

Work Plan Concept for Phase I

The following plan is a draft. It outlines the basic steps for completing Phase I for Capitol Lake management. At first, the work plan will be devoid of detail processes and serves as guide for the creation and scheduling of said processes. The work plan is dynamic. As information is discovered, discussed and validated the work plan will be modified. Technical teams, representatives, consultants and researchers may make recommendations that help us be successful in the first Phase and sets us up for success in Phase II. The goal is to successfully complete Phase I, satisfying the requirements of the budget proviso and move to Phase II of the plan.

For each element or portion of the following work plan, we intend to get public input. The first public input meeting or open house will be on March 9th from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. to receive input on **this work plan**. At that time we would also like to hear how to best receive future public input. For example, open houses, facilitated discussions, stakeholder presentations, etc. We could also vary how we get input depending on the topic. The question is “what would work best?” This is something for everyone to consider when you come to the open house.

The Plan

1. Identify and summarize the best available science concerning water quality and habitat as a result of either retaining or removing the dam. Since CLAMP’s last report in 2009, new scientific information has become available from the natural resource agencies on this subject. In addition, there have been interested parties who want other new information considered. There is a need to identify “new scientific information” to be considered and a process for vetting this information using a scientific process with emphasis regarding water quality and habitat. The following process is envisioned for accomplishing this.
 - a. Identify and summarize previously available science concerning water quality and habitat as a result of retaining or removing the dam.
 - b. Identify new scientific information concerning water quality and habitat as a result of retaining or removing the dam since CLAMP’s 2009 report. Describe the new scientific information and who has provided this information. Provide an opportunity for developers of that information to present.
 - c. Develop criteria and process for vetting the new scientific information. This will involve identifying state and nationally accepted criteria and methods for evaluating scientific information and selecting appropriate criteria and methods to be applied.
 - d. Organize and summarize current and new scientific information. Identify gaps in the information and what work needs to be completed to fill these gaps.
2. **Identify multiple hybrid options.** There are a variety of options that could run from Estuary to Lake and back. The proviso challenges us to identify and evaluate hybrid options for substantially improving fish, wildlife and ecosystems functions, maintaining a historic reflecting pool and adaptive management strategies. The proviso also indicates we need to develop a

general estimate of the cost of construction, maintenance cost, and public support for the options. To meet this directive the following process will be used:

- a. Identify hybrid options.
 - b. Identify the list of options consistent with the language of the proviso that would be evaluated in the EIS process.
 - c. ~~Identify data gaps to vet the options via the EIS process.~~ Identify data gaps where further information is required prior to full vetting.
3. **Shared Funding** is a critical component for the future of any solution. There is great debate over who should pay for what. However, before we can begin discussion, much less draw conclusions; we should do our due diligence to look at current models. Shared funding could include state, local, and federal governments and potentially other entities. We should understand the pros and cons for each model. Therefore our first task will be to:
- a. **Identify** criteria for consideration of a future funding model looks like.
 - b. **Identify** and evaluate current funding models available.
 - c. **Identify** gaps between current funding models and criteria for a future model.
 - d. **Identify** options to be considered.
 - e. **Identify** how we want to proceed on the subject of shared financing as we move to Phase II.
4. Long term shared **governance** of a future management plan, including consideration of the nexus between shared governance and shared funding.
- a. Identify and evaluate existing models.
 - i. Existing entities
 - ii. Statutory options to create new entities (RCW 36.61 the lake management model, RCW 90.72 the shellfish protection district and others)
 - iii. Other options that could be created locally (municipal corporations, Interagency agreements, MOU's, etc.)
 - iii-iv. New statutory options (i.e. Nisqually management model)
 - b. Identify positives and negatives of each model.
 - c. Degree of inclusiveness of each model.
 - d. Identify if/how we want to proceed on the subject of shared governance as we move to Phase II.
5. **Other** related activities which would contribute to reaching a broad agreement on long-term management. Below are examples based on;
- a. Sediment mitigation is an issue identified in the final ~~CLAMP~~ report that was not being addressed at that time.-
 - b. Flood mitigation strategies/sea level rise mitigation.
 - c. Process linking activities toward an EIS. This aligns Phase I to spring board into Phase II. This could include identifying criteria to be used to evaluate the options under an EIS

DRAFT