



**Funding and Governance Committee
Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Planning
1500 Jefferson Street SE, Room 2229, Olympia, Washington 98501
1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
October 20, 2016**

Meeting Notes

Participants

John Doan, City of Tumwater
Megan Duffy, Natural Resources
Steve Hall, City of Olympia
Rich Hoey, City of Olympia
Shawn Myers, Thurston County

Enterprise Services

Bob Covington
Searetha Kelly
Carrie Martin

Consultant Team

Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider

Meeting Purpose

1. Review and discuss the Draft Proviso (Phase 1) Report
2. Discuss next steps, including a plan to continue funding and governance work in parallel to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process and a draft letter of support for moving ahead with an EIS.

Notes

1. Welcome and Introductions

- A. Tessa Gardner-Brown welcomed participants to the meeting and introduced herself.
- B. Participants introduced themselves.

2. Review Meeting Purpose and Agenda, Process Updates

- A. Tessa Gardner-Brown reviewed the meeting goals and purpose.
- B. Phase 1 Wrap Up is in progress, with the last individual meetings of the committees occurring this month
- C. The Executive Work Group's last meeting is scheduled for October 28, 2016
- D. The Final Year-in-Review meeting is scheduled for December 16, 2016

3. Review and Discuss Cost Graphic

- A. Tessa Gardner-Brown led the discussion regarding Figure 8, the relative cost comparison of the options.

- B. Typically cost estimates are not done until design is at 30-60% complete, but the proviso directed DES to estimate construction and maintenance cost for the long-term management options so a relative cost comparison exercise was completed.
- C. In this case, the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) alternatives were approximately at 5-10% design. In the case of some options put forward in this Phase 1 process, only a simple sketch was provided by community members. This leaves a high degree of uncertainty with regard to costs, since there is no design from which to generate costs. This is the reason that the graphic was done as a relative comparison.
- D. Tessa walked the committee through the notes of Figure 8.
- E. The consultant team looked back to the CLAMP analysis as a starting point for cost components. Since that time, conditions have changed. For example, the New Zealand mudsnail is a changed condition that impacts dredge sediment disposal, which in turn has a dramatic effect on the largest cost factor.
- F. Participants discussed the value in either presenting the options together or separating them based on different levels of technical and feasibility analysis.
 - i. The community options (not vetted) could be shown with less color and the CLAMP options that have more vetting could be visible with more color, or
 - ii. The options could be separated, as in some of the other figures, with the CLAMP alternatives shown together and the newer community options together.
- G. The cost graphic is a snapshot in time and will be obsolete when the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) work begins.
- H. A revised version of the cost graphic will be incorporated into the proviso report, and will reflect feedback from all stakeholder groups.
- I. There are no specific costs/dollars directly associated with the cost graphic.
- J. The EIS will provide evaluation of the viability of the various options available.
- K. At the request of some members of the community, a net present value component was added to the Figure 8 graphic. This was reviewed in a meeting with the Office of Financial Management. They requested that “net present value for maintenance over time” be removed, as it is not consistent with the way state projects are funded and it proved to be confusing with little benefit. Members of the Funding and Governance Committee concurred with this decision.
- L. DES will provide the revised graphic next week.

4. Review and Discuss the Draft Phase 1 Report

- A. Tessa provided an overview of the Draft Phase 1 Report.
- B. The Phase One report will become available to stakeholders on-line today. DES will provide a link for committee members.
- C. Committee members were asked to send in comments by November 3.

5. Discuss Draft Letter of Support

- A. Committee members see a benefit to a joint letter of support for proceeding into Phase 2.
- B. The committee suggested that a letter of support from the Executive Work Group would be preferable, as they work at a policy level. Members will discuss this with their executives.

- C. The messaging of a potential joint letter was discussed, with key points identified, including, “we see a light at the end of this tunnel. We think we can resolve this and move forward, but to do it, we need full funding for Phase 2, etc.”
- D. Participants explained a regional Shared Legislative Strategy that is in development. Funding the EIS is one of three regional priorities put forward by the local governments (Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, Thurston County, the Chamber, the Economic Development Council and the Thurston Regional Planning Council.)

6. Discuss Next Steps

- A. A year-in-review meeting is scheduled for December 16.
- B. If Phase 2 (the EIS) is funded, it will run approximately from 2018 through 2020. Phase 3 would include design and construction, potentially 2021-2025.
- C. There is value in continued conversations, as an EIS moves forward. The EIS would be where a preferred alternative is chosen. DES envisions that collaboration would continue with the Executive Work Group, the Technical Committee and the Funding and Governance Committee, along with regular check-ins with decision makers, including the Department of Natural Resources, the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee, the State Capitol Committee and the Legislature.
- D. Information needs to continue to be shared.
- E. The Funding and Governance participants see a benefit to staying connected.
- F. City and County managers meet monthly. The suggestion was made to have DES, DNR, the Tribe and Port call in occasionally for a portion of the meeting.

7. Action Items

- A. DES – Provide link to the documents, Figure 8 and the Draft Phase 1 Report.
- B. Committee members provide feedback by November 3.
- C. Steve Hall and Bob Covington will coordinate on a time for an occasional group check-in.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 p.m.