



**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.**  
**Sept 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016**

**Meeting Notes**

**Participants**

Rich Doenges, Ecology  
Cristiana Figueroa-Kaminsky, Ecology  
Chris Conklin, WDFW  
Monica Shoemaker, DNR  
Kristin Swenddal, DNR  
Andy Haub, City of Olympia  
Scott Steltzner, Squaxin Island Tribe  
Brad Murphy, Thurston County  
Dan Smith, City of Tumwater

**Enterprise Services**

Lindsey Aldridge  
Carrie Martin  
Ann Sweeney

**Floyd|Snider Team**

Tessa Gardner-Brown  
Jessi Massingale, PE

**Public Observers**

Dave Peeler  
Ilene LeVee

**Meeting Purpose**

1. Discuss the revised draft Purpose and Need Statement.
2. Discuss the revised July materials regarding Review of Existing and Hybrid Options, and provide a “second touch” opportunity.
3. Discuss the relative range of costs for components of the long-term management options.
4. Discuss the relationship between Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the transition from one into the next.

**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. The last Technical Committee meeting will be October 20, 2016.

- C. Executive Work Group will have its “second touch” regarding Review of Existing and Hybrid Options, “first touch” on the Relative Comparison of Costs for Options and their final review of the Proposed Final Draft Purpose and Need Statement at the September 30, 2016 meeting.

### **3. Third Touch on Draft Purpose and Need Statement**

- A. Floyd | Snider discussed specific changes to the Draft Purpose and Need Statement
  - Stressed the importance of sediment management.
  - Put back in some of the background/context information. Added sentences that describe use of the resource pre-construction, and how it is used presently.
  - Transition sentence added upfront in the third paragraph; clarified active and passive use.
  - Additional description of why actions are taking place now; additional sentence to reflect consistency and compatibly with initiatives.
  - Community recommended that the value of the resource would be maximized; specifically, ecosystem service value, economic value and community value.
  - Expressed consistency with watershed-wide efforts.
- B. Technical Committee suggested strengthening the last sentence by saying ‘it will have’ instead of ‘expected to have’.
- C. Technical Committee suggested including a link or consistency with the Ecology-led TMDL process and implementation actions.
- D. The Technical Committee recommended that this version be included in the Proviso Report, and accepted it as an accurate reflection of project goals

### **4. Second Touch on Review of Existing and Hybrid Options**

- A. Floyd | Snider reviewed changes to existing and hybrid options document.
  - Added verbiage in title to reflect that all existing options were evaluated as part of the CLAMP process, and the alternate options had not undergone technical analyses or feasibility review.
  - The graphics for the dual-basin and restored estuary were edited to show water in the basin for a large portion of the time.
  - Added source that was used under option titles and additional text in blue to reflect that the options reported consistency with goals and based on technical analyses from the CLAMP process.
  - Some re-packaging, to show CLAMP options together and the newly proposed alternate options, but no change in the content.
- B. Floyd | Snider reviewed changes to potential components document.
  - Paired the potential component with goals that were identified for long-term management; added natural woody debris plan and fish access management.
- C. Technical Committee suggested adding in a column or numbering system that shows which component came from the community versus the committees. Add “see notes” in the graphics, as it’s important that they go together and that the graphic isn’t used out of context.

### **5. First Touch on Relative Comparison of Costs for Options**

- A. Floyd | Snider team discussed the Relative Cost Comparison document, including a full read of the notes on the graphic and discussion of the approach used to generate the relative cost comparison.

- B. The Technical Committee considered separating the bar into two to show construction costs and maintenance costs separately; adding units of measures and/or a scale of relevant percentage.
- C. The suggestion was made to consider adding the cost of on-going maintenance for the reflecting pool wall into the two hybrid options.
- D. Floyd | Snider will incorporate the changes and bring a revised document to the Executive Work Group.

**6. Discuss Next Steps and Phase 1 Transition into Phase 2**

- A. Floyd | Snider shared the Next Steps document.
  - i. Document shows why Phase 1 was completed and the intent of this process, how does Phase 1 support Phase 2, and what an EIS looks like.
  - ii. There were no immediate comments. The group was asked to submit any feedback during the review period.

**7. Update on Review of Best Available Science**

- A. Rich Doenges and Scott Steltzner reviewed the best available science spreadsheet, and provided an update on the Technical Committee review of the technical document list. The completed review will be an appendix to the Proviso Report.

**8. Review of Action Items**

- B. Floyd | Snider: Work on a revised draft Relative Comparison of Costs Options to bring forward to Executive Work Group.
- C. All: Send feedback on second touch of review of existing and hybrid options by October 6.
- D. All: Send feedback on first touch on relative comparison of costs for options by October 6.