentions for this objective, especially water access to the old brewhouse. In fact, allowing the middle and upper basins to silt in over time would appear to make such access more difficult, not less. Cultural and historical sites can be developed and maintained under any of the options.

i. Avoid Negative Impacts and Maximize Economic Benefits: While CLIPA appears to believe that the current economic situation of downtown Olympia is very good and has somehow benefitted from the lake, most outside observers feel very differently. In addition, the information available shows that visitor spending in the Olympia area is among the lowest in our state and is the lowest in metropolitan areas. On the other hand, Vancouver BC which is also situated in an estuarine area has a very robust downtown and tourism economy. Nor do other cities in Washington State appear to suffer from being situated on or near estuaries (Tacoma, Seattle, Everett, Bellingham, etc.). In addition, these statements clearly do not address how this option will be funded: will the local marine and boating industries continue to be subsidized by the State?

j. Minimize Long-Term Costs: From the available information, their contentions here are false. While there are sources of federal funding for estuary restoration, we are unaware of any sources of federal funds for maintaining the lake, so that option is likely to be 100% reliant on local and state funds. In reality, draft or proposed funding plans will need to be developed during the EIS process for the options evaluated, which will allow for a more robust discussion of both short and long term costs.

k. Finally, the latest CLIPA proposal factors in no costs for dam replacement or for any other major infrastructure needs to maintain the lake, actions that would have to be considered over a 50-year period. Today we are much more aware of the impact dams have on habitat and water quality, and replacing a dam that destroys a Puget

Sound estuary would be difficult at best from a regulatory standpoint. South Puget Sound deserves better.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. Please let us know if you have any questions or need for follow-up.

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From:	Dave Peeler <davepeeler@ >
Sent:	Thursday, November 03, 2016 3:18 PM
To:	Martin, Carrie R. (DES); Tessa Gardner-Brown; Jessi Massingale
Cc:	Sue Patnude
Subject:	DERT comments on Draft Final Phase 1 Report on the Capitol Lake/Deschutes Watershed Long-Term Management Planning
Attachments:	DERT Response to DES Draft Final Report.docx

Carrie,

Attached are DERT's comments on the draft final Phase 1 report. Please let us know if you have any questions regarding our comments or need any clarifications or follow-up. We have appreciated working with all of you during this Phase 1 process. Even though we may not always have agreed with the process or your decisions, overall you have performed admirably in a difficult environment. Thank you for considering our comments on Phase 1. We look forward to further participation in Phase 2.

Dave Peeler
President
Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team

November 3, 2016

To: Carrie Martin, DES

From: Sue Patnude and Dave Peeler

Re: DERT Comments on Phase 1 Report on the Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed Long-Term Management Planning

General Comments:
In general, DES staff and the consultant, Floyd:Snider, have performed admirably in conducting the Phase 1 process given the difficulty and complexity of the project. However as you shall see below, some limitations imposed on stakeholder involvement in the process have resulted in what we consider less than ideal outcomes. We are also greatly appreciative of the work to identify and summarize all of the technical, planning and management reports and studies that have occurred to date, to ensure that best available science (section 3.2) is used for this project, and to provide opportunities for stakeholder comments.

Study area:
The "Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed" as defined by DES for this project (section 1.1) is too limiting in scope to encompass all of the project implementation and management actions that will be needed for a successful outcome. We recognize that DES as an entity has limited geographic authority. However, the State writ large (e.g, including DNR, Ecology, WDFW, Agriculture and other state agencies) has substantial authority throughout the entire watershed from its headwaters to all of Budd Inlet and Puget Sound. To attempt to treat the "Capitol Lake" issue as a stand alone element within this larger watershed makes no sense from either an ecosystem or governmental perspective.

For example, upstream actions taken in the watershed can positively or negatively effect water quality, fish and wildlife, erosion, sediment transport and deposition, stream flow, and other factors that will have an effect on the Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed area, and

therefore on the implementation and results of whatever option is selected in Phase 2. Likewise, entities "downstream" of the study area can also have an effect on Budd Inlet (see Ecology's TMDL technical reports).

Focusing on a smaller geographic area is needed in part to identify the available options, but it is also too limiting in that it will almost by design narrow the actions and activities that my be considered as part of the overall project to restore a healthy Deschutes Watershed and a healthy South Sound. For these reasons we recommend that a broader stakeholder group be formed and be asked to directly participate during Phase 2 that can represent these broader geographic areas and broader issues.

3.3.2 Identification of Alternate Options and New Concepts:
We submitted our comments on the proposed CLIPA Managed Lake Sub-Option separately today and will not repeat them here but incorporate them by reference.

4.0 Sediment Management and Analysis in Phase 2:
This section of new material provides a good summary of the previous studies and modeling conducted prior to Phase 1. We note that the "subgroup" of the Technical Committee that participated in this effort did not allow any community or stakeholder input, which we believe is a mistake and weakens the final product. However, in general the statements of this section appear to be accurate and we support the recommendations for future modeling and study of sediments transport and deposition under the various management options and sediment mitigation measures that might be employed, including measures proposed to implement the Deschutes River TMDL that would reduce uprstream erosion and sediment transport, increase water quality, and provide better habitat for fish and wildlife.

4.2.2 Data Gap to be Evaluated in Phase 2: Climate Change:
We support the inclusion of this element in the future studies in Phase 2. We know that climate change and sea level rise are already occurring and the effects are likely to accelerate in the future. It is prudent to evaluate the effects of these changes on this project and on this watershed.

5.0 Funding and Governance:
The governance frameworks explored within section 5.4 are examples of existing special districts that are commonly used across Washington State for the governing of lakes, tidelands, management of flood zones, etc. While commonly used, these governing structures often have low levels of community engagement and participation. Regardless of which alternative is selected the resulting restored estuary, hybrid or lake will be a central part of our community and will need creative governing that is structured to ensure a high level of community engagement and participation. This could be achieved by establishing a governance structure that provides local community groups, non-profits and tribal governments an equal seat at the

table alongside local and state governments. This would likely result in creative, community centric governing that can handle the unique challenges associated with ensuring this project meets the needs of our local environment, economy and community.
To illustrate this point, the Funding and Governance Committee appointed by the Executive Work Group, which was composed of a few select staff from local governments, the Tribe, and two state agencies, met in closed meetings not open to the public, and no public comments or suggestions were ever sought nor considered. This small, closed group was in direct contrast to the CLAMP committee recommendation found at 5.2.1: *"A new governing structure will be required to address Deschutes watershed and Budd Inlet recovery action. The composition of this body may be similar to that of the Budd Inlet Restoration Partners. This group contains a number of the CLAMP entities, but to remain effective, it will need to involve all affected parties, governments, and stakeholders."*

Nor did this structure follow the recommendations of the Ruckelshaus Center Situation Assessment summarized at 5.2.2: *"Begin "conversations among the CLAMP entities and any other appropriate public service agencies within the Deschutes Basin (e.g. LOTT Clean Water Alliance, potentially one or more upstream local government agencies or major landowners) about a cost-sharing strategy and funding mechanism for long-term management of sediment, water quality, infrastructure, and other anticipated areas of capital expenditure. This could take the form of what one respondent proposed as a 'Deschutes River Basin Management District'."*

As a result, while the findings and recommendations of this committee are generally positive as far as they go, they contain nothing new or creative that would lead one to believe that (1) it is actually possible to develop and agree on a proposed long term funding and governance structure; or (2) that such a proposed structure would be supported by the stakeholders who have been, and conceivably will continue to be, excluded from this process given this committee's recommendations to continue the current committee structure into Phase 2 (section 5.6). This is very disappointing to stakeholders who envisioned a broader process that would truly involve their participation, and it does not bode well for the eventual success of this effort.

For example, the Budd Inlet & Capitol Lake TMDL study now in process at Ecology strongly suggests that reductions in pollution discharge by LOTT and other sewage treatment entities will be needed in order to meet water quality standards in Budd Inlet, and that the 5th Avenue Dam has by far the single largest negative impact on water quality in Budd Inlet. The outcome of the TMDL and the DES process are integrally linked and will have large ramifications for these entities. These issues (and entities) need to be brought into the Phase 2 discussion.

We recommend that a different, broader work group and committee structure be used for Phase 2 that allows for broader, active community and stakeholder participation, assuming that DES intends to utilize such a structure to advise it during Phase 2.

Thank you for considering our comments. Please contact us should you have any questions, need clarification or other follow-up.

Martin, Carrie R. (DES)

From: Allen T. Miller <allen@ >
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2016 3:55 PM
To: Liu, Chris (DES); Covington, Bob (DES); Martin, Carrie R. (DES)
Cc: 'Robert Wubbena'; 'Denisc733'; bikeandfish@ ; 'Joseph Beaulieu'; 'Jewel Goddard'; 'Les or Mary Eldridge'; justisholman@ 'Dave Milne'; 'Ron Rants'; 'Nancy Ronning'; marythompson1@ ; 'Ginny Stern'; brad.owen@leg.wa.gov; Fraser, Karen; Reykdal, Chris; Hunt, Sam; friends@savecapitollake.org
Subject: CLIPA comment letter on the Draft Capitol Lake Legislative Proviso Report
Attachments: 2061_001.pdf

Chris and staff:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Attached is the Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association letter. Please contact us if any questions.

Allen Miller
www.savecapitollake.org

Chris Liu, Director
Department of Enterprise Services

RE: CLIPA –MANAGED NORTH BASIN LAKE/WETLAND- HYBRID
Preliminary Comments—Oct 21 Review Draft
Phase 1 Report on the Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes
Watershed Long-Term Management Planning

Thank you for providing access to the subject Draft Report for our review and comment. Based on our review of your Draft Report and Floyd Snider's comments at the Executive Work Group Meeting on October 28, they continue to leave out or misrepresent the CLIPA Proposal that has been presented to DES for the last five years. The CLIPA Proposal is a "Managed North Basin Lake/Wetland Hybrid"— a cross between the two CLAMP proposals. Please clarify this long standing message in the Draft Report.

AN ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE COMMUNITY. CLIPA has been actively involved in the review and evaluation of State funded reports related to the current and planned management of the Deschutes River Urban Watershed, with a focus on Capitol Lake since 2009. For the last five years we have presented in writing, and in presentations to DES and the Community, a "hybrid cross " between the extremes of a Restored Estuary and the (CLAMP) Managed Lake option that CLAMP presented in 2009, which Floyd Snider continues to refer to. CLAMP also presented a "Dual Basin Hybrid".

CLIPA's proposal is a Combined Lake and fresh water wetland ecosystem in the Middle and South Basins, while retaining and improving most of the community's desired objectives for the Capitol Lake Basin that DES has listed in the Draft Report. The proposal is for a wetland in the mid basin (as an alternative to a salt water tidal mud flat) and retention of the North Basin as a Lake for swimming, small boat activity, and fishing. It also retains the North basin for a managed sediment trap and flood risk reduction for the Olympia Downtown and North Capitol Campus. Active and passive recreation throughout the three-basin lake is retained and enhanced.

CLIPA has been presenting this information to DES since early in 2009. Floyd Snider had focused on only one of our several sub-elements—the Percival Creek Extension as the differentiator to the CLAMP Managed Lake Proposal. The major difference between the CLAMP Managed Lake and the CLIPA proposal is the retention of the Lake as a community center of activity with a strong fresh water ecosystem program requiring much less pre-dredging;

this will cost less than 25% of the CLAMP proposed Restored Estuary cost and less than 15% of the CLAMP Managed Lake option cost as they were presented by Floyd Snider. These differentiators between the CLIPA Proposal versus the CLAMP proposals were either missed or ignored by Floyd Snider in the Draft Report.

COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER INPUT INTO THE DRAFT REPORT. We understood that DES/Floyd Snider and the Executive Work Group were pursuing a "fact based" and middle of the road objective review between the two extremes that CLAMP presented in 2009. We believe those two extremes are represented by: 1) Managed Capitol Lake with the 5th Avenue tide lock in place, and 2) Remove the 5th Avenue tide lock and restore the Lake basin to a Tidal Mud Flat/Estuary. All other design considerations are modifications of these two primary alternatives and whose definition was requested by the Legislative Proviso.

Our most recent discussion with DES was related to, what we believed to be, a biased presentation that was not objective nor representative of the facts (the first touch by Floyd Snider). We have been assured that it is DES's intent to present an objective and fact based report. The following comments are being presented for you to make the appropriate changes to your Draft for our "Second Touch confirmation" to ensure that the CLIPA Proposal will be accurately represented in the Draft Report.

FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT STUDIES—NOT NEW ENGINEERING ANALYSIS. The CLIPA Managed North Basin Lake/Wetlands proposal is based on: 1) The same State Consultant studies that were used by CLAMP and Floyd Snider, 2) The Corps of Engineers 2012 refinement and clarification of the CLAMP design elements that provides the most accurate cost estimates and unit volumes of sediment removal required for the CLAMP options, and 3) Several studies by the County Department of Health, DES, and others. Additionally available are government funded and volunteer scientist studies that provide key clarification of the fisheries' benefits of the Lake, actual water quality results versus Ecology models, New Zealand Mud Snail control activity by the State, and the recent dredging results in Budd Inlet. These studies have been forwarded to DES/FS to take away some of the mystery to describing the real conditions with any of the options. All of this provides the Community, Floyd Snider, and the Executive Work Group documentable data to provide a more fact based report to the Legislature.

In the cover of the Draft Report you state, "The report has been prepared-----based on information available at the time of the work. The information and conclusions contained in this report are largely based on stakeholder input, and also reflect previous technical analysis and other relevant reports. Floyd Snider cannot assure the accuracy of this information." (Note, presumably Floyd Snider can comment if they believe the data are not accurate or the information is incomplete to make a technical judgement or to properly reflect the issues in debate.)

Our CLIPA Science and Policy Panel is comprised of more than 20 professionals, each with an average of 35 years of experience in State Regulatory Agencies, Consulting, Water Quality and Resources Management, Academic Research, Environmental Law, Public Policy and Finance. We understand your challenge and the "gray area of the reporting process".

However, we do not accept that when valid information is submitted and then ignored in favor of anecdotal comments by agency representatives without written documentation of sources, that such agency information should be used in the Draft Report's public messages.
We have summarized below some of those issues that remain "suspect on facts or lacking logic". This information is important to help the general public understand the issues and to provide "informed input to future DES Surveys". This should also be important to DES when you finalize this Report to the Legislature.

DRAFT REPORT CORRECTIONS BASED ON AVAILABLE FACTS AND PUBLIC MESSAGING. We are limiting our review comments to the items that we believe have a significant public information objective or if they are directly related to the misrepresentation of the CLIPA HYBRID proposal.

A specific note refers to the opposing claim that the CLIPA proposal has not been "vetted". In reality, the CLIPA proposal uses the same State studies used by CLAMP and has had a much more extensive review than the CLAMP alternatives. DERT and Ecology have repeatedly attempted to prove a conflicting finding about the Managed Lake benefits, only to be shown with documented third party evidence that CLIPA's conclusions are scientifically correct and professionally valid. CLIPA's alternative has withstood extensive Peer Review, regulatory staff challenges, and full attack by those who want a different answer from what is now a well-documented Managed North Basin Lake/Wetland Hybrid.

THE CLAMP RESTORED ESTUARY PROJECT SUMMARRY

Complete a Pre-Dredge to remove almost 480,000 cubic yards of accumulated sediment in the Middle and North Basins of the Lake and in lower Budd Inlet prior to the removal of the 5th Avenue Dam (to avoid completely plugging up the Budd Inlet Harbor with mud); Remove 5th Avenue Dam and Railroad Bridge leaving a 500 foot river/harbor opening; Add new transition roadway to Deschutes Parkway. Install scouring protection on all shorelines, plus four bridges and their abutments to protect against "rip tide velocities two times per day and more during River flood stage". The rip tide velocities exceed the current speeds in the Tacoma Narrows and Deception Pass. The Estuary would eliminate all water contact boating and use in the entire Lake for 75% of the daylight summer hours. (The area will be a mud flat similar to those of East Bay and Mud Bay). Post Dredging of Budd Inlet every five years, or more often (sediment disposal varies from 10,000 to 100,000 cubic yards per year—see DRAFT REPORT section 4.0) to protect the Olympia Waterfront's boating and commercial programs. Install new King Tide and Seawater rise flood protection for Downtown and the North Capitol Campus after removal of protection provided by 5th Avenue tide lock.

CLAMP MANAGED LAKE. Complete the same Pre Dredge of 480,000 cubic yards, and then dredge additional sediment to a minus 13 feet tide level and remove the Railroad Bridge so that sail boats can sail to the I-5 Bridge on the Lake. Post Dredge every 10 to 25 years depending on sail boating objectives for Middle and North Basins.
CLIPA MANAGED NORTH BASIN LAKE/MIDDLE & SOUTH BASIN WETLAND HYBRID (cross between the above two CLAMP proposals). Complete a Pre-Dredge similar to

or less in volume than for the Restored Estuary. Volume dredged will be less in the Middle Basin since the North Basin Sediment Management System will more cost effectively manage small volume disposal. Retain the tide lock. No scour protection is needed. Modernize tide lock operation to continue to protect Downtown from flooding and sea level rise. Return swimming and small boat sailing to North Basin and kayaking to Middle and South Basins. Manage the Middle and South Basins as a fresh water wetland to optimize the area for wildlife, fish habitat, brown bat protection, and an urban laboratory for education on how the community can manage the area for people and the environment. Restore Percival Creek and Cove to an improved and unique natural salmon spawning stream in south Budd Inlet. Connect Percival Creek directly with salt water only if the fisheries managers advise it. Install and use existing State off-lake land for sediment dewatering and sediment reuse. Optimize the control of invasive species in the Lake in the same manner that WDFW and DNR use in other water bodies of the State. Post-Dredge the North Basin every 10 years. Spot dredge lower Budd Inlet and the Deschutes River channel to maintain intended functions about every ten to 20 years.

RELATIVE COST COMPARISONS---STARTING WITH A BASELINE THAT IS VALID. Careful comparison of the above three summaries will help clarify the differences and the comparative cost impacts between the Dam—No Dam Alternatives. The Relative Cost Comparison must be based on a plan that can be updated or modified as new information is provided. Transparency of information, findings, and conclusions are essential to resolve the confusion that now exists in the community and the Legislature. This process must present the true alternatives for the future of Capitol Lake.

At the start of the DES process, CLIPA was assured that we would serve on the Technical Team along with the regulatory, governmental, and consultant technical team. CLIPA is a broad based community organization that has taken input on Community views for over five years. When CLIPA was denied the opportunity to transfer their community (and technical) knowledge to Floyd Snider in a setting that encourage technical vetting of various studies, DES/FS effectively excluded the last five years of public input. As a result, the many disputed technical reports used by CLAMP for its interpretations of findings over the last seven years still remain. The Ruckelshaus recommendations were also ignored by the current process.

FOUR AREAS WHERE THE DRAFT REPORT MISSES FACTS OR KEY MESSAGES

1) NO BASELINE DEFINITION OF THE ALTERNATIVES BEING COMPARED. (See CLIPA's abbreviated summary above based on CLAMP reports.) There is no definition of the primary alternatives---Managed Lake with 5th Avenue Dam Retention versus Removal of 5th Avenue Dam returning the Lake Basin to a Tidal Mud Flat/Estuary. CLAMP representatives spent 10 years and over $2.0 million on consultant studies and presumably know what the Alternative Definitions are/were. DES and Floyd Snider spent another $250,000.00 each from a 2011 and 2013 legislative appropriation to set the stage for the EIS and development of the future of Capitol Lake. We still do not know what the basic definitions of the viable alternatives are. This is one reason why there is so much disagreement about the impacts, costs, and benefits. Everyone has a different definition in their mind about what each alternative is or how it will impact the

community and the surrounding environment. Here are some resulting confused or misleading messages from the Draft Report.

2) RELATIVE COST COMPARISON BAR CHARTS WITH NO BASELINE---The First and Second Touches of the DES/Floyd Snider presentation of the Relative Cost Bar Charts have no "defined baseline" and as a result, the Bar Charts "relative costs" for the CLIPA Managed Lake Option in the first draft were completely wrong. The second draft still has misleading conclusions. These Bar Charts have little real value but they may be interpreted by the general public as representing valid comparative costs. The following discussion of the factors affecting cost in the "second touch" bar chart between the CLAMP RESTORED ESTUARY Relative Cost" and the CLIPA MANAGED LAKE North Basin/Wetland Cost" identifies our point on the misleading conclusions that the Draft Report Bar Charts provide. (a) The 'mitigation for construction impacts' cost factor for the CLIPA sub option is presently shown as about twice the amount as for the Estuary option. If this factor is based on mitigation for dredging, which in the case of the Estuary, is a pre-dredge before dam removal, then it should be equal for both the CLIPA Managed Lake option and the Estuary, because the dredging for both options is exactly the same material, in the same amount, going to the same disposal site. If this factor is based on disruption due to construction activity, then it should only apply to the Estuary option. There is no significant construction associated with the CLIPA Managed Lake option. Construction for the Estuary option includes removal of large amounts of material to create the 500 foot opening at Fifth Avenue and the Railroad Bridge, construction of a new bridge and roundabouts for Fifth Avenue, placement of large volumes of rip-rap for armoring at these openings and the resultant detrimental impact on fish passage during these construction periods. For these reasons, the construction mitigation cost factor for the CLIPA option is less than or at least no more than for the Estuary option. For the same reasons above, the section of Note 5 that deletes permitting and design costs from inclusion in the bar graphs for all options should be added. These costs would clearly be more significant for the Estuary option with substantial construction required.

In a similar manner the 'mitigation for maintenance dredging' for the CLIPA option and Estuary option is not reflective of real life. Presently, this mitigation is only shown for the CLIPA option and is completely absent from the Estuary bar chart. This is a case of Floyd Snider making a technical determination for Phase 1 that should be deferred to Phase 2 if their stated intent on not making technical field judgements prior to the EIS is to be followed. The rationale for this position by Floyd Snider is contained in note 10 and in their comment that an estuary would be considered self-mitigating and would not require additional mitigation costs. At this stage (Phase 1), neither rationale has the certainty necessary to reach that conclusion. For example, note 10 describes impacts from construction access that would affect upland habitat or park space. CLIPA has proposed a fixed dredging operation in the North basin that could reasonably operate without those impacts described. For the Estuary option, over the fifty year life of the project, it is very likely that additional dredging will be required in the area that is now the North basin, and perhaps also in the Middle Basin of Capitol Lake. This could require significant mitigation. Probably even more important with an estuary will be the loss of

the freshwater ecosystems/wetlands that now occupy the Middle and South Basins of Capitol Lake. All vegetation and freshwater ecosystems presently in that area will die-off due to saltwater intrusion. This loss of freshwater wetland and habitat may require mitigation, especially if brown bats, Olympic Mudminnows, or other native species' habitats are lost. These are only a few examples that demonstrate that at this stage Floyd Snider should not be making technical decisions regarding mitigation that favors one option over another. We ask, as Floyd Snider did for the case of the uncertainty of dredge cost factors, that this mitigation for maintenance dredging impacts be kept equal for the two alternatives until the technical, environmental and engineering details can be examined in the Phase 2 EIS. Another questionable cost factor for the CLIPA option is related to the long-term maintenance cost factor for the reflecting pool, barrier wall or Fifth Avenue tide lock. We see this cost factor representing a place holder for repairs or upgrades that are likely during the later stages of this fifty-year project. We have no dispute with this concept. However, we have heard considerable comment at the Executive Committee meetings, about the need to deal with the impacts of sediment not only in the Capitol Lake Basin, but in Budd Inlet and the Port area if the tide lock is removed. We have heard comments about "diversion walls", "deflection barriers" and "weirs" near the I-5 Bridge. These could be costly additions to the Estuary option. Additionally, our technical experts have warned that the pulsing nature of sediments during major storm events could swamp Budd Inlet and the Port. The CLAMP study, referencing the Corps of Engineers, predicted over six feet of sediment would deposit in lower Budd Inlet and around Percival Landing every ten years following tide lock removal. As far as we can determine, none of these sediment management challenges associated with the Estuary option are factored into the DES/FS Relative Cost Comparisons.

3) COMMUNITY INTERESTS –AESTHETICS, RECREATION AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS----The 2009 CLAMP Recommendations focused on the removal of the 5th Avenue Dam with most findings presented to support that conclusion. Information on what the Community wanted between the Pioneer Park and Priest Point Park—Urban Watershed for their use and enjoyment was conspicuously ignored in the CLAMP Recommendations and is also largely in this Draft Report by DES/Floyd Snider. The Community input on Project Goals from the 2016 Phase 1 Process Figure 3 identified the top 7 objectives in this descending order---Aesthetics, Sediment Management, Recreational Opportunities, Water Quality, Economically Feasible & Reasonable, Habitat Restoration, and Flood Management. The Draft Report speaks to only a few of these Community Priorities in an informed manner. Section 4 in the Report provides a very thorough summary of the sediment management challenges. Mayor Kmet has asked that a section be inserted on water quality. This new section should also address the negative impacts that the proposed $46 million new fish hatchery by Pioneer Park will have on lower watershed water quality. A similar section should be added on "Aesthetics and Recreational Opportunities" that are important to the general public. The 280,000 citizens of the City and County want access and use of the Capitol Lake Basin for both active and passive recreation, improved aesthetics for community and tourism objectives and to return the urban watershed to a place for families to have active water contact recreation. Since the early 1980's, due to a failed government maintenance program, the community

lost a Lake swimming beach, a lake for youth sailing and boating, and even kayak level access to the entire Lake basin. Aesthetics of the Lake which serve as a complement to the historic City Beautiful Movement design of the State Capitol Campus and the center of the City of Olympia's effort to have a vibrant downtown are not even addressed in the Draft Report.

4) WHAT DOES THE RESTORED ESTUARY DO FOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE LAKE BASIN---IT DOES NOT REPLACE THAT WHICH WAS LOST EXCEPT FOR A POSSIBLE RETURN TO SEASONAL KAYAKING. During the five spring and summer months, only mud flat will be available in the Lake Basin during daylight hours for over 75% of the time. Water access and boating will be further reduced twice daily during the "rip tide" conditions during the four hours when the tidal flow velocity will exceed the current speeds in the Tacoma Narrows and Deception Pass. This will make kayaking for families and inexperienced boaters dangerous in the center of the City. IN CONTRAST, THE CLIPA MANAGED LAKE OPTION will return the North Basin to swimming, boating, paddle boarding, fishing, and many other family activities in a safe and clean environment in the middle of the City. Kayaking and water based nature trails will be available in both the Middle and South Basins and for academic studies in a natural middle of the City ecosystem.

5) INTERIM STEPS PENDING LONG TERM PROGRAM. DES last dredged Capitol Lake in 1986. The Community has continued to build waterfront assets along the Deschutes Urban Waterfront. The estimate of expenditures exceeds $100 million and the entire downtown and Port of Olympia's future is linked to the future of the how Capitol Lake is managed. The DES Schedule provides for the earliest time to implement the management plan as 2025. Given the debate and approach, this is an early estimate. Yet the community has seen no interim plan to "bridge the lack of action with a community friendly interim plan---pending a yet to be defined long range plan". A Three Step program is available that would demonstrate that reasonable people can work together to meet current day needs. STEP 1: Do an interim dredge of 25% of what is already identified as will be required under the Restored Estuary Alternatives. This amount would not conflict with any of the other identified alternatives, including the CLIPA Managed Lake Hybrid. STEP 2: Initiate a water quality sampling program to measure water quality from Pioneer Park to Priest Point Park on at least a monthly basis to continue objective and factual water quality data. This would continue until the long term management plan is adopted. Most of the debate and the disagreements about the benefits and impacts of the Lake related to water quality would be resolved and go away if the County Health Department and LOTT oversaw the sampling program and the data were used to guide future design considerations for the Lake Management Plan. STEP 3: Continue the DES Program to complete the EIS and develop the long term Management Plan.

In the absence of this THREE STEP INTERIM PLAN, all projects related to fish enhancement, steam bed modification, or upper watershed fish hatcheries (at Pioneer Park and Falls Terrace Park) should be put on hold until the entire Deschutes Urban Watershed Plan is adopted by the entire community.

We look forward to seeing the edited version of both the write up on the CLIPA Managed Lake Hybrid and to see how you address the related issues and the Bar Chart relative cost comparison. We have the specific costs for the Restored Estuary that the COE prepared in 2012, using the 2006 CLAMP report to provide a more realistic "Relative Cost Comparison" and will make this available for reference in the future.

We also look forward to seeing your draft write up on water quality and on the aesthetic and recreational opportunities related to each alternative. This will be a key discussion for the public and the Legislature.

Please let us know if you would like to meet to review your working draft to avoid repeating the past mistaken understanding of the CLIPA Managed North Basin Lake/Wetlands Hybrid proposal.

Allen G. Miller, on behalf of the
CLIPA Board of Directors.