CAPITOL LAKE/DESCHUTES ESTUARY COMMUNITY MEETING

Jefferson Building
Conference Room 1213
1500 Jefferson Street
Olympia, Washington 98504
June 1, 2016
5:30 p.m.

Minutes

DES STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:
Chris Liu, Director
Bob Covington, Deputy Director
Carrie Martin, Asset Manager
Curt Hart, Communications
Jim Erskine, Communications

MEETING PRESENTERS:
Christina Martinez, Floyd|Snider

OTHERS PRESENT:
Jennifer Belcher, Citizen
John DeMeyer, Citizen
Allen Miller, Heritage Park Development Assoc.
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Jewel Goddard, Citizen
Steve Trapp, DERT
Bob Wubbena, CLIPA
Dennis Burke, E^3
Harley Carpenter, ORLA
Karina Champion, Citizen
Robert Holman, CLIPA
Skylar Linden, Citizen
Dave Peeler, DERT
Jack Havens, Citizen
Lydia Wagner, Department of Ecology
Sandor Silagi, Citizen

Open House, Review of Meeting Materials

Chris Liu, Director, Department of Enterprise Services (DES), convened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the open house to review materials.

Welcome and Introductions: Review of Meeting Ground Rules

Director Liu reviewed the meeting agenda on the second touch of goals and objectives and the first touch on the methodology for categorizing best available science. All information is posted on the DES website. As an additional update, the Technical Committee is now open to observation by the public. At the next Technical Committee meeting, ground rules for attendance will be shared with community. Director Liu introduced Christina Martinez with Jacobs and the Floyd|Snider team.

Ms. Martinez reported the purpose of the process is to implement the provisions of a legislative proviso directing a review of best available science, consideration of hybrid options for the long-term management of Capitol Lake, and gauging community support for hybrid options. To implement the proviso and submit a report to the Legislature, the process also included review of methodologies for best available science and establishing goals and objectives to help inform later decisions during a future Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

The process includes a first and second touch of information. The first touch entails receiving input from the public, Technical Committee, and Executive Work Group. The agenda includes a second touch review of goals and objectives for the management of Capitol Lake and a first touch on the methodology for determining best available science.

Second Touch on Goals and Objectives and Overview of Community Input

Ms. Martinez reported the Floyd|Snider team reviewed prior documentation for the long-term management of Capitol Lake including a previous EIS, technical studies, and the Ruckelshaus Report to identify previously stated goals and objectives for the project. A clear purpose or need statement has not been developed in the past. The team collated and organized the information surrounding several themes: environment, infrastructure, community, and economy. Other components related to those themes include water quality, control of invasive species, and improvement in recreational opportunities.

Over the last month, draft goals and objectives were presented to stakeholders for review and feedback. This second touch review is the last opportunity to provide additional feedback prior to inclusion within the Proviso Report to the Legislature.

The team received 421 responses from an online survey. Respondents were asked to provide input on the goals for the long-term management of Capitol Lake. A second question asked respondents to rank the top five goals. The top six goals in priority order include:

- Aesthetics
- Sediment Management
- Recreational Opportunities
- Water Quality
- Economically Feasible and Reasonable
- Habitat Restoration

These are the same top goals found in the 2009 Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) process and the 1999 EIS. The order within the various documents has shifted but the goals are consistent. The input points to a clear path to the priorities for the long-term management of Capitol Lake. The purpose of the goals and priorities is to inform the ultimate decisions about the lake.

Community input on the goals showed they meant different things to different people. For example, some people indicated aesthetics meant seeing a lake environment and reflecting pool while others found an estuary to be aesthetically pleasing. Those differences in values for the top goals should be considered. The online survey tool generated 346 written comments. Some prevailing themes related directly to the goals of recreation, cost, and sediment management. Feedback spoke to restoring and enhancing recreational opportunities. Comments on costs ranged from evaluating the long-term maintenance costs of managing the lake to the upfront first-time costs for renovation or reconstruction. Several of the comments spoke to the importance of being good stewards of the public dollar and utilizing grant funding opportunities to ensure the good use of public funds. It is also important not only to consider the cost of construction and maintenance, but also the cost to the community because of economic impacts associated with long-term decisions.

Regardless of the management option, sediment management was important to many citizens. Most citizens want all options to carefully consider sediment management and avoid impacts from eventual sediment disposition downstream.

Three other important themes were noted. Some comments supported using a scientific approach to guide decisions and for choosing a management plan. Those comments will lead into the first touch on the methodology for categorizing best available science. A number of comments focused on garnering

broad community agreement and continuing to engage the community throughout the process. Other comments spoke to the increased sense of urgency to act because the effort has been ongoing for many years. Many community members are ready to move forward on scheduling and implementing action.

The Technical Committee's feedback on goals and objectives was minimal other than for some reordering and language revisions. The goal for aesthetics and visual quality was revised to reflect "Support and improve aesthetics and visual quality." Another suggested change revised the goal stating, "Avoid economic impacts" to reflect, "Avoid negative impacts and improve economic benefits." On a broader level, the Technical Committee recommended that the goal for improving ecosystem functions and improving fish and wildlife habitat should encapsulate the goals supporting healthy salmon runs.

The Executive Work Group recommended some refinements in the descriptions of the goals for long-term management, recommended adding "improve and support" language, to those goals that speak to "maintain, avoid, and improve." The Executive Work Group agreed with the recommendations from the Technical Committee. One example of a change was revising "Improve sediment management" to "Improve and support sediment management." June 2 is the input deadline for second touch materials.

Questions and Answers regarding Goals and Objectives
Ms. Martinez invited questions.

Dave Peeler asked whether the changes to the goals for long-term management (yellow circles) would be included in the next update of Figure 3, *Goals for Long-Term Management of Capitol Lake.* Ms. Martinez affirmed that the intent is to update the chart for inclusion within the Proviso Report.

Bob Holman recommended inclusion of the information from the community group presentations. Another set of community group presentations is scheduled in June. He questioned how those comments would be incorporated if the comment period ends on June 2.

Carrie Martin said the presentations in May included best available science and technical reports. The June presentations will include hybrid options. The presentations were aligned with the topics presented to the Executive Work Group. The only comment period ending at this time is the second touch on goals and objectives.

Mr. Holman responded that the basis of the presentation was to provide input on goals and objectives presented by Dr. Milne on the environment and water quality. That information should be incorporated within the materials.

Dennis Burke said one major obligation by government to protect public health is not included within the goals. Although water quality is included, water quality does not improve all aspects of public health. He stated that the Department of Ecology (Ecology) is studying water quality for the protection of fish and wildlife whereas the lake is receiving an immense volume of nutrients creating a tremendous amount of toxic algae. The state is measuring toxins produced in lake waters and most are associated with phosphorous levels above 0.02, which Capitol Lake greatly exceeds. However, Ecology never samples Capitol Lake for toxic algae or toxins, but may sample other lakes. Given recreation opportunities and the impact on public health, it is a goal that should be considered because it is a problem Ecology is not attempting to solve. With increasing temperatures, the issue would need to be resolved.

Ms. Martinez said she is unsure as to the extent of comments received on public health. Typically, health impact assessments include different areas of water quality, air quality, noise, and recreation. Those elements are typically examined holistically in terms of public health, which is why it might not have been included as a separate goal.

Karina Champion commented that when she completed the online survey, she assumed public health was an inherent requirement, which is why her comments did not address public health. However, if that assumption were incorrect, she would want to know and would include public health comments higher on her priority list.

.

Mr. Holman commented that regulations for Capitol Lake are established by Thurston County. The county's regulations cover public health. He shared information on why Ecology has not addressed public health. For the last 14 years, Capitol Lake has met county requirements because the lake is acceptable for swimming based on bacteria counts. Ecology has separated the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Study between Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet and dropped bacteria as an issue in Capitol Lake because the lake has been clean for some time. Toxic algae blooms occur in many lakes. However, Capitol Lake is not a lake but a fairly shallow river. Toxic algae blooms are difficult to develop in that environment and are likely why it hasn't been addressed.

Mr. Burke contended that the lake has never been sampled.

Jim Erskine, DES, said he was an employee of the former Department of General Administration and believes Thurston County Health monitors Capitol Lake and all other lakes in Thurston County for toxic algae. Capitol Lake is measured annually and repeatedly through summer months. He does not believe since his employment with the state beginning in 1999, that there has been a toxic blooming algae outbreak in Capitol Lake where there has been in other lakes in Thurston County. The lake is monitored but not by Ecology, which is likely why the agency is not including a sampling as part of the TMDL

Mr. Burke responded that King County and many other counties sample toxic blooming algae. The results are included on many databases in the state. One database focuses on toxins and toxic algae and it includes state monitoring that is funded by the federal government and county data. He challenged anyone to find any place in the record where Capitol Lake has been sampled for toxins. He recently reviewed current results for Black Lake, Orange Lake, and other lakes in Pierce County. Many lakes are toxic. However, Capitol Lake's environment is receptive to toxins. Capitol Lake has had blue green algae or bacteria blooms exceeding the values for toxicity. Neutral levels range from 0.04 of phosphorous. Capitol Lake exceeds those levels. It is not possible to find a sample result for Capitol Lake anywhere because he has spent hours trying to find the data. It does not exist.

Mr. Peeler ventured to guess that because the lake is closed to public recreation, the county is not expending resources to monitor for that purpose diverting resources to other lakes that are open for public recreation. He admitted to guessing as to that circumstance because if no public access is allowed, the county does not need to worry about public health. Should the lake open to access, then it would entail another course. He recommended checking the status of testing with Thurston County.

Ms. Martinez said the conversation speaks to the importance of water quality and public health.

Bob Wubbena commented that many of the findings are based on old data. He questioned why the county, DES, Ecology, and the cities are not conducting routine and ongoing monitoring for water quality parameters. Much of the data under consideration are outdated. It is important that as the

process proceeds, current data should be a requirement to avoid making decisions on outdated information. He acknowledged the efforts by cities to improve storm water.

Ms. Martinez encouraged citizens to submit additional feedback on goals and objectives by June 2.

First Touch on Methodology for Reviewing Best Available Science

Ms. Martinez reviewed the list of technical studies and provided an overview of the feedback from the Technical Committee and the Executive Work Group. The proviso directed the identification and summarization of best available science for water quality and habitat relative to conceptual options of retaining or removing the dam.

The Floyd|Snider team reviewed reports and studies on water quality, habitat, and lake management for the Deschutes Watershed. A list was compiled of available resources that were published and publicly available. A table document was drafted documenting the various studies, technical reports, and published information. The list is not inclusive of all available documentation, as some documents related to Capitol Lake are outside the scope of water quality and habitat.

The DES Work Plan directed a review of recognized methodologies to screen and determine best available science. As part of the EIS process, in a later Phase 2, all documents would be screened to determine what constitutes best available science.

Ms. Martinez reviewed state, federal, and international methods for screening documents to identify best available science:

- *Washington State Criteria (Chapter 365-195 WAC Growth Management Act)*
- *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Guidelines*
- *Internationally-Recognized Scoring System*

Questions, Answers, and Input regarding Methodology for Categorizing Best Available Science

Ms. Martinez invited questions on the proposed methodologies.

Ms. Champion questioned how the methodologies would be applied. Ms. Martinez explained that a list of scientific sources would be screened by one of the methodologies as a part of Phase 2 to complete an EIS for the project. The consultant team with experience and background in science would screen the scientific sources using the selected methodology.

Jack Havens asked whether the Executive Work Group or the Technical Committee renders the final recommendations on best available science. Ms. Martinez said that typically, consultants evaluate the sources that identify best available science; however, through that process, the team receives comments from state agencies, scientists, the community, Executive Work Group, and the Technical Committee.

Director Liu added that the Executive Work Group is receiving all the information. Many of the members are not technical experts. Members of the Technical Committee are connected to the science community and are reviewing recommendations. The recommended methodology is scheduled for review by the Executive Work Group in consultation with technical experts. The Executive Work Group, in addition to the Technical Committee and Community, would render a recommendation on the methodology to be used.

Mr. Wubbena said that of equal importance are methodology criteria that might be selected for evaluating the documents. Many data sources and reports are old and have been superseded by current reports and data. The selection of data is important. He was an administrator for nine years with staff responsible for authoring similar reports. Those reports reflected opinions and were considered as best available science. However, other consultant studies are authored by professionals with the expertise and background. The challenges encountered throughout this process is the review of documentation and weighing those documents, because procedurally, some sources considered to be best available science could in fact no longer be considered good science because of time, history, and new information. That speaks to the question of how and who will sort through those issues. It appears that the process has not been defined. He suggested employing all three methodologies because the task encumbers sifting through all reports and the success would be based on how well the reviewers are applying the criteria to the reports. At this point, that process is unclear.

Ms. Martinez agreed that a process or procedure might need to be developed for decision-making over the science, especially if there is conflicting scientific information. It could entail reviewing how other projects addressed the issue.

Mr. Burke suggested the issue is a "mine field." He agreed with the previous speaker's comments because when conducting any type of analysis it involves reviewing assorted information that may have scientific validity. However, the outcome is how the information is consolidated and summarized. One example is developing an innovative way to solve the long-term management issue. The important aspect is that the process would rely on peer review. Ecology's model speaks to contracting peer review. He asked whether the peer review would be open to the Technical Committee and community to provide comments. The issue is whether a consultant's opinion constitutes peer review. The issue could be problematic and requires some detailed analysis.

Ms. Martinez replied that discussions with Ecology officials have indicated the agency believes reviews are independent. The agency has been asked to present to the Executive Work Group about review how data are peer reviewed.

Mr. Holman said that clearly the issue is an Ecology position and some opposing positions that are in conflict, which will need to be resolved. Ecology has conducted a peer review of its model; however, the model was peer reviewed prior to its application in the early stages. What Ecology has failed to do is peer review the results of the application of the model. The question is about purity and what it means. Clearly, Ecology has not peer reviewed in that sense. Additionally, one of the issues regarding Capitol Lake is the length of the process. It appears that this process is another attempt to "start over." DES contracted with Ruckelshaus to complete an analysis. One of the report's statements speaks to the dam's effect on water quality in Budd Inlet. The report indicates that the dispute regarding water quality should be resolved by selecting one or both of the following options:

1. Obtain another independent scientific review of the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) computer models of this dynamic,
2. Request that those independent reviewers--and possibly a third party facilitator—participate in one or more meetings between Ecology technical staff and the outside scientists who have questioned their computer model, to see if it is possible to refine the model such that these parties are in agreement about the validity of the findings.

At least six months ago, Ruckelshaus answered the question and recommended looking at the available science, and when it conflicts, a third party should review the science. One of the frustrations by the

public is that the wheel continues to be reinvented. It is important not to lose sight of what was gained by the Ruckelshaus Report. He asked why DES discontinued the Ruckelshaus process, as it appeared that some progress was occurring.

Director Liu acknowledged the question. However, the current work is to address what is directed by the proviso. The Ruckelshaus Report was a preliminary report to launch this process. The report was a recommendation. DES is not in the position of funding several concurrent processes. Some of the recommendations from Ruckelshaus have been considered. The proviso was developed on the basis of the Ruckelshaus Report. He is not able to speak to why it was or was not included in the proviso. Not one of the questions is an easy question with an easy answer. He agreed with Mr. Holman's comments that the process should consider many issues. However, the process may not consider everything in the Ruckelshaus Report because it's not included in the proviso. If an EIS process moves forward, many of the issues would be addressed. DES is moving forward with the directive by the proviso and within available funding limitations.

Mr. Wubbena said that regardless of the methodology that might be selected, the process should narrow the issues discussed, debated, and presented and move closer to the Ruckelshaus Report's first finding. There are likely half a dozen major issues that could be identified for further analysis to determine some key findings to produce information that is explicit, clear, and current. In those areas of polarization, the Ruckelshaus recommendation could come into play. The next step is the critical issue of debate.

Mr. Peeler added that the three different types of ensuring best available science are good. Each vary to some degree as the first two speak more about documenting, such as documenting how the study was completed and how evaluation occurred. The third option relies on scoring and determining a specific category (outcome). It is likely the process will use some kind of accommodation of all three methodologies to ensure good science is considered. Ecology has policies that speak to ensuring credible data. Those policies ensure that when data are obtained or created, the data are credible. There is no perfect scientific study as there are always questions remaining because of various kinds of limits and constraints of studies, resources, or the ability to obtain information. The results will always generate more questions. Many of the comments speak to those questions because when there are inconsistent findings, inconsistent data, or the lack of information in certain areas, it speaks to whether it rises to the level of needing more research through the EIS process to obtain the information to fill in the blanks or to determine what the right answer might be. Those issues are part of the entire process of continuous documentation, review, scoring, and evaluation to determine whether the information is consistent, expected, or whether there are gaps in information that might be important or critical.

Ms. Martinez reviewed the Technical Committee's feedback on the three methodologies for best available science. Members reviewed the strengths and weaknesses of the three methodologies. Most members were familiar with the state methodology and its applicability to environmental data. Members noted potential weaknesses in the federal methodology related to peer review and potential introduction of subjective scoring, such as more qualitative scoring versus quantitative scoring. Ecology plans to provide the agency's policy on peer review, which was developed to reduce vulnerabilities in the application of the federal guidance. No member on the committee had any experience with the international methodology but recognized that the model was a ranking system instead of an identification system. Members initially supported the state methodology to evaluate best available science for water quality and habitat and suggested habitat could be geographically defined similar to water quality, which could be slightly expanded and scoped to include water quantity or other related disciplines, such as sediment. The committee discussed the potential to expand the list of documents to include studies or reports on regional restoration projects and their effects on water quality and habitat

(other lakes that have water quality or habitat issues or other lakes influenced by the presence of a dam). Members believe the additional reports would help provide context around management decisions. The Technical Committee will review the list of technical documents and will forward information on additional studies and reports that should be included.

The Executive Work Group's first touch of the methodologies did not result in any significant feedback on the methods. Members requested more information on the input and comments from the Technical Committee as the experts, as well as input from the community. The Executive Work Group appreciated the compiled document list, which includes key historical documents. Members recommended changes to the table title clarifying that the document was only a list of technical documents that had not been reviewed using one of the best available science methodologies. Members plan to review the language on some of the figures and provide input by June 2.

Ms. Champion commented that from a perspective of a science teacher, the international and the federal methodologies have more room for subjectivity and bias because there is much more room for qualitative conclusions. Although qualitative information can be helpful, it makes sense that the state methodology was created because of the challenges associated with the subjective language in the federal methodology. Many of the reports were generated by Ecology. Ecology has its own requirements and is subject to auditing. She is pleased to see some of the documents included on the list as it lends itself to extra steps to be considered because more eyes will review the information. The recommendation to consider studies outside the region generated her interest in obtaining similar research on the Salish Sea because of similar habitats that might provide a wider perspective of areas that have encountered similar challenges.

Mr. Burke said he reviewed the 2012 and the 2015 reports and would like to request that Ecology provide critical information regarding final actions. Ecology uses a specific model. He asked about Ecology's dataset and the conditions surrounding the dataset that were used to calibrate the model. Secondly, he asked about the dataset and what information was used to verify the model. Dependent upon the data used to calibrate and verify, any number of results could be obtained. He asked about the flow conditions that were modeled. One of the conditions was a low flow over seven consecutive days and low flow conditions spanning 30 years, which is more stringent than the normal Q-710, a low flow occurring over seven days over a 10-year span. These are extremely important parameters and are lacking in those reports that he read. The information could be included in some appendices that he is unaware exists. However, Ecology should provide a brief paper on its modeling procedures.

Mr. Holman commented that it is important to recognize that Ecology exists because of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as Ecology reports to the EPA. Ecology's TMDL must be approved by the EPA. It appears that in some respects, the process might benefit if the process utilizes the broader EPA methodology because EPA is the final decision authority. He personally has no opinion as to the specific methodology. However, using a broader-based methodology to determine what is included or excluded might benefit the process over a state system that is much more rigid and is in some ways grounded by Ecology because the agency is so well-versed in the methodology. It could disadvantage others who don't have the resources or the knowledge of the systems.

Ms. Martinez remarked that there appears to be a mix of preferences in terms of the methodologies from the Community.

Mr. Wubbena asked when the decision on the methodology would be presented to the community. He then could apply judgment on the factors that would be considered.

Ms. Martinez said the typical EIS process considers reliable resources for assessing impacts, benefits, and conclusions of alternatives considered in the EIS. Regardless of the alternatives in the EIS surrounding a lake, estuary, hybrid, or a new concept, the EIS is required to evaluate many different factors during the environmental process, such as water quality, air, noise, social and economic issues, and other issues. The proviso specifically directs examination of water quality and habitat because they appear to be the two main concerns surrounding water quality impacts or benefits associated with different alternatives. It is also important to ensure habitat is adequately addressed. The goal is identifying the tools, data sources, and technical information to consider to arrive at some conclusions on benefits and impacts of any particular management alternative. The EIS evaluations will occur during Phase 2. However, there appears to be some concerns about how the tools would be selected for assessing impacts and benefits.

Mr. Wubbena said from his perspective as an individual with a background in environmental engineering, he envisioned the Technical Committee convening some work sessions whereby the consultant team would lead EIS evaluations of the different management options. There are many studies available with different data. As the summary response is developed to the proviso around those alternatives, the Technical Committee, in theory, would be assisting to ensure the process doesn't veer off-track and remains focused on the results of the studies. Essentially, the Technical Committee would assist in sorting data.

Ms. Martinez agreed that similar processes have been employed for other EIS processes. However, this process has not been fully vetted for Phase 2. She has worked on an EIS process that included a technical committee representing scientists from local agencies or state agencies to vet the methodology for evaluating impacts and benefits, as well as the conclusions about benefits and impacts from the various alternatives. There is definitely history in this region of those types of processes occurring whereby a technical committee is included throughout the process of developing an EIS. She is uncertain as to whether the structures have been established for the Capitol Lake EIS.

John DeMeyer said after reviewing the list of data sources, they appear to be the studies that would be considered in the future analysis as the project proceeds as it relates to water quality and habitat. He does not understand why Thurston County's annual water quality monitoring reports are not included on the list. Those reports span multiple years of an ongoing systematic approach for measuring water quality.

Ms. Martinez acknowledged that the suggestion is good input and the process is seeking additional sources of data. During the first touch review, the community is asked to provide input on the methodology that should be used, as well as any missing studies or reports. Thurston County intends to provide additional documents and data it believes should be included. She invited Mr. DeMeyer to include the request on a comment form for additional information to include on the list.

Mr. DeMeyer replied that the reports are critical because good science relies on good data. He also assumes that another list of studies would be developed as each of the other goals is addressed during the EIS, such as sediment management. Ms. Martinez replied that assessments occur on sediment management as part of the EIS, the process will identify data resources for determining best available science in addition to identifying the methodology for assessing sediment impacts and management issues. The proviso did not include best available science for sediment management.

Mr. DeMeyer asked whether economic studies would be included within the list. Ms. Martinez affirmed that economic studies would be included in an EIS to assess economic considerations. It is likely water quality and habitat were included in the proviso because those two issues are the most controversial topics. The proviso did not request a review of prior analysis regarding economics or other issues. Eventually, a methodology would need to be identified for assessing economic impacts and benefits of the different alternatives. The methodology may include assessing prior studies. It is uncertain at this point, whether a list of other types of studies would be necessary.

Mr. DeMeyer said he has been dealing with the Capitol Lake issue for several years and was hopeful that this process would resolve the issues. The ultimate solution needs to include broad economic studies. He wants to avoid another phase down the road that leads to nothing. Ms. Martinez affirmed the process is in Phase 1 to implement the provisions of the proviso. Phase 2 is a later phase and would focus on the preparation of the EIS to support a preferred alternative moving forward. The EIS requires analysis of social, economic, and environmental impacts and benefits.

Ms. Champion shared that her students have an oyster garden at Johnson Point. She asked whether there are data or research that could be included on the list addressing impacts on local oyster and clam farms. Ms. Martinez said she expects that a future EIS would study the effects of sediment movement. Potentially, should shellfish resources be identified they would be another consideration. Ms. Champion inquired about any historical data on shellfish.

Mr. Holman added that shellfish would normally apply to Budd Inlet, as Capitol Lake has no shellfish because of the lack of tidal action. He referred to information on funding and governance and questioned whether it would entail a parallel process in addition to the work of the Technical Committee. He asked whether that process would consider economics because to establish funding sources, the costs would need to be identified, as well as the economics of the area.

Director Liu explained that sediment management was not a component included in the proviso. The proviso also does not address economics. The members of the Executive Work Group recognize the need to address these issues.

Mr. Holman acknowledged that economic studies would be needed to determine how much funding would be required. Director Liu noted that no one would disagree with that observation.

Mr. Burke noted the extensive cost for removing the dam and the huge costs associated with damage to recreation. He asked how the process would resolve those issues, as he no longer knows what to believe or not to believe. Ms. Martinez acknowledged that the Phase 1 Work Plan includes developing cost estimates for construction and maintenance for each alternative. As a component of the proviso, hybrid options are to be identified along with general cost estimates for construction and maintenance of those options. The consultant team is currently exploring ways to develop the cost estimates because at this phase of the process only conceptual options are being explored, which lack sufficient detail to determine construction and maintenance costs. As the design process proceeds, better data would be available to ascertain costs. At this phase, only conceptual cost ranges would be available to satisfy proviso requirements.

Open House for Written Input and Material Review

Ms. Martinez invited the community to review the materials on display. Staff is also available to answer questions.

Director Liu encouraged citizens to fill out a comment form. He encouraged filling out a separate comment form for each issue. The forms can be completed online. The comment period ends on June 2.

Mr. Wubbena asked whether the next step is establishing the framework to enable the community to provide feedback. Director Liu said the timing is uncertain at this point.

Mr. Wubbena remarked that unless the framework has been identified he would be unable to provide additional comments.

Adjournment
With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned to an open house at 7:08 p.m.

Prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net