



CAPITOL LAKE EXECUTIVE WORK GROUP

*Jefferson Building
First Floor Presentation Room
1500 Jefferson Street
Olympia, Washington 98504*

Meeting Minutes January 29, 2016

(Approved: March 25, 2016)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cathy Wolfe, Thurston County
Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater
Cheryl Selby, City of Olympia
Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
Bill McGregor, Port of Olympia

DES STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chris Liu, Director
Bob Covington, Deputy Director
Carrie Martin, Asset Manager

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Sue Patnude, DERT
Greg Schundler, Citizen
Denis Curry, CLIPA
Stewart Gloyd, Citizen
Myra Downing, Citizen
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Holly Gadbow, Citizen
Jim Wilcox, Citizen
Bob Jacobs, Heritage Park Association
Jack Havens, Citizen
Michael Carra, Citizen
Ken Camp, Lt. Governor's Office
Gary Bahr, Department of Agriculture
Peter Heide, Citizen
Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology
Ben Heidgerken, Citizen
Jason Sweeney, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Bill Robinson, Citizen
Allen Pleus, Department of Fish & Wildlife
Martin McCallum, Citizen
Darrell Hoppe, Olympia Planning Commission
Robert Jensen, DERT

ABSENT:

Karen Fraser, Senate
Neil McClanahan, City of Tumwater

Robert Sands, Citizen
Nouk Leap, DES
Perry Lund, Department of Ecology
Carl Nelson, Citizen
Allen Miller, CLIPA
Kay Cooper, Citizen
Rose Hong, DES
Ben Dennis, Instream
Helen Wheatley, Citizen
E.J. Zita, Port of Olympia
Gary Larson, Citizen
Gary Cooper, Citizen
Jen Masterson, OFM
Marshall Oatman, Citizen
Alex Callender, Department of Ecology
Daniel Einstein, DERT
Ken Spiller, Citizen
Stuart Reed, Citizen
Dick Binns, Citizen
Colleen Cary, Citizen
Matt Miskovic, DES
Steve Trapp, DERT
Andy Hobbs, The Olympian

Michael Saunders, Citizen	Rosemary Gilman, Citizen
Matt Barrett, USACE	Kathleen Downey, Citizen
Bob Holman, Citizen	Zena Hartung, DERT
Dave Peeler, DERT	Bill Helbig, Port of Olympia
Bob Barnes, SPSSEG	Chris Conklin, WDFW
Roberta Woods, Citizen	Dick Stamey, Citizen
J. Beekmann, Olympia Yacht Club	Lawrence Holt, Citizen
David Bremer, Congressman Denny Heck's Office	Bob VanSchoorl, Citizen
Steve Shanewise, Citizen	Dan Smith, City of Tumwater
Kristin Swenddal, Department of Natural Resources	Jeff Parsons, Puget Sound Partnership
Joe Downing, Port of Olympia	Andy Haub, City of Olympia
Tim Young, Citizen	Lisa Dennis-Perez, LOTT Clean Water Alliance
Andrea Smith, Representative Chris Reykdal's Office	Bob Wubbena, CLIPA
John Rosenberg, DERT	Scott Steltzner, Squaxin Island Tribe
Lydia Wagner, Department of Ecology	Rachel Newman, Citizen
Derek Gourdiaan, Citizen	Anne Van Sweringen, BHAS
Howard Hegwer, Citizen	Emmett O'Connell, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Jerilyn Wallay, South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	Paul Dziedzic, Meeting Facilitator
Curt Hart, DES	

Welcome and Introductions

Chris Liu, Director, Department of Enterprise Services (DES), called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m. He welcomed everyone and thanked everyone for participating in the initial kick-off meeting for the long-term management of Capitol Lake.

Members in attendance provided self-introduction.

Director Liu thanked state and federal representatives for attending the meeting. He recognized individuals representing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Natural Resources, the landowner of Capitol Lake, former City of Olympia Mayors Bob Jacobs and Holly Gadbow, Thurston County Commissioner Bud Blake, Port of Olympia Commissioners Joe Downing and E.J. Zita, and David Bremer representing Congressman Denny Heck's Office. Senator Karen Fraser was unable to attend because of activities in the Legislature.

Opening Remarks

Director Liu recognized Senator Karen Fraser for her efforts to pursue a successful budget proviso for initiating the planning process for Capitol Lake.

Explanation of Proviso, Process and Expectations

Director Liu reported DES is responsible for the long-term management and care of Capitol Campus to include Capitol Lake. Approximately 260 acres of the lake are included within the grounds of Capitol Campus. The lake is a popular destination for the local and regional community. Current issues surrounding the lake include poor water quality and the presence of invasive species.

In December 2014, the Ruckelshaus Center completed a situation assessment of Capitol Lake confirming the community was evenly divided on the long-term management of Capitol Lake, either as an estuary or

maintaining the basin as a lake. The assessment recommended a collaborative process to bring together local and tribal governments who all have a stake in how the lake is managed. DES also needs to know from governmental partners their respective interest in pursuing a solution. The Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) process ended in 2009. That effort produced a substantial amount of data. This effort would build on the information CLAMP completed and identify gaps the previous process did not address.

Future work is outlined in the budget proviso adopted by the Legislature in 2015. The Ruckleshaus assessment recommended a collaborative process with executive leaders channeling public input. State lawmakers directed DES through the proviso to conduct a proactive approach through public engagement to evaluate options. The proviso included four major provisions:

1. Identify a shared governance structure for Capitol Lake management;
2. Identify a sustainable and politically feasible cost-share model that includes a mixture of private, local, state, and federal funds;
3. Develop a plan to manage existing sediment in the lake, as well as sediments carried downstream by the Deschutes River and deposited into the lake each year; and
4. Identification of feasible lake management alternatives, including hybrid approaches that might work.

Other provisions include summarizing the best available science, identifying the range of public support or concerns about each of the options that might be considered, and identify general cost estimates for each option.

A successful process considers available information and defines elements that were not previously analyzed. It could entail an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, a review of each alternative measured against defined criteria, and a determination on the best way to move forward together. This process would not entail a vote on a decision, but it would include working together to develop the best outcome for the community.

Important to the success are several principles:

- Listen to each other around the table.
- Assume a positive intent for anything that is considered on the table.
- Work to meet each other's needs for this resource.

The first meeting is intended to launch the process to work together to achieve the objectives outlined in the proviso for the management of Capitol Lake. It's important to share and listen to thoughts on how to organize and operate for success. Moving forward, the group will consider the framework (copy provided) developed for a collaborative process.

DES is neutral regarding the long-term management decision for the lake. The legislative appropriation provided DES with funding for a facilitator and consultant assistance as needed. DES will provide regular updates on the status of the effort to the State Capitol Committee, Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee, Office of Financial Management, and the Legislature. DES will also submit a report to state lawmakers by January 1, 2017 summarizing the efforts.

The work group will need to understand what's important to each government partner and respective constituencies. This is critical to work together in a cooperative and collaborative manner. It's also important to have an agreement on the work group's role in listening to each other, being open to all ideas, electing co-leads to assist with meeting organization, and providing direction to the technical work groups. There may be gaps that the technical work groups may not have time or resources to address. It will be important to identify those gaps. For areas that require completion, it's important to ensure that sufficient work has been completed to lay the groundwork and to provide an understanding on what's needed in the future to conclude the effort.

Commissioner Cathy Wolfe arrived at the meeting.

Comments from Government Leaders

Director Liu introduced Paul Dziedzic, meeting facilitator.

Mr. Dziedzic invited questions on the proposed process and comments on the importance of the resource to each member and their respective constituents. He asked members to confirm their willingness to participate in the process for the next year, outlined several options for moving forward, and invited comments.

Port Commissioner McGregor requested the identification of some acronyms for several stakeholder organizations. Manager Martin identified several of the acronyms:

- DAHP = Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation
- PSP = Puget Sound Partnership
- RCO = Recreation and Conservation Office
- AG = Department of Agriculture
- LOTT = LOTT Clean Water Alliance
- CLIPA = Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association
- DERT = Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team

Director Liu noted there might be other stakeholder groups not currently listed. Those groups are not excluded and are welcome to join the process.

Mayor Selby asked whether the proceedings are being filmed. Manager Martin said the filming is to provide a live feed to another meeting room in the event an overflow area would be required. The group will discuss whether meetings should be filmed moving forward.

Commissioner McGregor noted the majority of the population resides in Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater. He questioned why the City of Lacey was not included as a member of the work group. Director Liu replied that the City of Lacey was not purposely excluded. If members concur, the City of Lacey could be included.

Mayor Kmet agreed the City of Lacey should be included as the City is a member of LOTT Clean Water Alliance (LOTT).

Commissioner Wolfe agreed because the effort is a regional approach and the City of Lacey should be included. Mayor Selby concurred.

Mr. Dickson indicated he had no comments.

Mr. Dziejdzic queried members on whether there's consensus to include the City of Lacey as a participant.

Mr. Dickson noted that the characterization of that decision could have an effect on other jurisdictions and it could be interpreted widely to extend beyond the City of Lacey. The issue is where membership should end.

Mayor Selby questioned whether the City of Lacey would be assessed if a funding determination includes local jurisdictions. Mr. Dickson said the reference to the LOTT is an acknowledgment that LOTT is a participant and Lacey could be as well.

Commissioner Wolfe said her comments reflected only the boundary of Thurston County and not beyond the jurisdiction of Thurston County.

Mayor Kmet supported the inclusion of Lacey as the three jurisdictions in north Thurston County work jointly with Thurston County and the Port. Additionally, the three jurisdictions and Thurston County comprise the LOTT Board of Directors and LOTT is the major discharger into Budd Inlet. South county jurisdictions are not as closely affiliated with lower Budd Inlet.

Commissioner Wolfe offered another consideration of including Joint Base Lewis McChord because of recent efforts to integrate the base within the community. Many military retirees will live in Thurston County.

Commissioner McGregor agreed The City of Lacey should be included because of the population base, as well as being a member of LOTT.

Mr. Dziejdzic said it appears there is a sentiment to include the City of Lacey.

Director Liu urged members to consider the effectiveness of the process. Establishing too large of a group creates difficulties in scheduling meetings. It is however, important to have the right representatives at the table.

Several members preferred forwarding an invitation to JBLM to join as one of the interested stakeholder organizations.

Mr. Dziejdzic asked Mr. Dickson for feedback on the distinction of including the City of Lacey. Mr. Dickson declined to comment.

Mr. Dziejdzic said it appears there is agreement and no objection to invite the City of Lacey to participate while extending an invitation to JBLM to join other organizations identified as interested stakeholders.

Mr. Dziejdzic referred to the choices for articulating success. One way of viewing success is the DES report based on the work completed by the work group. Another choice is to consider the process as a way to set the stage for preparation of an EIS that moves to a decision and action. That would build on

previous work completed and it would evaluate issues and ideas. It would also assist DES in moving forward on a decision and action as opposed to a report to the Legislature.

Director Liu added that the technical work is the issue to address in moving forward. The proviso outlines all the work that should be completed; however, it might be beneficial to step back and consider the concept of what the outcome of the process is attempting to achieve. This could be viewed as a problem or an opportunity that needs to be solved. Capitol Lake is a resource located within the middle of the community. The issue is how best to utilize the resource regardless of the management decision. The question is what the best decision is for the community. There has been much conjecture that the state should make a decision and move forward. However, that concept deserves some pushback as the group is at the behest of the community and should be doing what the community wants. Each member represents the community. It's important to move forward knowing what the community interests are. DES and the state are not set on any particular direction but want to ensure the process is a cooperative solution that satisfies the needs of the community while serving the community in the future as well. It's important for participants to search for cooperative methods of resolution. It's also important to recognize that some decisions will not solve everyone's concerns. However, it's possible to cover many concerns. There is no pre-ordained outcome. DES is ready and willing to listen to the community and to the participants as it works to develop a solution that fits the community now and in the future.

Mr. Dziedzic invited comments from participants.

Commissioner McGregor commented that it's important for him to represent the three-member Commission. The cities and county are also in the same position, and any decision would need to be reviewed by the member's respective agency for discussion. Any decision he renders would be a consolidated decision by the entire Port Commission and not as a single Commissioner.

Mr. Dziedzic noted that there might be instances during the process when members might be asked to provide feedback on different options that might be viable for shared funding or governance. The process might not entail specific decisions.

Manager Martin described the EIS process. When projects are initiated, an EIS is one of the permitting and regulatory requirements, which includes identifying options that are measured against different criteria, such as economic impact, fish habitat, recreational use, or environmental impacts to the water body. A decision on long-term management, managed lake, hybrid or restored estuary, would require an EIS. The EIS is the formal requirement to assess impacts of any proposed action.

Sally, Toteff, Regional Director, SW Region, Department of Ecology, explained that an EIS for this process would follow the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). SEPA includes clear rules on how impacts are evaluated for any local or state proposed project. Not all decisions are related to an EIS but are often related to a streamlined process of a Determination of Non-significance (DNS) whereby project impacts have been determined to be non-significant. SEPA was adopted in 1970 by the Washington State Legislature establishing the first step prior to a project receiving permits. The process assesses impacts to the natural and built environment, emphasizes community involvement, and provides an opportunity for the community to provide feedback to the agency that is overseeing the process of evaluation.

Mayor Kmet commented on the numerous prior studies and committees for Capitol Lake and should the group move a project forward, the process would have to complete an EIS regardless of the decision. He

questioned whether the effort should feed into an EIS process. It's an issue the technical work groups should explore in terms of how to utilize this process to help position the state and stakeholders for some kind of EIS process. Otherwise, it could only entail completion of just one more study. He suggested natural resource agencies should provide some guidance as to how the work group's efforts could feed into an EIS process. He indicated a desire for a better understanding of the group's options.

Mr. Dziedzic reviewed the suggestion as to how the group's work might move toward an EIS process, as well as identifying the resources required to complete an EIS and available resources from DES.

Mr. Dziedzic asked for input from members on the importance of Capitol Lake to constituencies and what the process represents in terms of future actions for future management of the lake.

Mayor Kmet remarked that the Deschutes River, Capitol Lake, and lower Budd Inlet are an important part of the Tumwater community. A large part of Tumwater drains into the watershed through the river or Percival Creek. He is concerned about continuing violations of water quality that are occurring in the lake and Budd Inlet and what those economic consequences are to the communities. It is hoped that the group could agree on a solution that addresses those issues. Tumwater also has a fish capture facility scheduled for an upgrade by the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) in conjunction with the Squaxin Island Tribe. It's important the facility provides the ability to capture and raise fish to fulfill the state's fisheries obligations under its treaties. The solution should keep the hatchery a viable, long-term operation. There are many other issues surrounding recreational concerns and lack of access to the lake. Many people would like to kayak up to the brewery, as many have done so in the historic past. Those options are not available with the lake closed because of invasive species. A number of issues directly impact Tumwater. The discussion on the lake has occurred for many years and it's time to move forward.

Commissioner Wolfe said the County Board of Commissioners agree with Mayor Kmet's concerns surrounding water quality and restoration of habitat for wildlife and fish. However, the community is divided with half wanting to maintain a lake and the other half wanting to convert the lake to an estuary. There is no one solid position. She agreed action must occur from the work group, as she was a member of the previous committee. She supports focusing on hybrid alternatives rather than reinventing the wheel with the lake vs. estuary debate. Officially, the former interest by the majority of the Board of County Commissioners was to convert the lake to an estuary; however, she opposed that choice, as she preferred to maintain a lake. The current Commission has not had an opportunity to discuss the issue and she's unsure as to the county's position today. She also wants to avoid repeating prior work. She plans to participate in the process with the hope that some actions will lead to an outcome.

Mayor Selby acknowledged that the City supports the process. The current City Council has not studied or taken a position on the state's plan for Capitol Lake even though it has been discussed endlessly for many years by City policymakers and staff. In the past, some Councilmembers leaned toward certain principles that she believes are still valid today to include the City not wanting the lake to become a battle in the community that results in winners and losers. The City is anxious to participate in a process that allows all issues not only to be heard, but also addressed by whatever the decision the state makes. To do so, the state would create both the authority and the necessary funding to implement a dual basin, an estuary, or a dredged lake. Having a community slugfest over lake versus estuary is pointless unless there is a mechanism and money to move forward. The City believes that every idea of compromise and reconciliation should be explored to address concerns regarding sediment management, water quality, healthy fish and fish runs, aesthetics, recreational value, economic impacts, infrastructure costs, and

impacts construction would have on downtown businesses if the dam were removed. This could entail another situation where the east/west corridor was eliminated for sometime similar to the Nisqually Earthquake impacting downtown Olympia. It's also important for boating sustainability, Port of Olympia and Marine Terminal impacts, bat populations, and upper Deschutes nutrient-loading. While science is important to this work, no new science or technical studies would magically resolve the issue and convince everyone that a lake or an estuary is the right solution. Dueling science only divides public opinion rather than creating a basis for reasonable consensus. Every effort should be expended to ensure that the process does not become a brother against brother or sister against sister civil war. The City is hopeful all parties will come to the table in good faith with an interest in compromise and problem-solving to move this important issue forward. Mayor Selby added that she is not a scientist but she does have the technical consulting wisdom of Andy Haub with the City. She is a business owner and hopes to represent a voice that is not always present at the discussions at this level from the private sector. In terms of keeping boards and councils apprised, she supports filming the meetings, as well as staff support for check-in points during Council study sessions at certain leverage points.

Commissioner McGregor shared that during the Commission's discussion on sending a representative to represent the Port as a member of the work group, he was recommended as the Commissioner to attend because of his prior involvement in CLAMP. However, he reassured Commissioners that he would attend with an open mind as the decision must represent a win-win for everyone. Collaboration between the entities would likely result in a collective decision. The outcome could be a hybrid solution. The silting issue is of great importance not only to the Port, but also to marine businesses located on the north side of the dam. Filming the meetings is important for those individuals unable to attend. He agreed a work session of the Port Commission would be a good way to update the Commission on the directions and results of each monthly meeting. It's important for all citizens to have the ability to watch the meetings.

Mr. Dickison expressed appreciation for members attending on behalf of the Tribal Council as the Council is fully committed to the process. The Council views the process as another important step in government-to-government relations, which is important to the Council. In terms of decision-making, Mr. Dickison said he is not one of the decision-makers and would be providing regular updates to the Tribal Council, as he has done over the last 30 years. As a scientist, he hopes to contribute that experience to bear in the process. Some might ask how the tribe can participate in an open process committed to a fair outcome when its position is remarkably clear and well documented. While that aspect may be true, the values supported by nearly everyone such as recreation, water quality, economics are all issues of importance that the group will work on together to achieve an outcome. There are many specifics envisioned in the process that the group needs to work on and determine. Clearly, sedimentation is a process that is ongoing with the river always transporting sediments down the valley and into the estuary. It's important to develop the best means to manage sediments in a practical way in an urban environment. He asked members not to assume that the Tribe's position for restoration would automatically mean turning back the clock 150-200 years. Everyone lives in the present day and understands outcomes. The Tribe is committed to working within the process to try to achieve some genuine workable outcomes.

Director Liu thanked members for their comments as it demonstrates that everyone supports the effort and has concerns. It underlines the importance of addressing all issues in a cooperative manner. Looking to the future it's possible to work together on the issues. DES will help facilitate the conversation, is receptive in considering all the issues, and will provide resourcing as provided within the proviso. Satisfying the proviso would demonstrate to everyone that the participants are working

together on a forward path to address all concerns acknowledging that the history of past processes will not haunt this process in the future. The Governor and congressional delegations are very interested in the issue surrounding Capitol Lake. DES is committed to facilitating an open and fair process for all participants to include the community. Members represent the best outcome of today's meeting by making a commitment to participate.

Mr. Dziejdzic reviewed a few questions to receive guidance from members. Many are process questions and to help scope the group's work within the budget proviso. Basic questions surround the operation of the work group in terms of recording the meetings, posting minutes, forms for public input, meeting schedule, and assigning co-leads to assist in guiding the group and working on issues between meetings.

Commissioner Wolfe and Mayor Selby commented that the size of the group wouldn't necessarily warrant the need for co-leads. They recommended deferring the co-lead discussion.

How Do We Move Forward?

Mr. Dziejdzic outlined two options for moving forward:

- Option 1 – Scope out work on each of the proviso issues, give charge to Technical Committee, and discuss how the work group will address shared governance and cost-sharing.
- Option 2 – The Technical Committee meets prior to the next meeting to scope work related to the resource and use the next meeting in February to receive and react to the suggested plan and discuss the plan to address other issues (shared governance & cost-sharing).

Mayor Selby favored Option 2, as Option 1 would delay efforts until March.

Mayor Kmet recommended using the Technical Committee as a resource and guide for the work group to provide information and help position the group for meetings. At some point in the process, it would be helpful for staff or the Technical Committee to highlight the scope and outcome of the studies completed to date to afford a common foundation on all the completed studies.

Manager Martin advised that DES has all the studies compiled and summarization of the information is included as an item for the Technical Committee to pursue through an information review. A summarization of the studies is possible.

Mr. Dziejdzic said the addition would amend Option 2 in terms of sharing information on where the process has been and how the group will use the year to prepare for the potential of an EIS.

Mayor Selby asked about other studies completed by other scientists outside the state that could be included as well.

Director Liu recommended providing a clear delineation between previous studies and potential new information. It's likely a request to 20 scientists to weigh in on the issue would result in 20 different opinions. Some of those issues will be debated as the effort continues. He would prefer not presenting independent studies regardless of whether the studies have been vetted or not vetted. Past studies in possession by DES represent the history of culminated studies and could be clearly summarized. He recommended beginning at that point first.

Commissioner Wolfe supported the direction as proposed but cautioned that the process should not be staff-driven and that the work is completed by participants. She wants to avoid being locked into past positions. Even though, she has favored the lake option in the past, she is participating with an open mind.

Mr. Dickison supported the concepts in Option 2; although his opinion differs somewhat in that Option 1 appears to be too restrictive to the proviso issues. It's important that the group approach the work with a broad perspective that the proviso could be treated as a minimum standard, but that the group should be prepared to embrace other issues as the process proceeds, which might be more important than some of the elements contained in the proviso.

Commissioner McGregor said he's comfortable with Option 2. However, some elements in the proviso are technically driven, which may entail the Technical Committee working on those elements. He questioned the available resources for the Technical Committee. Mr. Dziedzic said the proposal doesn't entail the Technical Committee reporting on its work and rendering any recommendations about the substantive elements. Rather, the committee would present recommendations on its plan for the next year, such as identifying what should be addressed. The group would have the opportunity to review, react, and provide direction on the work plan for resource-based questions. The Technical Committee would not work on recommendations on the questions but rather how to be productive during the course of the year to position the group in front-loading or moving to an EIS.

Mayor Kmet pointed out that the technical resources would not be addressing governance or cost-sharing. Mr. Dziedzic agreed those are separate elements. Mayor Kmet said it is also likely legal support would be required for those elements. Mr. Dziedzic said the Technical Committee would focus on resource-related questions and not governance and cost-sharing. The suggestion is including some time at the February meeting for the first discussion on what it would entail to consider those questions and how should they be organized if the decision is to move forward with the Technical Committee. It would entail an entry-level process for sharing thoughts and then moving forward. It's important to frontload the resource discussion and identify a game plan for moving forward.

Director Liu pointed out that the work plan would be approved by the work group in terms of how the work group moves forward.

Mr. Dziedzic asked whether members are clear about the membership of the Technical Committee.

Commissioner Wolfe said she's unsure of the staff member assigned from the county. Mayor Kmet reported that the City assigned one staff member to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Dziedzic referred to the draft meeting schedule. He suggested scheduling a two-hour meeting in February to accommodate time to receive a report on the resource work plan. He asked members to provide feedback to Manager Martin on meeting dates and duration to review an adjusted meeting schedule at the February meeting.

Director Liu and Commissioner McGregor agreed a two-hour meeting in February is warranted.

Mr. Dziedzic said the work group previously requested deferring the identity of co-leads. Essentially, deferring that decision would entail communications to each member on some of the preparation meeting questions individually.

In terms of informing the public of the group's work, options include posting meeting notes, recording meetings, posting video of meetings on the website, or live streaming. Some members expressed a preference for the meetings to be filmed.

Commissioner McGregor supported some form of filming for the public to ensure the public is informed and to avoid any misconceptions. It's important for the meetings to be transparent. Mayor Kmet commented on the quality of the film and questioned whether the meeting venue would be conducive for filming.

Members agreed to film and post the video on the website rather than live streaming. Director Liu noted that DES IT staff would be consulted for technical guidance.

Discussion ensued on ensuring microphones or some other form of amplification is available so members of the public in attendance can hear the discussion.

Members supported preparation of meeting minutes with a detailed summary of conversations. Members agreed to be responsible for approving the minutes of the prior meeting at the beginning of each meeting.

Discussion ensued on the form of public input during meetings.

Commissioner McGregor asked for an example of a public input process used by another jurisdiction. Director Liu replied that at the end of each meeting, the agenda included an opportunity for public input. Mr. Dziejcz described the process in the Skagit example, as the public comment period was substantial in many cases. Director Liu offered that constituents could also have the opportunity to provide feedback to their respective councils and boards during public comment opportunities.

Mr. Dziejcz emphasized the importance of the group to be clear on its process and consider how to involve the public as opposed to receiving input separately. The work plan by the Technical Committee will outline the work plan providing the group with an opportunity to consider how to include public input. He offered to consult with members prior to the next meeting to establish a public input process while the group considers how it will complete its work over the next year.

Mayor Selby noted that the community is adept and engaged. The City is currently working with a consultant on the Downtown Strategy Plan. That planning effort affords different leverage points, when the process reaches out to the community affording opportunities for community feedback. She preferred deferring the public input process until the work group has reviewed its work plan and calendar to consider some leverage points to receive public comment.

Mr. Dziejcz asked for feedback on whether to include a public comment period at the end of each meeting.

Mr. Dickison reiterated the Tribe's participation in the process to further government-to-government relations. The Tribe encourages all members to engage their respective constituents. However, the group's time would be better spent on its discussion.

Mayor Selby preferred to consider the issue when the work group has a calendar. Other members concurred with the approach.

Commissioner McGregor asked whether information would be provided to the public on how citizens could provide written communications. Director Liu affirmed that DES would coordinate and establish information for distribution and receipt of information.

DES Communications Director Curt Hart affirmed that staff would coordinate the filming, meeting room amplification, and public information process.

Commissioner Wolfe agreed with Mr. Dickison's comments in terms of the work group's limited time but also believes it's important to provide an opportunity for public comment. At some point, the work group needs to hear from the public.

Mr. Dziejdzic affirmed the focus at the February meeting would be on organizing the work plan and determining steps necessary to complete the work. The work group will identify points in the process for engaging feedback from the community. The February 26 meeting will be extended to two hours.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:04 a.m.