Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 2, 2018  Time: 8:00 – 9:30 a.m.
Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA  Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

Meeting Participants

Work Group Members

• Bud Blake, Thurston County
• Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
• Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater
• Chris Liu, Washington State Department of Enterprise Services
• Cheryl Selby, City of Olympia
• E.J. Zita, Port of Olympia

Department of Enterprise Services

• Debra Delzell
• Kevin Dragon
• Linda Kent
• Bill Frare
• Carrie Martin

EIS Consultants/Facilitators

• Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
• Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
• Jessi Massingale, Floyd|Snider
• Meaghan McClure, EnviroIssues
• Ray Outlaw, EnviroIssues

Others

• Joe Downing, Port of Olympia

Meeting Notes Summary

Opening Comments and Review of Agenda
Jessi Massingale Floyd|Snider, welcomed members of the Executive Work Group (EWG) and thanked them for making the time to attend. She invited Department of Enterprise Services (Enterprise Services) Director Chris Liu to make opening remarks.

- Director Liu shared his excitement to be in Phase 2 of this process. He defined project goals and emphasized Enterprise Services’ commitment to a transparent public process. He introduced Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, as the facilitator who will support EWG meetings throughout Phase 2. Director Liu explained that DES hopes to continue the momentum from Phase 1, in which the EWG worked successfully. He stated that no thoughts or ideas should be excluded, but heard and considered. He hoped the group will be open to talking through issues as they arise. Enterprise Services has identified technical teams and committees to act as resources to support the EIS process. With sufficient funding to continue this process, Enterprise Services plans to move forward with what he hopes will be a rewarding process.

- EWG members introduced themselves. Port Commissioner E.J. Zita was recognized as the Chair of the Port Commission this year, and therefore the Port’s new representative to the EWG.

Following the introductions, Ms. Hayman explained her role as facilitator, which is to keep the discussion on time and on track, and to help EWG members successfully accomplish the meeting objectives. She noted she’ll keep track of action items and other follow-up items for future meetings. She reminded the group that everyone’s full participation is encouraged and candid conversation would be supported. She requested that participants be brief in questions and responses to allow time to hear from everyone.

- Mayor Cheryl Selby, City of Olympia, asked Ms. Hayman how EnviroIssues got involved in this phase of the project. Ms. Hayman explained that EnviroIssues is subcontracted with Floyd|Snider who is managing the project and preparation of the environmental impact statement. Ray Outlaw, also with EnviroIssues, is the public engagement team lead.

Ms. Massingale welcomed members of the EWG and thanked them for their participation. The EIS process kicked off with the opening of the scoping period on September 26, 2018. She explained that it was important to meet early in the scoping period in October, and recognized people made time in busy schedules to attend this meeting on short notice. She emphasized there was a tight turnaround in planning this meeting ahead of the first open house, which is why the agenda was sent out just one day before the meeting. She said the intention moving forward is to send final draft agendas to the group one week in advance. She added that she wanted to circle back at the end of the meeting to schedule the next EWG meeting before the end of October.
• Director Liu clarified that the purpose of sending out the agenda in advance is to enable work group participants to review the agenda early and suggest agenda items that may have been missed.

• Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe, thanked the project teams from Floyd|Snider and Enterprise Services for being available on short notice. He expressed concern about a failure to engage this committee earlier in the process. He shared that he had hoped this meeting would happen sooner rather than later and added that there was an item on the agenda he wanted to expand further as it arose.

• Director Liu complimented Mr. Dickison on his willingness to share his concerns with the group. He emphasized that if something sparks concern, all should feel comfortable to bring it up.

**Project Timeline**

Ms. Massingale walked through the process map as the tool to talk through different elements and approaches for engagement. She added that she didn’t want to go into much detail about scoping or the key EIS milestones, as the team will present a summary of those items during the late-October meeting.

As part of the timeline, Ms. Massingale provided a brief overview of how the project name originated in Phase 1. She explained that in 2016, there was recognition that the public referred to the area as Capitol Lake; however, there was interest in recognizing the greater watershed and Budd Inlet. The connectivity to the larger geographical region resulted in the addition of “Lower Deschutes Watershed” to the project name. She described that if the project name was to be changed, the name change would not occur until after the scoping period to avoid confusion.

• Mr. Dickison shared that he saw it as a singular issue, rather than as a series of issues. From the Tribe’s perspective, he sees institutional bias for how things happen regarding the watershed. He described this bias as reflected in the name as well as other circumstances that play into the impact of methods of public participation. Mr. Dickison said the Tribe is committed to calling out and reducing this bias.

  o Mr. Dickison described his frustration with the project participating at Harbor Days and not at the Festival of the Steh-Chass. Mr. Dickison described that the organizational dynamics around Harbor Days were concerning to the Tribe. In addition, the project participation felt to the Tribe like a biased decision, and he said he expected a more neutral process. He emphasized the importance of words and public facing documents as conveying meaning of cultural concepts.

Director Liu said he appreciated Mr. Dickison’s comments. He added that he was very familiar with institutional cultural/minority bias through his work with the minority subcommittee, and respectfully acknowledged Mr. Dickison’s points. He agreed that the group should have met
earlier and offered to take full responsibility for that not happening. Director Liu said that meeting regularly will be important for this group to stay connected and address issues as they arise in the process. He reiterated the importance of accommodating all involved with this process, including meeting in another location if it would be more convenient for EWG members.

- Mayor Selby suggested that conference calls could be more accommodating to EWG members’ busy schedules to provide updates between meetings.

- Commissioner Zita emphasized the need for meeting more frequently, as well as the concern about public engagement. She apologized on behalf of the Port for focusing outreach participation in the Harbor Days Festival. She expressed disappointment that the project didn’t participate in both events.

Ms. Massingale explained that looking at the geographical footprint when contemplating renaming the project is just one of the ideas that has been discussed. She emphasized that the EIS is about evaluating impact. She added that in this process the consultant team are advocates of the process, not for a specific outcome.

Changing the Project Name

Ms. Hayman restated Ms. Massingale’s request for feedback about a revised project name.

- Commissioner Zita said it is important to have a strategy that examines the issues and goals for the project in order to rework the name, perhaps including the alternatives.

Ms. Massingale asked what the group thought about including the primary alternatives in the logo.

- Mayor Selby suggested changing “Capitol Lake” to “Managed Lake,” adding that it would replace the “fuzzy nostalgic feeling” of what it used to be. She continued that the lake could be different in the future, and deserving of a new name.

- Mayor Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater, encouraged the group to think about the title of the project. He identified “estuary restoration” and “managed lake” as options for adding to the project name. He said the idea of bullets as a subheading to the name may not address Mr. Dickison’s concerns.

- Mayor Selby suggested removing Capitol Lake and leaving Lower Deschutes Watershed as the name.

- Commissioner Bud Blake, Thurston County, added that the name should have significance to rural and urban residents in the area.

- Mr. Dickison responded that it wasn’t part of his intention to achieve a particular name change. He explained what his expectations were as the Tribal lead and welcomed more discussion and dialogue on topics of language.
Ms. Hayman captured an action item for the consultant team to work on alternatives for the project name and bring them to the EWG for discussion.

**EIS Process and Community Engagement**

Ms. Massingale emphasized that Enterprise Services has proposed to go above and beyond the SEPA requirements for public involvement in this process. She stated the expectation for issuance of a scoping report in early 2019 (when the Legislature is back in session) and the kind of milestone that is for the project. She described that the report shapes what is studied in the EIS. She also explained how the consultant team was meeting with stakeholder groups, briefing them on the project and had committed to various forms of early community outreach. Ms. Massingale asked the group about upcoming events that might be good options for project outreach in their communities. She asked for their thoughts on achieving the best balance of outreach, recognizing considerations for logistics, timing relative to project milestones, and project budget.

- Director Liu suggested the group should think about local events that could have good audiences for this effort.
- Mayor Selby suggested calling the Visitors Bureau, Experience Olympia & Beyond to ask what events are happening and then bringing those events back to the work group for discussion.
- Commissioner Blake added that he would reach out to his offices in the county for ideas on local events.
- Mayor Selby encouraged the consultant team to keep Kiwanis groups and the Downtown Alliance updated on this process.

Director Liu asked Mr. Dickison if there are other things the group should consider from a tribal perspective. Mr. Dickison said he would investigate options and provide a response soon.

Ms. Massingale said there are many groups with interest in the Capitol Lake area who want opportunities to engage. She listed groups with whom the consultant team has met with for project briefings.

Ms. Gardner-Brown provided a short summary of the October 1 briefing with the Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association (CLIPA). She said it provided the opportunity for CLIPA representatives to ask questions and share their interests in the process. Ms. Gardner-Brown concluded that CLIPA was pleased with the outcomes of the meeting, and the team hoped this tone carries into briefings with other interest groups moving forward.

Mayor Kmet asked where alternatives were assessed in the process. Ms. Gardner-Brown pointed out this would occur in the technical evaluation and alternatives analyses step.

Ms. Massingale reviewed the outcomes of Phase 1 and how accomplishments connect to work needed in Phase 2. Commissioner Zita said the analysis in Phase 1 was substantial and seems like
a good foundation for Phase 2. Ms. Massingale added that an economic analysis would be incorporated in Phase 2.

Commissioner Zita asked when the community sounding board would start. Director Liu said the format for the community sounding board has yet to be determined. Ms. Gardner-Brown said the team has imagined the sounding board format would look like a roundtable discussion of approximately 14 interested community members. She added that the team hoped to identify individuals during the scoping period. Ms. Massingale explained that the community sounding board is an efficient way to hear from a diverse group with a range of interests.

Mr. Dickison requested keeping a roster of meetings – it would be helpful to facilitate and track public involvement opportunities and project meetings. Ms. Massingale confirmed that meetings and meeting participants would be noted, shared with the EWG and posted to the project website.

Mayor Shelby expressed an interest in involving youth in this process. She has observed similar groups attending these events and meetings and encouraged the team to consider how much this project could impact youth given the timeline for something like this. This suggestion was favorably received by the other EWG members, Enterprise Services, and the consultant team. Commissioner Zita reminded the consultant team that they have a standing invitation to present information at Evergreen State College.

Mr. Dickison asked if social media was being used for outreach during this process. Ms. Massingale shared that the team has a social media strategy, including communication via Facebook and Twitter.

**EIS Scoping and Ways to Comment**

Ms. Gardner-Brown provided additional information on scoping. She emphasized that the team is still conducting outreach and searching for interested individuals and groups throughout the county. She said it is a critical time in the process for people to know they can engage with the EIS process. Ms. Gardner-Brown shared that the first open house of the scoping period is scheduled for October 10, and the second on October 22. She informed the group that the project team would be present for meeting attendees to ask questions and to receive their verbal and written comments. She emphasized that the purpose of the meeting is to help define the scope of the EIS through public comment.

- Director Liu asked how spoken testimony will be transcribed. Ms. Gardner-Brown said there will be a court reporter transcribing at both meetings.
  - Ms. Massingale explained that a lottery system will be used for public comment in order to ensure an equal opportunity for people to provide verbal comments.

Mr. Dickison commented that somewhere in this process of scoping the team will need to make decisions about which alternatives will rise to the top. He noted there may be other alternatives
proposed through this process. He asked how the team intends to decide about which alternatives are further analyzed and which are not.

- Ms. Gardner-Brown explained that an Alternative Report, which documents how the existing alternatives were generated, is already posted on the website. She said the team will document variations of potential future alternatives in the scoping report. The team will develop “measurable evaluation criteria” in collaboration with the EWG and other advisory groups, and perhaps with the community sounding board. She added that the team can then use criteria to determine which alternatives are most viable. She emphasized that the measurable evaluation criteria will be developed before alternatives are analyzed.

**Future EWG Meetings**

Ms. Massingale explained that the project team hopes the EWG can meet on a quarterly basis after October. She added that it is important to meet before the draft scoping report is complete, so the team can have dialogue about this phase. She asked the EWG what their expectations were regarding frequency of meetings.

- Mayor Kmet requested clarification about how meeting agendas are distributed. Ms. Massingale replied that the agendas will be emailed to the EWG members, and that the plan will be to have these distributed at least one week in advance in the future.
- Ms. Massingale offered four dates and asked the EWG if Doodle polls were the best way to determine availability. *The EWG agreed Doodle Polls are an acceptable scheduling tool.*

Ms. Massingale explained that she would like to introduce a standing agenda item at the end of each meeting for round-table feedback. She added that as part of this process, providing opportunities to offer feedback is very important.

**Final Thoughts/Questions**

Mayor Kmet asked if the EIS provides funding for fieldwork. Ms. Massingale answered that to some extent yes, depending on the technical evaluation and what potential data gaps may be identified. She said the team will wait to see what comes out of scoping. She added that there are differences of opinion on technical aspects and continuing criticism about water quality data. Ms. Gardner-Brown pointed out that questions like these would make good scoping comments.

Mayor Selby shared that people are asking why the project needs the remaining $900,000 of the appropriation. She requested that Enterprise Services inform the EWG if they are needed to be advocates for that funding request.

Ray Outlaw, EnviroIssues, shared that promotional materials communicating elements of the scoping period were available for meeting attendees to take with them on their way out.
added that the outreach team would be interested to hear any suggestions of organizations or businesses who would be interested in a briefing during the scoping period of this EIS.

**Opportunity for Public Comment**

No one expressed interest in providing public comment when invited by Ms. Hayman.

**Adjournment**

Ms. Massingale thanked the group for attending and candidly sharing thoughts and ideas. *The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 a.m.*