

Technical Committee
Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Planning
1500 Jefferson Street SE, Room 2330, Olympia, Washington 98504
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
July 14, 2016

Meeting Notes

Participants

Sally Toteff, Ecology
Rich Doenges, Ecology
Lydia Wagner, Ecology
Cristiana Figeroa-Kaminsky, Ecology
Darric Lowery attending
for Chris Conklin, Fish and Wildlife
Kristin Swenddal, Natural Resources
Bill Helbig, Port of Olympia
Scott Steltzner, Squaxin Island Tribe
Brad Murphy, Thurston County
Dan Smith, City of Tumwater

Enterprise Services

Lindsey Aldridge
Carrie Martin
Gabrielle Stilwater
Ann Sweeney

Floyd|Snider Team

Tessa Gardner-Brown
Jessi Massingale, PE

Public Observers

Jack Havens, CLIPA

Meeting Purpose

1. Discuss stakeholder feedback on the draft Purpose and Need Statement and review the revised draft Purpose and Need Statement
2. Discuss stakeholder feedback on the June materials regarding Identification of Hybrid Options, and provide a “second touch” opportunity
3. Discuss consistency of existing and hybrid options with goals for long-term management of Capitol Lake
4. Identify potential components of and data gaps for existing and hybrid options

Notes

1. **Welcome and Agenda Review**
 - A. Participants introduced themselves.
 - B. Floyd|Snider team reviewed the meeting purpose, agenda, and packet of materials.
2. **Process Updates from DES and Review of Ground Rules for Observers**
 - A. Reviewed ground rules for community members choosing to observe Technical Committee meetings.

- B. Executive Work Group will have its “second touch” on the draft Purpose and Need Statement and “first touch” on Existing and Hybrid Options at the July 22, 2016 meeting.
- C. There will be no technical, executive or community meetings in August. Meeting topics will be combined with next steps for the September meeting.

3. Second Touch on Draft Purpose and Need Statement (with Feedback from Executive Work Group and Community)

- A. Floyd | Snider reviewed the revised draft Purpose and Need Statement that was shared with the Executive Workgroup and community in June 2016.
 - i. The key things heard from the executives and community were to place more focus on sediment management, ecological function and economics, and to expand the description to a watershed approach.
 - ii. The first paragraph focuses on the initial key topics through an environmentally and economically sustainable management approach. The context paragraph was removed. The second paragraph provides a single context sentence and then focuses on the primary issues. The third paragraph discusses the need and approach to resolve the problem, and is largely unchanged.
- B. The Technical Committee reviewed the revised draft Purpose and Need statement.
 - i. Suggestions included the term estuary in the first sentence of the second paragraph; possibly use ‘the Lower Deschutes Watershed’ or ‘Deschutes Estuary’ to create a watershed focus. Include a definition of “lower Deschutes Watershed” in the proviso report to explain the direct scope of this project.
 - ii. Discussed revising the second sentence of the first paragraph by flipping the two statements; ‘To address existing sediment accumulation and manage future sediment deposition, the work proposed as part of this project is also needed to restore and enhance community use of the resource.’
 - iii. Andy Haub was not able to attend the July 14 Technical Committee meeting, but sent in suggestions similar to a call to action. Floyd | Snider will consider using some of this language in the Proviso Report.
 - iv. The committee is encouraged to continue to send additional suggested changes.

4. Second Touch on Identification of Hybrid Options (with Feedback from Executive Work Group and Community)

- A. Floyd | Snider discussed minimal revisions to the identification of Hybrid Options document. Notes were added to address DELI modifications. The Percival Creek Extension was shifted from a Hybrid to a Managed Lake Sub option, with the concurrence of CLIPA.
- B. Conceptual proposals with less development were added to the notes sections, including nutrient harvesting, sediment management ideas such as construction of a weir at the north end of the south basin and/or a jetty in Budd Inlet, and an expansion of park areas at Heritage Park and along Deschutes Parkway.

5. First Touch on Review of Existing and Hybrid Options; Brainstorm options or potential components of options

- A. The Technical Committee expressed concern regarding the validity of information provided for the new hybrid options. How can the table be used without having the information validated technically?

- i. The benefit of the table is that it standardizes the review options and summarizes them in a consistent format.
 - ii. Suggested title change “statements of intended consistency with project goals”, to make sure readers are clear on level of validation.
 - iii. Also suggested combining the options that have undergone more formal technical review into one table and the new conceptual options into another. The table of new conceptual options should be heavily caveated to highlight that the information represents **opinions** of the proponent.
- B. Suggestions on the Components Table
- i. Instead of just Canada geese, include “invasive or nuisance species” to also include invasive plants.
 - ii. Suggested separating improving stormwater conveyance system and Heritage Park berm into two separate items.
 - iii. Add to header on “Benefit...” something to the effect that “approach and specifics would vary depending on the option.”
 - iv. Add caveat to this table similar to others, “Potential Components, not yet validated to determine feasibility.”
 - v. Suggestions for possible additions to the component table:
 - Temporal or Seasonal Hybrid: Adjustable dam at the expanded Fifth Avenue dam site, to keep the basin filled during summer months for swimming and other uses, and allow tidal action the rest of the year.
 - Large woody debris component. How large woody debris moves through the system from the upper watershed and is managed as it moves toward Budd Inlet.
 - Keep the South Basin mitigation wetlands in mind. If these were developed in perpetuity, the report should explain the commitments and manage future expectations.
- C. Committee is again encouraged to send in any other suggestions by July 28.

6. Status of Best Available Science Review. Rich and Scott will come up with a framework; Floyd|Snider will put documents into the shared site and send that link to the committee members. The expectation is that the agenda for the September 30 meeting of the Executive Work Group will include this topic.

7. Next Steps/Action Items

- A. Floyd|Snider: Resend link to shared site and include folder of technical documents for review.
- B. All: Send feedback on second touch of Identification of Hybrid Options by July 28.
- C. All: Send feedback on second touch on draft Purpose and Need Statement by July 28.
- D. All: Send feedback on first touch on Review of Existing and Hybrid Options by July 28.
- E. Darric: Send statement with information on large woody debris.
- F. Brad: Send ideas on temporal hybrid option.