

Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study

Net Benefits Analysis ***Stakeholder Involvement***



Final Report

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
June 2006

– *This page intentionally blank* –

Acknowledgements

Numerous individual and organizations contributed to the successful implementation of the net benefits analysis' stakeholder involvement efforts. Thanks and warmest regards are extended to each.

CLAMP Steering Committee members

Bob Van Schoorl, Port of Olympia
Dick Blinn, Thurston County
Dick Wallace, WA Department of Ecology
Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
Joe Hyer, City of Olympia
Neil McClanahan, Co-Chair, City of Tumwater
Peter Antolin, Co-Chair, WA Department of General Administration
Scott Robinson, WA Department of Natural Resources
Sue Patnude, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife

CLAMP Steering Committee staff

Curtis Tanner, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
Nathaniel Jones, WA Department of General Administration
Steven Morrison, Thurston Regional Planning Council

Additional CLAMP member agency staff

Margen Carlson, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
Perry Lund, WA Department of Ecology

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Coastal Services Center staff

Thomas G. Safford
Zac Hart

We also thank the NOAA Coastal Services Center for contributing grant funding to complete this project.

Stakeholder Meetings Facilitator

John Kliem, Creative Community Solutions

Focus Group Participants

Allen Miller, Heritage Park Development Association

Angela Ruiz, Citizen
David Bills, Tumwater Area Chamber of Commerce
Donna Nickerson, Black Hills Audubon Society
Donna Smith, Citizen
Doug DeForest, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce
Emily Piper Sanford, Citizen
Emily Ray, Citizen
Eve Fagergren, Citizen
Frank Anderson, Citizen
Gary Franklin, South Capitol Neighborhood Association
John Demeyer, Olympia Yacht Club
John Lynch, Chambers Lake Homeowners Association
Keith Johnson, Chambers Lake Homeowners Association
Loris Fenske, Olympia Heritage Commission
Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound
Nancy Stevenson, Tumwater Historic Preservation Commission
Oscar Soule, Citizen
Paul Allen, Friends of the Deschutes Estuary
Paul Seabert, Olympia Downtown Association
Paul Spivak, Citizen
Randy Weeks, Citizen
Renee Sunde, Thurston County Economic Development Council
Sara Carter, South Sound Green, Thurston Conservation District
Tamara Garcia, Thurston County Visitors Convention Bureau
Tom Hanson, Capital Lakefair

The Olympia Yacht Club

The Olympia School District's Knox Center

The Olympian

Cover Photo: Zac Hart, Coastal Management Specialist, NOAA Coastal Services Center

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Background	2
A.	Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study	3
B.	Net Benefits Analysis	3
III.	Stakeholder Involvement Process	4
A.	Planning and Development	4
1.	Objectives	4
2.	General Framework	5
3.	Participation	5
B.	Meeting Methods	6
1.	Focus Group, Meeting One	7
2.	Focus Group, Meeting Two	7
3.	Public Meeting	8
C.	Results	9
1.	Focus Group Attributes	9
2.	Public Meeting Attributes	10
3.	Public Involvement Brainstorm	10
D.	Integration with the Net Benefits Analysis	10
IV.	Discussion	11
A.	What worked well?	11
B.	What could be improved?	12
V.	Conclusion	13
VI.	References	14
VII.	Appendix A: Focus Group Meeting One	14
VIII.	Appendix B: Focus Group Meeting Two	22
IX.	Appendix C: Public Meeting	36
X.	Appendix D: Focus Group Attributes	43
XI.	Appendix E: Public Meeting Attributes	48
XII.	Appendix F: Public Involvement Brainstorm	52
XIII.	Appendix G: Attribute “Translation”	57

I. Introduction

The successful exploration of coastal management and restoration opportunities depends upon having quality scientific information about the natural, physical, and social context in which these activities take place. Collecting natural and physical scientific data has become a part of virtually all of these types of projects. Increasingly, federal and state agencies have also begun examining the economic costs and benefits associated with different management actions. The majority of these efforts have focused on analyzing the costs of potential restoration options and providing comparisons of the expenses associated with different management scenarios. Although most agencies would like to gather information about both the costs and the benefits of particular activities, quantifying the full range of benefits provided by natural areas can be costly and requires complex economic modeling (Lipton & Wellman 1995, de Groot et al. 2002). Because of these difficulties, detailed analysis of social and economic benefits has not been a regular part of restoration planning.

Nevertheless, it can be valuable to decision makers to have access to information about the types of benefits that may be derived from a particular ecosystem under different management scenarios. It is increasingly acknowledged that information about the human and social context is critical for evaluating natural resource management efforts (Casagrande 1997b, Heinz Center 2002, Thayer et al. 2005, Waage 2003).

In Olympia, Washington, a multi-jurisdictional committee that provides guidance on the management of Capitol Lake has recognized the value of such human and social information. The Capitol Lake Adaptive Management (CLAMP) Steering Committee is exploring a variety of management options for the lake. The lake was created by damming the Deschutes River, and it is thought that restoring estuary processes, such as tidal inundation, could eliminate several of the problems associated with maintaining the lake environment. In order to explore this possibility, the CLAMP Steering Committee initiated a Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS), which includes a socio-economic study: the Net Benefits Analysis (NBA).

During the initial discussions of the DEFS and the NBA, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC) staff recognized the need to: 1) identify ways to gather input from non-governmental groups, the business community, and citizens about the types of benefits they derive from the Deschutes Basin, and 2) develop a formal social and economic assessment that would integrate both quantitative and qualitative estimates of the value of these benefits. Integrating local input in both the project development and analysis stages has been found to be a superior approach for involving the public in natural resource management decision-making (Casagrande 1997, Heinz Center 2002, Imperial 2005, McCool & Gutherie 2001). These types of studies have also shown that approaches that merely present management options for public comment often lead to conflicts between different interest groups. Based on these experiences, NOAA CSC and WDFW staff worked to develop an approach that would engage local and regional stakeholders in each stage of the net-benefits assessment.

Conventionally, studies of the social and economic benefits of natural resources have focused on attaching dollar values to goods and services that are bought and sold in markets (e.g., fish or timber) and quantifying "non-market values" (e.g., the benefits of wetlands in improving water quality or the value of an undeveloped forest or beach for recreation). Further, government agencies often identify which goods and services should become the focus for these valuation studies. These methods, however, do not always capture the full range of values that are important to local communities. In addition, the high cost of conducting purely quantitative non-market

valuation studies has meant that they are not always feasible given the limited resources available for restoration and other coastal management efforts.

To avoid these problems, the DEFS developed an approach wherein local stakeholders identify the types of benefits for which quantitative market and non-market valuation studies will be completed, and also highlight particular benefits that need to be characterized through qualitative analysis. This approach is consistent with effective natural resource management and coastal restoration efforts in other regions (Casagrande 1997, Driver 1996, Lipton & Wellman 1995, Page 1997, Thayer et al. 2005). The results of this process are outlined in the subsequent sections of this report.

II. Background

Capitol Lake, located in Olympia, Washington, is an impoundment of the Deschutes River. The lake was created in 1951 by erecting a dam to retain fresh water from the river before it joins the salt water of Budd Inlet and the Puget Sound. The state created the lake to realize a reflecting surface for the Capitol Building, which was a feature of the site plan that the architectural firm of Wilder and White created for the Washington State Capitol Campus in 1911. The Washington Department of General Administration (GA) has taken responsibility for maintaining and operating the lake and the associated dam and Deschutes Parkway since their creation in 1951.

The following excerpt from the Draft 2005 Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan Annual Report describes the evolution of Capitol Lake maintenance and adaptive management.

In the early 1970s and into the 1980s lake management activities were intensified with efforts to address sedimentation, water quality, and public recreation. During this period, the state dredged the lake twice, once in 1979 and again in 1986. Yearly estimates of sediment accumulation in the lake are from 29,000 to 55,000 cubic yards per year. Attempts in the mid-1990s to secure maintenance dredging permits, to keep up with sedimentation, encountered significant environmental challenges. At that time, immediate dredging was abandoned in lieu of a more comprehensive lake management approach.

When the state sought permits for the construction of Heritage Park in 1996, it became clear that a limited management strategy was no longer feasible. Lake managers needed to balance the sometimes competing demands of fisheries, habitat, water quality, public use, flood management, and aesthetics. While Capitol Lake is only a small part of the Deschutes River watershed, it is necessary to consider the larger ecosystem and respond to a broader range of community interests in managing the basin.

In 1997, GA established a partnership with state natural resource agencies and local governments with permitting and/or management responsibility for Capitol Lake or its watershed. The nine jurisdictions serving on the *Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee* include the following:

- State Department of Ecology
- State Department of Fish and Wildlife
- State Department of General Administration
- State Department of Natural Resources
- City of Olympia
- Port of Olympia
- Squaxin Island Tribe
- Thurston County
- City of Tumwater

GA has provided staff and resources for the Steering Committee's operations. In addition, the other jurisdictions have provided technical staff assistance to both the Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committees. Still evolving its role, the Steering Committee was established to provide guidance to GA on lake management and has recognized a shared interest and responsibility for the lake's future. While the day-to-day management of this resource remains with GA, member entities are contributing dollars, staff, and other resources to assure that the lake will be healthy and fulfill the public's expectations.

In June 1999, the Director of GA adopted the first Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (1999-2001). Established for an interim two-year period, the plan was to ensure that operations, maintenance, and capital investments were coordinated so that limited financial resources could be used in an effective and efficient manner. A new draft CLAMP plan was reviewed by the public in summer 2002, with the CLAMP Steering Committee's recommendation to adopt that fall. The Director of GA forwarded the plan to the State Capitol Committee, which adopted the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan - A Vision for the Next Ten Years: 2003-2013 in December 2002.

The CLAMP 10-Year Plan identifies 14 Management Objectives... In any one year, there may be several activities where substantial progress has been made. (Draft 2005 CLAMP Annual Report)

A. Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study

The CLAMP Steering Committee seeks to provide information and guidance to GA to support a thorough discussion of the possibilities for managing Capitol Lake. It is possible that restoring the Deschutes River estuary (an area where freshwater from a river or stream mixes with saltwater in a bay or estuary) may alleviate some of the problems related to current lake management. While we have more than fifty years of experience and studies related to maintaining the lake environment, we have very little information about how an estuary would function here today. Thus, the second objective of the CLAMP 10-Year Plan is to carry out a study to determine whether it is feasible to restore estuary processes to the Capitol Lake.

The Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS) consists of several components, each of which contributes to our understanding of the various costs and benefits associated with restoring estuary processes to Capitol Lake. Some of these components analyze physical attributes of an estuary. A bathymetric study surveyed the shape of the bottom of the lake, and the hydraulic and sediment transport model predicts how sediment would move and be distributed if estuary processes were restored. Other portions of the DEFS provide ecological analyses of a restored Deschutes River estuary. The reference estuary study examined other South Puget Sound estuaries to help us understand how they function, as well as the types and amounts of habitat that might result from restoring estuary processes. The engineering design and cost estimate study will use existing data, as well as that generated in other components of the DEFS, to develop feasible estuary restoration design alternatives and predict how those alternatives will affect existing infrastructure and what they will cost. Finally, the net benefits analysis will elucidate the socio-cultural and economic effects of restoring estuary processes in the urban setting of downtown Olympia. Each of these components will be subject to independent technical and community reviews.

B. Net Benefits Analysis

While ecological studies are an almost obligatory foundation for considering restoration activities, studies of social and economic aspects of restoration are more rare, even though examining and incorporating socio-economic information can lead to a more effective and sustainable decision. In recognition of this fact, the net benefits analysis (NBA) was included in the DEFS from an early stage. The net benefits analysis asks, "How do we expect social, economic, and environmental values in the Deschutes Basin to change if estuary processes are restored?" Discussions about integrating different types of social and economic information into the DEFS began in early 2005. Perry Lund, then project manager for the DEFS, approached the Human Dimensions Program at the NOAA Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC) to inquire about possible collaboration in the net benefits analysis component of the study.

In March 2005, NOAA CSC and Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) staff met in Olympia to talk about the objectives of the DEFS, the types of social and economic data that could be included in the net-benefits portion of the study, and the technical and financial resources that

would necessary for this component. NOAA CSC and Ecology staff recognized the need to expand the initial scope of the net-benefits assessment to include a broader range of social and economic data and to develop a process that would integrate local and regional stakeholders into the assessment effort.

Following these meetings, the director of the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program within Ecology made a formal request, on behalf of CLAMP, for assistance from the NOAA CSC. In response, NOAA CSC staff met with members of the CLAMP technical work group to discuss the development of a proposal and work plan for a NOAA-funded project that would support the NBA. During this period, the leadership of the CLAMP technical work group rotated to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Throughout the fall of 2005, NOAA CSC and WDFW staff developed a project plan and finalized a scope of work for the stakeholder involvement portion of the NBA. A contract was completed in January 2006 and the stakeholder involvement process began in March 2006.

III. Stakeholder Involvement Process

A. Planning and Development

WDFW and NOAA CSC staff continued their collaboration in planning the community involvement process and added the services of facilitator John Kliem. The CLAMP Steering Committee reviewed and approved major planning milestones, as well as staff recommendations about correspondence and outreach. The primary planning activities included refining objectives, creating a general framework, and identifying participants.

1. Objectives

The first planning task was to clarify the objectives of the community involvement process. Initially, the objective was quite general: the CLAMP Steering Committee wished to have the community make recommendations about the kinds of goods and services that should be analyzed in the Net Benefits Analysis (NBA). Staff from several of the CLAMP Steering Committee member organizations spent time considering the wording of the objective and how the community participants might understand that wording. Eventually, this discussion resulted in three distinct objectives for the stakeholder involvement process.

The first objective was to “Identify attributes related to the Deschutes Basin that should be analyzed in the Net Benefits Analysis.” The most difficult idea to communicate is what was meant by “attributes”. The goal was to get community participants to identify tangible products or services, and tangible or intangible experiences or feelings that the Deschutes Basin provides that are important to them. “Ecosystem goods and services” is often used in this kind of analysis, but some felt that this phrase was too evocative of conventional economic analyses, which rarely include non-market and subjective attributes, despite their importance to a community. The wording above was used variously in written and spoken communication with community participants.

The second objective was to “Recommend whether the identified attributes should be analyzed quantitatively or qualitatively.” Although there are methodologies for determining the values of non-market goods and services, it can be expensive to have such analyses done. The CLAMP Steering Committee had a finite amount of money with which to conduct the NBA, and the quantitative/qualitative recommendations from the community would help sort the data for analysis.

The third objective was to “Suggest ways for the community to be involved in making a final decision about the long-term management of Capitol Lake.” A detailed project implementation plan for the DEFS now anticipates the various scientific studies will be completed by mid-2007, and

a final report will be delivered in 2008. Many in the general community were anxious to turn their attention to the decision making process that follows completion of the study. Would it continue to be a lake? Would estuary processes be restored? It made sense to channel that interest into creating a brainstorm of public involvement suggestions, thereby improving public outreach and involvement in the future.

Although communicating these objectives was very important, it was equally important to be clear about what would not happen as a part of this process. Because the community was so interested in the eventual decision making, and because opinions ran deep and strong about what that decision should be, staff knew it would be tempting to use this process as a forum for debate. While that discussion would be valuable to the community, this process needed to result in some specific information to guide the completion of the impending NBA, which would later inform that very discussion. Thus, at several points during the process, staff and the facilitator emphasized that this process was not a forum for debate, rather a way for the community to help define the content of the NBA.

2. General Framework

The second planning task was to determine how to achieve these objectives. WDFW and NOAA CSC staff and the facilitator designed a series of meetings with two major components: two small working group sessions followed by a large public meeting. Each of these meetings was facilitated and a professional note-taker recorded the proceedings and provided summary notes. The meetings were held in the evening at locations in downtown Olympia.

The smaller working group was called the Focus Group. This sample of community members provided specific responses and opinions regarding the scope of the NBA, quantitative and qualitative analysis, and future public involvement. The public involvement process started with a small group because staff predicted it would take two meetings to achieve the objectives, and that it would be important to have consistent participation from the first meeting to the second. It would be difficult to assure this continuity between meetings with an open house meeting style. Additionally, it was important for the Focus Group to develop a sense of intimacy and teamwork with the facilitator and with each other so that they could move beyond debate and focus on the common objectives at hand. The Focus Group created the first draft of Deschutes Basin attributes that alternately guided and was added to by the community.

The two Focus Group meetings were followed by a public meeting. This meeting gave the broader community an opportunity to review the Focus Group's work, identify additional Deschutes Basin attributes, and add to the public involvement brainstorm. Although the public meeting was only one night, a local television station (Thurston Community Television) provided coverage of the meeting and broadcast the footage nine times over the subsequent two months.

3. Participation

Focus Group participants were identified by both targeting local organizations and soliciting interested citizens. Staff created a list of invitees (Box 1) using an early draft of a CLAMP communication strategy that identified local and regional constituent groups. Although Capitol Lake is located in Olympia, it represents the State of Washington through its inclusion in the Capitol Campus. Thus, a regional perspective was an important facet of the Focus Group. The

“focus group: A small group selected from a wider population and sampled, as by open discussion, for its members' opinions about or emotional response to a particular subject or area, used especially in market research or political analysis.”

*The American Heritage® Dictionary
of the English Language: Fourth
Edition. 2000.*

invitation list included local and regional business and trade associations, local and regional environmental groups, an educational organization, neighborhood and historic groups, and a local tribe. The CLAMP Steering Committee recommended several additional groups. The local paper ran an article that outlined the community involvement effort and solicited interested individuals to contact WDFW staff. Ten citizens responded to this call for participation.

Box 1. Focus Group Invitation List

- Black Hills Audubon Society
- Capitol Lakefair
- Chambers Lake Homeowners Association
- Economic Development Council
- Friends of the Deschutes Estuary
- Heritage Park Association
- Olympia Downtown Association
- Olympia Heritage Commission
- Olympia Yacht Club
- People for Puget Sound
- Project Green, Thurston Conservation District
- Puget Sound Anglers South Sound Chapter
- South Capitol Neighborhood Association
- Squaxin Island Tribe
- Thurston County Chamber of Commerce
- Tumwater Chamber of Commerce
- Tumwater Historic Preservation Committee
- Visitor Convention Bureau
- Individual citizens

Staff communicated with potential Focus Group participants in several ways. The CLAMP Steering Committee sent an invitation letter and background information to each individual and the leader of each organization. The letter requested an RSVP so that staff could plan effectively. This also allowed staff to emphasize the importance assuring continuity by having one person from an organization attend both meetings. WDFW staff spoke on the phone or via email with each organization and individual, and 25 of the 28 organizations and individuals confirmed their participation and attended the first meeting.

Public meeting participants were sought through a combination of advertisement, distributing fliers, and email distribution. The public meeting was advertised in the local paper, on local radio stations, and fliers were posted at locations around town, including the local college. Fliers were distributed in hard copy and electronically to Focus Group participants and via email to several Capitol Lake distribution lists. Many recipients forwarded the flier within their organization or to additional distribution lists, creating another layer of awareness.

B. Meeting Methods

Facilitator John Kliem employed the Institute of Cultural Affairs' Workshop Method™ (Standfield 2002). This method generates team consensus, creativity, and responsibility, and

works well for building consensus in a diverse group. It relies on individual, team, and full group work to brainstorm a list of ideas, find relationships among the ideas, and discover greater insight into their meaning.

One of the most important steps in the Workshop Method™ is to create a focus question. The focus question drives the whole workshop by triggering the brainstorm and providing direction at various other points in the workshop. Thus, the focus question must illuminate the issue and also encourage imaginative thinking.

It often helps to consider both the rational objective (What is the product or result needed?) and the experiential objective (What do you want the group to experience through the workshop?) when creating a focus question. The rational objective of the Focus Group, as stated above, was to have participants create a list of attributes or values that they associate with the Deschutes Basin and (at the second meeting) make recommendations about quantitative/qualitative analysis and public involvement. The experiential objective for the group was to enjoy working together in a cooperative atmosphere to evoke creative thinking and a sense of satisfaction from creating a visible product.

The facilitator also made use the concept of “mental maps”, developed by sociologist Dr. Lorraine Garkovich, in creating the focus question (Garkovich, online). Garkovich explains that, “Each

landowner or person with an interest in the prospective use of a given piece of land has in mind a certain future for that parcel which is linked somehow with his/her own well-being.” Further, she explains that,

Land uses affect people’s “mental map” of their community. In other words, the ways in which land is used and the physical arrangement of these uses directly shape the mental map we develop and indirectly affect our definitions of the desirability of our community as a place to live and work. These mental maps come to define the essential nature of the community... (Garkovich, online)

The notion of mental maps complements the rational objective of the Focus Group: to identify attributes or values related to the Deschutes Basin that should be analyzed in the NBA. Considering the two together led to the focus question, “How does the Deschutes Basin fit within your mental map of our community?” The concept of mental maps, the focus question, and a homework assignment to consider these ideas were included in a letter of introduction from the facilitator to each Focus Group participant.

1. Focus Group, Meeting One

The first Focus Group meeting was held on Tuesday, March 07, 2006, from 6 o’clock pm until 9 o’clock pm at the Olympia Yacht Club. After the 25 Focus Group participants and various staff introduced themselves, WDFW and GA staff gave three informal presentations to provide some context for the evening’s activities. These presentations covered the history and management of Capitol Lake, basic estuary information, and the basics of the DEFS and the NBA. After staff explained how the Focus Group’s work fit into the NBA, they retreated to the edge of the room to observe and did not participate in the remainder of the workshop.

The activities for the evening were designed to follow the Workshop Method™. The facilitator asked the group to list at least 10 images or examples of how the Deschutes Basin fits within their mental map of the community. He used examples such as ‘provides recreational fishing’, ‘supports downtown businesses’, and ‘provides aesthetic values’ to stimulate the group’s thinking. He also used a large aerial photo of the Deschutes Basin to delineate the area the group should be thinking about. A question from a Focus Group participant led staff to clarify that the group shouldn’t limit their ideas to values associated with either a lake or an estuary. Rather, the group should identify attributes that important to them, and these could be attributes they experienced in the past, experience currently, or would like to see in the Deschutes Basin in the future.

Subsequently, the group divided into pairs and collaborated to write their top five to seven ideas onto five-inch by eight-inch index cards. These cards created a tangible record of the group’s work, and were used throughout the remainder of the stakeholder involvement process. The facilitator then led the group through several rounds of posting the attributes on the wall for the whole group to see and understand and then sorting the attributes into related clusters.

Once the group agreed on the clustering of the attributes, they created a title for each cluster that conveyed its essence. The facilitator helped the group do this by explaining, “You can think about all the cards we have up on the wall as telling a story about the Deschutes Basin, and each of our clusters as chapters in that book. What title would you give each chapter to describe what’s inside?” Please see Appendix A for meeting notes and Appendix D for a table depicting the attributes or values and the “chapter titles” the Focus Group created. The facilitator concluded the meeting by leading a brief reflection on the evening’s work.

2. Focus Group, Meeting Two

The second Focus Group meeting was held a week later on Tuesday, March 14, 2006, from 6 o’clock pm until 9 o’clock pm at the Olympia School District’s Knox Center. The facilitator

reminded the group of the focus question, and explained that the first objective of the evening would be to provide recommendations on which attributes should be analyzed quantitatively, and which were appropriate for qualitative analysis. He provided further explanation for the terms “quantitative” and “qualitative”. He also pointed out that neither kind of analysis is better than the other and reminded the Focus Group that *all* of the attributes they identified would be analyzed in the NBA. Working in groups of three, the participants selected a cluster of attributes and worked together to decide whether to recommend quantitative or qualitative analysis. Both kinds of analysis were recommended for some attributes.

The facilitator described the focus question for the meeting’s next activity: “How should the public be involved in the final decision making about the long-term management of Capitol lake?” The participants worked in groups of four or five to brainstorm and present their suggestions, which are captured in Appendix F.

The final activity of the evening was optional. Staff wished to collect as much detail as possible from the Focus Group participants regarding the attributes they identified, and so the facilitator asked the group to provide additional detail on the attribute cards. He described that the additional detail would be the recipe for that attribute card. These instructions would explain how the attribute could be measured in the NBA. Please see Appendix D for a table that depicts the attributes, the qualitative and quantitative recommendations, and the “recipe card” details.

Before adjourning, staff asked for volunteers to come to the public meeting to present the Focus Group’s work and engage the public participants in discussion. Staff talked about the importance of having actual Focus Group participants present their work to the public. The meaning of the attributes the Focus Group identified, and the titles they gave the chapters would have more value when paraphrased by the participants themselves. Ten Focus Group members volunteered to present the group’s work at the public meeting, and four more attended to engage in discussion. A meeting summary is available in Appendix B.

3. Public Meeting

The public meeting was held on Tuesday, March 21, 2006, from 6 o’clock pm until 9 o’clock pm at the Olympia School District’s Knox Center. More than 70 people attended the meeting. A welcome from Peter Antolin, the Deputy Director of GA, was followed by the three presentations that staff gave at the first Focus Group meeting. Then the facilitator introduced the focus question and talked about the Focus Group meetings, after which Focus Group representatives took turns summarizing the content of the attribute chapters and the public involvement brainstorm. These presentations were followed by an impromptu question and answer period that covered issues related to the funding, objectives, and outcomes of the broader DEFS. Brief remarks from Linda Villegas Bremer, the Director of GA, marked the transition from presentations to workshop activities.

The facilitator invited the public to participate in the second half of the meeting, wherein they walked around the room to study the attribute cards, which were grouped by chapter and posted around the room. Focus Group participants acted as mentors for each chapter, and answered questions from the public. The public meeting participants posted cards with additional Deschutes Basin attributes (available in Appendix E) and further suggestions for public involvement in decision making (available in Appendix F). Because the single, three-hour time frame constrained the evening’s activities, the public meeting participants were not asked to specify whether they thought their attributes should be qualitatively or quantitatively analyzed.

C. Results

1. Focus Group Attributes

The Focus Group achieved each of the three objectives set before them. They identified more than fifty attributes related to the Deschutes Basin that they felt should be included in the DEFS. They organized these attributes into eight categories and gave the categories creative names that described the value of those attributes to the group. The “Sustainable Future” chapter described the value of a place on the landscape that embodies a social, environmental, and economic balance. The chapter titled “Healthy Economy” captured a broad variety of attributes that contribute to the local economy, particularly a thriving downtown area and marine-related economic sector. “Everybody’s Basin” identified the value of having a unique cultural amenity that is centrally located and used by many. The Focus Group identified attributes that depict close-in natural habitat that is accessible for people, plants, and animals, and called the chapter “Web of Life”. In “Come Play Outside” the Focus Group listed the attributes that make the Deschutes Basin a place that can draw families, couples, and others to participate in a broad variety of outdoor activities. “It’s the Water” captured attributes that represent the aesthetic value of water. The attributes, or values, in “From Here to There” focused on having physical connections throughout the Deschutes Basin

Table 1. Summary of Focus Group’s Deschutes Basin attributes.

SUSTAINABLE FUTURE	HEALTHY ECONOMY	EVERYBODY’S BASIN	WEB OF LIFE	COME PLAY OUTSIDE	IT’S THE WATER	FROM HERE TO THERE	SPIRITUAL CONNECTIONS
A place to teach kids about nature	Safe haven for mooring boats	Unique cultural amenity (community celebrations, Capitol, history...)	Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown	Old Brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point	Aesthetic value of water	Connects Chehalis & Woodland Trails	A wonderful, broad learning experience
Model for thoughtful stewardship	Destination for visitors	“Central” public resource	Seasonal change	“Green Lake” atmosphere	Reflecting pond for our grand capitol	Various basin areas unique & integrated	Causes me to pause/slow down
Risk management of water level rise (climate change)	Drawing card for economic activity	Shared community asset	Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space	Community events (Proc. of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)	Views of Puget Sound & mountains	Waterway connects from West Bay to Falls	Spiritual connection to something larger
Demonstrates sustainable environmental practices	Not a large tax burden	Lake is point of civic pride	Ecological & social link to Puget Sound & Pacific Ocean	Expand and develop use	Castle @ St. Helier, Jersey, C.I.	All the improvements completed @ Heritage Park	Close-in, quiet space
Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting	Economic driver (inc. transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)	Waterway tells story of the history of the community	Wildlife habitat	Family & romantic getaway	A reflecting estuary for our Capitol		
Deal with sewage, pollution	Help keep downtown alive & healthy		A place to observe salmon	Walk, run safely			
Provide flood protection	Lake/estuary attracts downtown business		Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna	Picnicking & watching kids swim			
	Ecotourism and wildlife viewing		Extension of Puget Sound	Wonderful, safe area to exercise			
	Promotes water based activities			Canoe/kayak to experience tides			
				Swimming			
				Getaway boat fantasy			

KEY:
Quantitative Analysis
Qualitative Analysis
Both Recommended

(from the Tumwater Falls to West Bay Marina). The Focus Group designated the final chapter “Spiritual Connections” in recognition of the value of the Deschutes Basin to the human spirit.

The Focus Group fulfilled the second objective by working together to recommend qualitative or quantitative analysis for each attribute. The group recommended quantitative analysis for 47% of the attributes and qualitative analysis for 34% of the attributes. Participants recommended both kinds of analysis for the remaining 19% of the attributes. In addition, the Focus Group provided added detail to guide analysis for all but 7 of the 53 attributes. Appendix D contains all of the attributes sorted into their respective categories, the kind of analysis recommended for each attribute, and the additional investigative detail. The summary table is reproduced here as Table 1.

2. Public Meeting Attributes

The public meeting participants contributed to the first objective by providing many additional attributes in each of the eight categories. Several of their suggestions echoed or built upon ideas identified by the Focus Group. In addition, many public meeting participants described their attributes in sentences or long phrases. A handful of attributes had not been identified in the Focus Group, and thus added new dimensions to the categories. Some of these novel attributes included indigenous shellfish farming, Native American history, biodiversity, and existing infrastructure investments. A complete list of the attributes identified at the public meeting is presented in Appendix E. As mentioned above, the single, three-hour time frame constrained the evening’s activities, and so public meeting participants were not asked to specify whether they thought their attributes should be qualitatively or quantitatively analyzed. Even so, the longer, narrative style of many of the public meeting participants’ attributes provided detail that was useful in the context of the NBA.

3. Public Involvement Brainstorm

Finally, both the Focus Group and the public meeting participants created lengthy lists of public involvement suggestions that satisfied the third objective of the stakeholder involvement process. The Focus Group followed the ground rules of the brainstorming methodology closely (e.g., defer judgment, every idea is valid, quantity is wanted) and produced list of more than one hundred ideas about how the public could be involved in future decision making. In addition to suggestions related to decision-making, the Focus Group offered ideas about how to involve the public and disseminate information. The public meeting participants added 35 more suggestions. The complete list is available in Appendix F.

D. Integration with the Net Benefits Analysis

All of the attributes, the additional detail, and the qualitative and quantitative recommendations that the Focus Group and the public meeting participants created will help shape the scope of work of the impending NBA. All of this information will be included in the analysis and will continue to be part of the body of information that is being created about the estuary alternative for Capitol Lake.

In the course of the NBA, additional quantitative and qualitative information will be gathered to ensure that all possible changes in attributes are measured and/or described. In order for all of the attributes to receive due consideration in the NBA, staff must effectively communicate the particular meaning of that information to the economic and other social science experts that will conduct the analysis. To facilitate this communication, WDFW staff and NOAA CSC staff worked together (and with feedback from the Focus Group) to re-organize and “translate” the descriptive and informal language from the Focus Group and public meetings. This “translation” is in no way intended to replace, nor indicate the relative importance of, the particular attributes identified by the Focus Group and the public. Rather the translation is an effort to more concisely and clearly define

those attributes and group them based on the types of data that will be collected during the formal economic assessment. This effort is summarized in Table 2. Please see Appendix G for the full socio-economic “translation” of Deschutes Basin attributes.

Table 2. Summary of “Translation” of Deschutes Basin attributes.

Benefit Category	<i>Description</i>
Outdoor Recreation	<i>The goods and services related to outdoor recreation were primarily captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Come Play Outside” and “From Here to There” and include both marine and land-based recreation activities</i>
Tourism	<i>The goods and services related to tourism were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Healthy Economy,” “Everybody’s Basin,” and “Come Play Outside”, specific examples cited included both traditional tourism (restaurants, retail establishments, and hotels) and ecotourism.</i>
Aesthetics and Spirituality	<i>The goods and services related to aesthetics and spirituality were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Healthy Economy,” “It’s the Water,” and “Spiritual Connections.” Participants attributed value to the basin’s ability to promote a sense of place and self, its importance to wildlife, and more generally its connection to larger natural systems.</i>
Ecosystem Functions	<i>The goods and services related to ecosystem functions were generally captured in the focus group chapters “Sustainable Future,” “Web of Life,” and “It’s the Water.” These included risk management functions, biodiversity support, and consumptive uses (fish and shellfish).</i>
Cultural, Civic and Historical Pride	<i>The goods and services related to cultural, civic, and historical pride were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Everybody’s Basin,” “Web of Life,” and “Come Play Outside”. Participants identified the basin as a focal point for the area and viewed the basin as a place where the natural environment, history, and community could be displayed, protected, and honored.</i>
Education	<i>The goods and services related to education were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Sustainable Future” and “Everybody’s Basin” and recognize the opportunity for students, residents, and tourists to learn about the natural environment, sustainable environmental practices, local and regional history, outdoor recreation, and relevant local natural resource issues.</i>
Marine Commerce	<i>The goods and services related to marine commerce were generally captured in the focus group chapter entitled “Healthy Economy”, recognizing both the direct benefits provided by the Port of Olympia and the numerous businesses supported by marine traffic and commerce, including yacht clubs, boat repair and supply shops, grocery stores, and restaurants.</i>
Infrastructure	<i>The goods and services related to infrastructure were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Sustainable Future,” “Healthy Economy,” and “Come Play Outside” and includes the dams, bridges, parkways, walkways, parks and roads associated with Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet.</i>

IV. Discussion

A. What worked well?

A variety of aspects of this stakeholder involvement process worked well, helping to achieve the desired outcomes. The most notable of these was working with an experienced professional facilitator who had an understanding of a variety of relevant local issues. The professional facilitator was a neutral focal point, which helped to establish a greater degree of trust and objectivity throughout the stakeholder involvement process. The facilitator was also a valuable addition to the WDFW and NOAA CSC staff team that worked together to design the stakeholder involvement process. Each person brought a particular expertise and perspective to the planning efforts, which resulted in more creative and effective activities and communications, as well as better results.

The process employed in the Focus Group meetings worked particularly well, and helped achieve very meaningful responses to the meeting objectives. The combination of individual, small team, and full group activities prescribed by the Workshop Method™ led the Focus Group to achieve their experiential objective: to enjoy working together in a cooperative atmosphere to evoke creative thinking and a sense of satisfaction from creating a visible product. Because of the cooperative atmosphere that evolved, Focus Group members concentrated their efforts on the rational objectives and produced very relevant products that provide much of the scope needed for the NBA.

The cooperative atmosphere that was established in the Focus Group meetings also had important educational value. Participants heard a variety of perspectives at the meetings, and left the process with a deeper understanding of the issues, historic perspectives, and a more thorough understanding of the studies and methods being employed. Each of the participants is now a community ambassador for the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan and the DEFS.

The techniques employed in soliciting participation for both the Focus Group process and the public meeting were also effective when judged by the high and diverse attendance at all meetings. Eighty-nine percent (25 of 28) of the organizations and individuals invited to participate in the Focus Group attended the first meeting. It is possible that the combination of direct calls and emails, formal invitation letters, and some follow-up from CLAMP Steering Committee members brought about the high attendance rate. It may also mean that the community was very anxious for the opportunity to engage on the topic of Capitol Lake management.

While none of the methods used to advertise the public meeting were innovative (e.g., newspaper article, radio spot, fliers), more than 70 people attended the meeting. This number is somewhat higher than past public meetings related to Capitol Lake. Again, it is possible that the community was very anxious for the opportunity to engage on the subject. It is also possible that the level of ownership that Focus Group participants felt in the process and outcomes led them to encourage others to attend. As mentioned above, this meant that information about the meeting was distributed to a secondary layer of people and organizations.

Finally, the public involvement brainstorm was an unexpected success. In addition to providing some excellent fodder for discussions about the eventual decision making regarding the long-term management of Capitol Lake, the stakeholders provided many practicable communication and outreach suggestions. These suggestions are relevant for the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study, but also for the CLAMP Steering Committee in general. The Steering Committee recently reinstated a Communications Subcommittee, which will use the public involvement brainstorm as it revisits the overall communication strategy.

B. What could be improved?

Although the stakeholder involvement process led to fulfillment of each of the three objectives, several aspects of the process could be improved. It would be beneficial to select and engage with a facilitator earlier in the planning process. A professional facilitator could have made helpful suggestions with regard to selecting participants and choosing the number and sequence of meetings. In addition, it would be valuable for the facilitator to participate in, or at least be privy to, the discussions about the meeting objectives. The facilitator could have helped with the wording and, alternately, the discussion may have assisted in the formation of the focus question.

In addition, the structure of the public meeting was not very effective. In contrast to the Focus Group meetings, where the group fulfilled experiential objective of cooperation and satisfaction in the product, the presentations and loose open house format of the public meeting did almost nothing to achieve the experiential objective. As a result, the feedback from the public meeting was less focused and less relevant to the objective at hand. The public meeting participants were not able to establish a rapport and sense of trust with the facilitator or with each other. Because this atmosphere was missing, public meeting participants were not responsive to the facilitator's efforts to manage the agenda and objectives (as evidenced by the impromptu and off-track question and answer period). Staff recommends implementing the Workshop Method™ and Focus Group activities with a broader set of public participants, dispensing with the separate small group and public meetings.

V. Conclusion

By most measures, the Net Benefits Analysis stakeholder involvement process was successful. It accomplished the three rational objectives: identify attributes related to the Deschutes Basin that should be included in the NBA, recommend quantitative or qualitative analysis for each attribute, and make suggestions about how the public could be involved in future decision making regarding the long-term management of Capitol Lake. The products associated with each of these objectives will shape the investigation and evaluation within the NBA, as well as future communication and public involvement related to broader Capitol Lake issues. All of these efforts contribute to the consideration of the human and social aspects of Capitol Lake and Deschutes Basin management and, hopefully, more sustainable decisions for the management of this coastal area.

Perhaps more significantly, the Focus Group meeting fulfilled its experiential objective. As many of them told WDFW staff, the Focus Group participants enjoyed working together in a cooperative atmosphere, which evoked creative thinking and a sense of satisfaction from creating a visible product. This sense of cooperation and of understanding is a small step toward a sustainable solution for managing Capitol Lake: a solution that transcends the deep-seated and diametrically opposed positions. As Linda Villegas Bremer, the director of GA, remarked at the public meeting, "Perhaps there is a solution that is richer than those we understand today, and can meet all of the community's needs."

VI. References

- Casagrande, D. (1997). "The Human Component of Urban Wetland Restoration." *The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 100: 254 – 270.
- Casagrande, D. (1997b). "Values, Perceptions, and Restoration Goals." *The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 100: 62-75.
- De Groot, R. S., M. A. Wilson, & R. M. J. Boumans. (2002). "A typology for the classification, description, and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services." *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 41: 393-408.
- Driver, B. L. (1996). "Benefits-Driven Management of Natural Areas." *Natural Areas Journal*, Vol. 16: 94-99.
- Ebbin, S. A. (2002). "Enhanced fit through institutional interplay in the Pacific Northwest Salmon co-management regime." *Marine Policy*, Vol. 26: 253-259.
- Garkovich, Lorraine. (online). "The meaning of land in American society."
<http://www.landfilm.com/meaning2.html>
- Lipton, D. W. & K. W. Wellman. (1995). *Economic Valuation of Natural Resources: A Handbook for Coastal Resource Policy Makers*. Silver Spring, MD: NOAA Coastal Ocean Program Decision Analysis Series No. 5.
- H. J. Heinz Center. (2002). *Dam Removal: Science and Decision Making*. Washington, DC: H. J. Heinz Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment.
- Imperial, M. T. (2005). "Using Collaboration as a Governance Strategy: Lessons from Six Watershed Management Programs." *Administration & Society*, Vol. 37 No. 3:281-320.
- McCool, S. F. & K. Guthrie. (2001). "Mapping the Dimensions of Successful Public Participation in Messy Natural Resource Management Situations." *Society and Natural Resource Management*, Vol. 14: 309-323.
- Page, C. (1997). "Predicting the Social Impacts of Restoration in an Urban Park." *The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 100: 76-102.
- Standfield, R. Brian (2002). *The Workshop Book: From Independent Creativity to Group Action*. Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society Publishers.
- Thayer, G. W., T. A. McTigue, R. Salz, D. H. Merkey, F. M. Burrows, & P. F. Gayaldo, (eds.). (2005). "Science-Based Restoration Monitoring of Coastal Habitats – Volume II: Tools for Monitoring Coastal Habitats." Silver Spring, MD: NOAA Coastal Ocean Program.
- Waage, S. (2003). "Collaborative Salmon Recovery Planning: Examining Decision Making and Implementation in Northeastern Oregon." *Society and Natural Resource Management*, Vol. 16: 295-307.

VII. Appendix A: Focus Group Meeting One

MINUTES OF MEETING

Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP)

Focus Group: Meeting 1

Tuesday, March 7, 2006 6:00 p.m.

Olympia Yacht Club

201 Simmons Street NW

Olympia, WA

Call to Order

Facilitator John Kliem convened the first of two Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) focus group meetings at 6:03 p.m.

Welcome & Introductions

Mr. Kliem welcomed everyone and introduced staff:

- Margen Carlson, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Net Benefits Analysis Study Manager
- Curtis Tanner, WDFW, Project Manager for the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS)
- Nathaniel Jones, Washington Department of General Administration (GA), Asset Manager
- Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services

Mr. Tanner introduced the previous DEFS Project Manager Perry Lund, Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE), and Tom Safford and his assistant Zac Hart, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), from Charleston, South Carolina.

Focus group participants provided self-introductions:

Allen Miller, Heritage Park Development Association

Angela Ruiz, Citizen

David Bills, Tumwater Area Chamber of Commerce

Donna Nickerson, Black Hills Audubon Society

Donna Smith, Citizen

Doug DeForest, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce

Emily Piper Sanford, Citizen

Emily Ray, Citizen

Eve Fagergren, Citizen

Frank Anderson, Citizen

Gary Franklin, South Capitol Neighborhood Association

John Demeyer, Olympia Yacht Club

John Lynch, Chambers Lake

Homeowners Association

Lois Fenske, Olympia Heritage Commission

Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound

Nancy Stevenson, Tumwater Historic Preservation Commission

Oscar Soule, Citizen

Paul Allen, Friends of the Deschutes Estuary

Paul Seabert, Olympia Downtown Association

Paul Spivak, Citizen

Randy Weeks, Citizen

Renee Sunde, Thurston County Economic Development Council

Sara Carter, South Sound Green, Thurston Conservation District

Tamra Garcia, Thurston County Visitors
Convention Bureau

Tom Hanson, Capital Lakefair

Mr. Jones reported GA is charged with the management of Capitol Lake and is responsible for the Capitol Campus, Heritage Park, and the Deschutes Parkway. The lake was created in 1951 with the installation of the 5th Avenue dam. There have been challenges with management of the lake. In 1997, GA established a partnership with state natural resource agencies and local governments with permitting and/or management responsibility for Capitol Lake. The nine jurisdictions serving on the CLAMP Steering Committee include:

- State Department of Ecology
- State Department of Fish and Wildlife
- State Department of General Administration
- State Department of Natural Resources
- City of Olympia
- Port of Olympia
- Squaxin Island Tribe
- Thurston County
- City of Tumwater

The CLAMP Steering Committee meets monthly to manage the dam and lake to the best advantage of the state and the community. Challenges of lake management include sedimentation, maintenance dredging costs, environmental concerns, milfoil/noxious weeds, flooding hazards, and dam challenges to control flood hazards, and habitat. A major component of the Heritage Park construction project is to raise the elevation of the flood control to protect downtown Olympia. The “artificial environment” of Capitol Lake as a freshwater lake has generated “artificial habitat” that does not naturally occur in a natural saltwater estuary system. The river, lake, and inlet are all connected as one system with water quality issues. The question posed to GA was “what would the challenges be if GA didn’t manage it as a lake but as an estuary or some other system.” The system has been managed as a lake since the dam was installed in 1951. GA requested an opportunity to study other options. In November 2003, GA was asked to move forward with an estuary feasibility study. The study has four components: economic, environmental, social, and cultural. The focus group will discuss the values participants associate with the community’s natural resource.

Mr. Tanner provided a PowerPoint presentation, “What is an estuary?” and an overview of the DEFS, restoration, and design alternatives. An estuary is a partially enclosed body of water where freshwater from rivers and streams flows into the ocean. Estuaries are places of transition. A defining feature of an estuary is the mixing of fresh and salt water. Estuaries provide important habitat for fish and wildlife, improve water quality, and provide direct economic benefits including tourism, fisheries, and other commercial activities. Cultural benefits can include recreation, scientific knowledge, education, and aesthetic values. He presented an overhead photo of the Deschutes River estuary prior to the 5th Avenue dam installation.

The CLAMP’s 10-year plan identifies 14 management objectives including, “Complete an estuary feasibility study to determine a long-range management decision.” Mr. Tanner reviewed the DEFS study components. There is a need to understand the social and economic effects of alternatives on values important to the community. The end result is a final feasibility report. DEFS study components include independent technical and community review. Mr. Tanner presented restoration design alternatives that include removal of the 5th Avenue dam and the restoration of an opening approximately 500 feet in width.

Ms. Carlson explained a component of the DEFS the focus group will discuss is the net benefits analysis. The net benefits analysis is an assessment of how the community, social, and economic values might be affected if an estuary is restored. The analysis includes an economic element (quantitative) and describes what the public might predict or anticipate with a change (qualitative). The focus group process will help scope what community, social, and economic values should be studied as part of the net benefits analysis, which will be forwarded as a recommendations to the CLAMP Steering Committee.

At the March 14, 2006 meeting, the focus group will place the values identified into quantitative and qualitative “buckets.” On March 21, 2006, an open door, public meeting is planned offering the broader

community an opportunity to review the results and determine if anything is missing. All the information derived from the focus group process and public meeting will be presented to the CLAMP Steering Committee as a recommendation from the community. The Steering Committee can add, delete, or change items identified in the end product. Ms. Carlson emphasized that even though everyone is interested in the final decision concerning long-term management of Capitol Lake that is not the focus of the meetings.

Mr. Tanner reported the March 14 and 21, 2006 meetings will be held at the Olympia School District Knox Building facility.

A focus group participant indicated his interest in knowing why the lake was created and the pros and cons that led up to the decision. Mr. Jones explained the bridge connection between east and west Olympia was finally resolved with the construction of the 5th Avenue dam. The reflecting pond created by the dam was the most important piece and was included in the 1911 plan for the Capitol from the onset. Creation of the lake could have provided jobs at the end of the war. There was controversy associated with the construction of the dam and the Deschutes Parkway was part of the same project. The Deschutes Parkway provided connectivity between Olympia and Tumwater. The controversy concerned navigation up the river to the brewery in the early days. Businesses along the river depended upon barge traffic and opposed the dam construction.

Mr. Kliem emphasized that the purpose of the meetings is not to debate whether an estuary or a lake is the best alternative. The question before the focus group is, *“How does the Deschutes basin fit within your “mental map” of our community?”* The Deschutes basin area encompasses the waterfall in Tumwater and extends to West Bay Marina. Mr. Kliem described the meeting format that will include individual work followed by forming small teams to review ideas and selecting the most important to share with the entire group. The group as a whole will then share ideas.

Mr. Kliem explained the individual work task. He asked focus group participants to list 10 images of how the Deschutes basin fits in their “mental map” of the community. He provided some examples. In reply to an inquiry, Ms. Carlson said participants should consider what values are personally important regardless of the reference point of past, present, or future.

Mr. Kliem recessed the meeting from 6:53 p.m. to 7:02 p.m. for the individual participant exercise.

Mr. Kliem asked participants to review their lists and “star” the top three to five attributes. He requested participants pair up with another participant and compare their respective lists. Between the two lists he asked the teams to choose five to seven attributes, summarize the attributes into three to five words, and write each attribute separately on the cards provided at the table. At the conclusion of the exercise, the teams will discuss and share the attributes with everyone.

Mr. Kliem recessed the meeting from 7:07 p.m. to 7:26 p.m. for the small teams exercise.

Mr. Kliem asked each team to pick one of their ideas that participants believe present the most exciting mental image of the Deschutes Basin. Additional participant comments are noted.

- Community events – Procession of the Species, Lakefair, lighted ships
- Expand and develop use. How to connect the downtown to the lake and vice versa and make it more user-friendly year-round from morning to night. Activities could include walking historical tours showcasing the Capitol’s history and habitat. Evening uses could include non-motorized kayaking trips that point out the wildlife and trees. Expand and enhance how the Deschutes basin is used today.
- Old brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point

- “Green Lake” atmosphere like Seattle, a vibrant, community place for recreation and different uses that bring people together. Green Lake is a destination with physical activities, water usage, restaurants, and residential uses.
- Castle at St. Helier, Jersey Channel Islands. In reply to an inquiry, a participant explained there is a castle in the Bay of St. Helier near the Channel Islands off the coast of France. It is gorgeous when the tide is in. When the tide goes out it’s a pile of ruins surrounded by mud.
- Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space
- Seasonal change
- Walk, run safely
- Accessible natural habitat close to downtown
- Views of Puget Sound and mountains
- Unique cultural amenity - community celebrations, Capitol, history
- Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting

Mr. Kliem and participants then organized the group of values into similar “clusters.” He collected additional comment cards with ideas that have not been shared with the participant comments that have been shared:

- Safe haven for mooring boats
- Central public resource, to be the key attribute, it’s located in the middle of the community, public access.
- A place to teach kids about nature
- Not a large tax burden
- Model for thoughtful stewardship. A model for the community and others as the public evaluates how to move forward.
- Deal with sewage pollution. It’s an issue. There are unknown outfall drains and sewage lines. It’s about dirty water, not clean water.
- Waterway connects from West Bay to Tumwater Falls
- Drawing card for economic activity
- Destination for visitors
- Reflecting pond for our grand Capitol
- Connect Chehalis and Woodland Trails. The Woodland Trail vision is to connect across the Capitol Lake/estuary to the west side. The trail would connect up through Watershed Park to the Chehalis Trail. Currently, there is no access across the lake.

Mr. Kliem and participants organized the second group of values into similar “clusters” that were established earlier and new “cluster” categories dependent on the value. Some values were rearranged into what participants felt were more appropriate categories. He said participants would develop titles for the “cluster” lists at the end of the meeting. Mr. Kliem collected comment cards with different attributes than those shared:

- Family and romantic getaway
- Help keep downtown alive and healthy
- Wildlife habitat
- Economic driver (including transportation, tourism, Port, marine businesses, and yacht club)
- Provide flood protection
- Waterway tells story of the history of the community
- Lake is point of civic pride
- Spiritual connection to something larger
- Demonstrates sustainable environmental practices

- A place to observe salmon

Participants and the Mr. Kliem organized the group of values into established “clusters” and recognized “provide flood protection” as a new category. Mr. Kliem collected additional comment cards:

- Ecotourism and wildlife viewing
- A wonderful, broad learning experience
- Extension of Puget Sound. On the map, the Deschutes basin is one unit. That’s an attribute of the park; boating, shipping, salmon run, aesthetics. The lake was originally part of Puget Sound.
- Picnicking and watching kids swim
- Various basin areas unique and integrated
- Lake/estuary attracts downtown business
- Close-in, quiet space
- Ecological and social link to Puget Sound and Pacific Ocean
- All the improvements completed at Heritage Park

Participants and Mr. Kliem organized the group of values into established categories, established new “clusters” if needed, and reorganized values as appropriate. A discussion of activities that could be accomplished in the future versus those that take place currently ensued; i.e., one is recreation and the other deals with infrastructure.

Mr. Kliem collected the last of the value cards from participants:

- Honoring local (Northwest) flora and fauna
- Promote water-based activities
- Canoe/kayak to experience tides
- A reflecting estuary for Capitol. Studies show an estuary will reflect the Capitol approximately 70% of the time.
- Risk management of water level rise (climate change)
- Causes me to pause/slow down
- Wonderful, safe area to exercise
- Getaway boat fantasy

Additional thoughts concerning participants’ “mental maps” of the Deschutes basin included *swimming* and *shared community asset*.

Mr. Kliem explained the next step is to develop titles that convey the focus of each “cluster” of ideas. Participants discussed one-word title concepts based on the values listed in each “cluster.” Based on the title concept, values were rearranged when appropriate. Discussion of aesthetics in general and the aesthetic value of water ensued. A participant suggested Puget Sound is not an aesthetic; it’s a fact. Discussion of “ecological and social link to Puget Sound and Pacific Ocean” followed. One is a value of Puget Sound. The other is a function. It was suggested to create a separate category for spiritually. A dialogue concerning the difference between education and sustainable values and clarification concerning “model for thoughtful stewardship” ensued.

Mr. Kliem asked focus group participants to look at the “cluster” titles and refine the “chapter” names. The discussion yielded the following “cluster” chapter titles. In addition, further fine-tuning of where some values should be located based on the refined chapter names also occurred:

- Go Play Outside
- Healthy Economy

- Web of Life
- Everybody's Basin
- From Here to There

- Sustainable Future
- Spiritual Connections
- It's the Water

The final draft "Meeting One Values Table" follows:

Capitol Lake Focus Group: Meeting One Values Table

SUSTAINABLE FUTURE	HEALTHY ECONOMY	EVERYBODY'S BASIN	WEB OF LIFE	GO PLAY OUTSIDE	IT'S THE WATER	FROM HERE TO THERE	SPIRITUAL CONNECTIONS
A place to teach kids about nature	Safe haven for mooring boats	Unique cultural amenity (community celebrations, Capitol, history...)	Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown	Old Brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point	Aesthetic value of water	Connects Chehalis & Woodland Trails	A wonderful, broad learning experience
Model for thoughtful stewardship	Destination for visitors	"Central" public resource	Seasonal change	"Green Lake" atmosphere	Reflecting pond for our grand Capitol	Various basin areas unique & integrated	Causes me to pause/ slow down
Risk management of water level rise (climate change)	Drawing card for economic activity	Shared community asset	Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space	Community events (Proc. of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)	Views of Puget Sound & mountains	Waterway connects from West Bay to Falls	Spiritual connection to something larger
Demonstrates sustainable environmental practices	Not a large tax burden	Lake is point of civic pride	Ecological & social link to Puget Sound & Pacific Ocean	Expand and develop use	Castle @ St. Helier, Jersey, C.I.	All the improvements completed @ Heritage Park	Close-in, quiet space
Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting	Economic driver (inc. transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)	Waterway tells story of the history of the community	Wildlife habitat	Family & romantic getaway	A reflecting estuary for our Capitol		
Deal with sewage pollution	Help keep downtown alive & healthy		A place to observe salmon	Walk, run safely			
Provide flood protection	Lake/estuary attracts downtown business		Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna	Picnicking & watching kids swim			
	Ecotourism and wildlife viewing		Extension of Puget Sound	Wonderful, safe area to exercise			
	Promotes water based activities			Canoe/kayak to experience tides			
				Swimming			
				Getaway boat fantasy			

Mr. Kliem asked if any of the chapters were a surprise to any of the participants:

- Someone mentioned swimming
- None of the aspects are a surprise, but he had never thought about all of the pieces
- It's a nice comprehensive picture
- I like the commonality of the ideas. The group came together with similar visions.

Mr. Kliem said the pieces and elements don't always sync together. It will provide fertile ground for future dialogue as the group determines what the most important values of the Deschutes basin are. He asked participants how the work product will affect conversations as the community moves forward with the discussion about the future of the Deschutes basin. Comments included:

- There are pros and cons related to each value
- Each value should be evaluated
- The social and economic aspect is more than what I thought. The Deschutes basin is an important part of the community, however.
- I see a mental picture of what the Deschutes basin was in the past, what it is today, and what the community would like to see for the future. As an example, swimming is a mental picture of the past. Sustainability speaks to the future.
- I want to swim in the future.
- There could be more values. However, the list is comprehensive.
- Capitol Lake is a broken system. I'm concerned as the community takes part in the Deschutes basin exercise that it is dealing with a broken safety culture. He's excited about the multiple views, ideas, and shared and different values. Don't just think about the Deschutes basin as a reflecting basin, think of it as an estuary. Are we coming up with something that might fix it or are we caught up in something else? I look at the matrix and it's terrific.

Ms. Carlson suggested it might be useful to think about the multiple objectives. The next step is to connect the values to the net benefits analysis. One piece is to determine how the identified values will change with a restored estuary alternative. Another objective is to determine how to engage the public in the decision-making, which might shed light on the "broken safety culture."

A participant commented that the public is looking at a system that is changing physically and changing in the public's perception of the values concerning the system. Considering the perspective that the basin is a changing environment the question is how to best address the issues.

Mr. Kliem reviewed the two primary objectives for the focus group at the March 14, 2006 meeting that will include placing the values into quantitative and qualitative "buckets." The focus group will also develop a recommendation for the CLAMP Steering Committee concerning how to continue the dialogue within the larger community.

A participant commented that the terms that are used are important. One needs to be very careful not to add personal bias. It's important not to make big time assumptions as to what the Deschutes basin will be or what it has been, but to analyze a lake or estuary alternative through the values identified.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Kliem adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services

VIII. Appendix B: Focus Group Meeting Two

MINUTES OF MEETING

Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP)

Focus Group: Meeting Two

Tuesday, March 14, 2006 6:00 p.m.

Olympia School District's Knox Building

First Floor Board Room

1113 Legion Way SE

Olympia, WA

Call to Order

Facilitator John Kliem convened the second of two Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) focus group meetings at 6:01 p.m.

Welcome & Introductions

Mr. Kliem welcomed everyone. Staff and focus group participants provided self-introductions.

Attendance:

Margen Carlson, Washington State
Department of Fish and Wildlife
(WDFW), Net Benefits Analysis Study
Manager
Curtis Tanner, WDFW, Project Manager,
Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study
(DEFS)
Nathaniel Jones, Washington Department
of General Administration (GA), Asset
Manager
Perry Lund, Former DEFS Project
Manager, Washington State Department
of Ecology (DOE)
Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary,
Puget Sound Meeting Services
Allen Miller, Heritage Park Development
Association
Angela Ruiz, Citizen
David Bills, Tumwater Area Chamber of
Commerce
Donna Nickerson, Black Hills Audubon
Society
Donna Smith, Citizen
Doug DeForest, Thurston County
Chamber of Commerce
Doug Myers, Puget Sound Action Team

Emily Piper Sanford, Citizen
Emily Ray, Citizen
Eve Fagergren, Citizen
Frank Anderson, Citizen
John Demeyer, Olympia Yacht Club
Gary Franklin, South Capitol
Neighborhood Association
Kathleen Herman, University of
Washington Graduate Student
Keith Johnson, President, Chambers Lake
Homeowners Association
Loris Fenske, Olympia Heritage
Commission
Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound
Nancy Stevenson, Tumwater Historic
Preservation Commission
Oscar Soule, Citizen
Paul Allen, Friends of the Deschutes
Estuary
Paul Seabert, Olympia Downtown
Association
Paul Spivak, Citizen
Sara Carter, South Sound Green, Thurston
Conservation District
Tom Hanson, Capital Lakefair

Agenda & Focus Group Work Tasks

Mr. Kliem reviewed the agenda for the evening:

- Identify quantitative and qualitative attributes for the study.
- Draft recommendations for public involvement in the final decision-making concerning long-term management of Capitol Lake.
- Recipe card exercise - participants have an opportunity to come back to their value cards to fill in any other thoughts.
- Wrap up.
 - Plan review
 - March 21, 2006 open house/public meeting
 - Focus group participant volunteers to act as mentors at the March 21, 2006 public meeting

Mr. Kliem reminded participants of the focus question, “How does the Deschutes Basin fit within your ‘mental map’ of our community?” Last week, the focus group developed a *Meeting One Values Table* with eight different clusters of values: Sustainable Future, Spiritual Connections, From Here to There, It’s the Water, Healthy Economy, Go Play Outside, Web of Life, and Everybody’s Basin. Some of the values will be used to inform the net benefits analysis. Participants will explore quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative focuses on numbers, logic, and the objective. Quantitative data can be represented by ordinal, interval, or ratio scales that lend to statistical manipulation. Qualitative data deals in words, feelings, images, and the subjective. Qualitative data is not easily expressed as a number and is represented by subjective/nominal scales. Focus group participants will determine whether the value represents quantitative or qualitative data that can be analyzed as part of the net benefits analysis. Mr. Kliem provided two distinct examples to illustrate the difference: Bird watching in the basin is good for the local economy (quantitative) versus bird watching in the basin is spiritually satisfying (qualitative).

Mr. Kliem asked participants to form teams of three and select one of the eight cluster groups to work on. Each team decides whether the values are quantitative (by placing a “blue” dot on the card) or qualitative (by placing a “green” dot on the card) in nature. When completed, teams will bring its cluster of values and place it back on the wall for further review and discussion.

An attendee said it would be helpful for participants to note on the cards how a quantitative value could be measured. Ms. Carlson agreed and said that is the kind of detail she hopes participants can add with the “recipe card” activity. Staff welcomes suggestions as to the kinds of measures that might be looked at as part of the net benefits analysis. Mr. Kliem said participants could note a particular measure on the card with a pen. Ms. Carlson provided further clarification of the exercise.

A participant asked how minority input will be considered. Ms. Carlson said attendees are welcome to approach staff at the end of the meeting to provide additional suggestions. Another attendee noted quantitative data is statistical data that can be analyzed, proved, or disproved. It’s not data that can be manipulated.

Participants formed teams and selected clusters.

Mr. Kliem recessed the meeting from 6:27 p.m. to 6:50 p.m. for the exercise. The following represents the results.

Capitol Lake Focus Group: Meeting One Values Table

KEY:

Quantitative Analysis

Qualitative Analysis

Both Recommended

SUSTAINABLE FUTURE	HEALTHY ECONOMY	EVERYBODY'S BASIN	WEB OF LIFE	COME PLAY OUTSIDE	IT'S THE WATER	FROM HERE TO THERE	SPIRITUAL CONNECTIONS
A place to teach kids about nature	Safe haven for mooring boats	Unique cultural amenity (community celebrations, Capitol, history...)	Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown	Old Brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point	Aesthetic value of water	Connects Chehalis & Woodland Trails	A wonderful, broad learning experience
Model for thoughtful stewardship	Destination for visitors	"Central" public resource	Seasonal change	"Green Lake" atmosphere	Reflecting pond for our grand capitol	Various basin areas unique & integrated	Causes me to pause/ slow down
Risk management of water level rise (climate change)	Drawing card for economic activity	Shared community asset	Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space	Community events (Proc. of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)	Views of Puget Sound & mountains	Waterway connects from West Bay to Falls	Spiritual connection to something larger
Demonstrates sustainable environmental practices	Not a large tax burden	Lake is point of civic pride	Ecological & social link to Puget Sound & Pacific Ocean	Expand and develop use	Castle @ St. Helier, Jersey, C.I.	All the improvements completed @ Heritage Park	Close-in, quiet space
Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting	Economic driver (inc. transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)	Waterway tells story of the history of the community	Wildlife habitat	Family & romantic getaway	A reflecting estuary for our Capitol		
Deal with sewage, pollution	Help keep downtown alive & healthy		A place to observe salmon	Walk, run safely			
Provide flood protection	Lake/estuary attracts downtown business		Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna	Picnicking & watching kids swim			
	Ecotourism and wildlife viewing		Extension of Puget Sound	Wonderful, safe area to exercise			
	Promotes water based activities			Canoe/kayak to experience tides			
				Swimming			
				Getaway boat fantasy			

The following is a summary of the quantitative and qualitative measures for the values as suggested by focus group participants:

Sustainable Future

- **Model for Thoughtful Stewardship**
 - Utilize the opportunity to showcase an effective public process resulting in a sustainable end
- **Risk management of water level rise (climate change)**
 - Active climate change is leading to increased unusually high flows in the Deschutes and higher water level in South Sound. The 55-year-old dam is aging and needs repair/upgrade. A restored estuary will protect Olympia and surrounding areas from flooding and act as a buffer to the effects of climate change more than a Capitol Lake reservoir.
- **Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting**
 - A Deschutes estuary restoration project will provide a showcase model of habitat/wetland restoration for Washington State and the nation at the Capitol Campus. The current lake is not sustainable.
- **Deal with sewage, pollution**
 - An estuary with increased tidal flushing and eelgrass will help reduce pollution and decrease the concentration of pollutants in South Sound/Budd Inlet.
- **A place to teach kids about nature**
 - Whether it is a lake or an estuary, the basin serves as a springboard for discussion and experience of nature for children.

Healthy Economy

- **Ecotourism and wildlife viewing**
 - Ecotourism and wildlife viewing will be enhanced by a properly restored estuary with boardwalks, viewing stations, and interpretive centers/signage that will enhance the local economy.
- **Economic Driver (including transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)**
 - How much business would “Mud Fair” attract?
 - How much would the downtown economy be affected if the lake were an estuary?
- **Not a large tax burden**
 - No – lost opportunity
 - What is the annualized cost of dredging versus the loss of income?
 - How much would it cost each citizen to make up for the losses?
- **Destination for visitors**
 - Number of visitors: Where from? Frequency?
 - Restaurant revenues
 - Existing survey data from Olympia Downtown Association (ODA), Chamber, Capitol Visitors Center ~ new survey?
 - Marine-oriented visits: Tugboat races, Wooden Boat Festival, Lakefair, Harbor Days, etc.
- **Safe haven for mooring boats**
 - Re: sediment changes, impact on Port operations
 - Look and feel ~ aesthetic values
 - Model slip loss associated with slip loss [sediment deposition?]
 - Number of boats currently moored, revenues from moorage and boat repair

- Tax revenues
- Department of Natural Resources (DNR) lease revenues – impact on recreational and other programs (state matching grants)
- Boat cleaning, repair, canvas works
- **Lake/Estuary attracts downtown business**
 - Future condos
 - Anchoring at new Anthony's, Budd Bay

Everybody's Basin (community celebrations, Capitol, history) [very important!]

- **Unique cultural amenity**
 - Quantity/number and types of uses by all groups and individuals
- **Central public resource**
 - A downtown park
 - On the bus line
 - Very public (minimal private property)
 - Within city limits
 - Easy to get to, even by walking!
 - Central, visible site
- **Shared community asset**
 - Develop a way to quantify this statement
- **Lake is point of civic pride**
 - Community-wide survey to assess level of civic pride and/or attachment to lake, and the same set of questions about Capitol Basin
- **Waterway tells story of the history of the community**
 - Public access along the waterway provides an opportunity to interpret the history that took place here and tells a story about how the community has evolved.

Web of Life

- **Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown**
 - Number of people using the area
 - Number of species in census
 - Annual biomass
- **Seasonal change**
 - Plant life cycles
 - Visitors by month
 - Number of migratory birds, fish, etc.
 - Productivity
- **Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space**
 - Decibel levels by location
 - Contributes positively to human health factors
- **Ecological & social link to Puget Sound and Pacific Ocean**
 - Foreign visitors
 - Number of boats visiting
 - Nutrients released into Puget Sound
 - Anadromous fish species
 - Numerous bird species
 - Powerful/strategic beginning of (for) Puget Sound

- **Wildlife habitat**
 - Protection
 - Number of species (flora and fauna) in fresh water and salt
 - Provides many ecological services that can be measured
 - Provides support for the species
- **A place to observe salmon**
 - Fishing
 - Boating
 - Enjoyment and learning
- **Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna**
 - Honoring = protecting
 - Community and ecological heritage
- **Extension of Puget Sound**
 - History of basin (200 years)
 - As Nisqually [Deschutes?] River runs into Puget Sound, it is a physical part of Puget Sound – for 1000 years, except for the last 50 years.

Come Play Outside

- **Old brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point**
 - Survey interest in future awareness of historical value
 - Making the old brewhouse a vital focal point will reflect the community's past as well as providing public space to serve the community today
- **“Green Lake” Atmosphere**
 - Use old brewery
 - A serious attempt at analysis should be made about development of the stretch from the Old Brewery to West Bay Marina and the reflecting basin to see which part, parts, or whole would/could reflect that sense of “Green Lake” in Seattle. If you need to ask what “Green Lake” means, you need to go there two or three times to see it and feel it.
- **Community events (Procession of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)**
 - Survey, measure economic impact
 - Cost of events if relocated
 - Attendance numbers at events
 - Accessibility
 - It isn't Lakefair without a full time lake
- **Expand and develop use**
 - Measure usage now
 - Population versus projections available
- **Family and romantic getaway**
 - Count families and times used and the variety of activities
- **Walk, run safely**
 - Measure usage, crime indicators
- **Picnicking and watching kids swim**
 - See the “family” card
- **Wonderful, safe area to exercise**
 - See the “walk, run” card
- **Canoe/kayak to experience tides**
 - Survey canoe place – how many, where, etc.

- Sea kayak from the historic Brewhouse in Tumwater, with the tides, to Percival landing. Anthony's for dinner/drinks
- Kayak rentals on the estuary
- **Swimming**
 - This is a long term goal in water quality that could allow swimming
- **Getaway boat fantasy**
 - I like to go down to the marina at Percival Landing at lunch time on a busy day at work and dream about getting away from it all on one of the beautiful sailboats I wish I owned!

It's the Water

- **Reflecting pond for our grand Capitol**
 - A part-time reflecting pond caused by tidal changes doesn't work or hold the value of the vision
 - Be sure that a full calculation of costs of each alternative is provided
- **Castle at St. Helier, Jersey, Channel Islands**
 - The environment we have in the three basins is enhanced by having a water surface at all times. Tidal transition lands (mud flats) are not a positive image for some people.
- **A reflecting estuary for our Capitol**
 - A restored estuary will honor the heritage of the Deschutes Basin and our Capitol Campus. Approximately 70% of the time, tides in an estuary would reflect the Capitol (if there is sun).

From Here to There

- **Waterway connects from West Bay to above the Falls**
 - Measure: distance, map it
 - Identify gaps in the connections, depth of navigable waters
 - This is about having public access along the water to walk (run, ride a bike, or float a boat) from the West Bay Marina to above the Tumwater Falls to Pioneer Park. (This can provide for interpretation of the habitat/history of the community as well.)
- **Various basin areas unique and integrated**
 - Each of the three basins has a unique nature and function
- **Connects Chehalis and Woodland trails**
 - Measure: the cost, distance, timeline, map it, identify gaps in trail connections, environmental impacts
 - Build a bridge over lake/estuary to connect trail system
- **All the improvements completed at Heritage Park**
 - Measure: plan is completed

Spiritual Connections

- **A wonderful, broad learning experience**
 - Educational opportunities/subjects (e.g., environmental education, water quality, ornithology, limnology, etc.)

- **Spiritual connection to something larger**
 - “The ocean refuses no river.” The Deschutes River basin serves as a visual metaphor for life.
- **Close-in, quiet space**
 - GIS – area within city divided by use (e.g., business, nature, residential)

Mr. Kliem described the next focus group activity. It’s important to hear from the broader community and their views concerning the Deschutes Basin. Focus group participants will again work in small groups of four to five and brainstorm the public involvement question, “*How should we involve the public in the final decision-making about the long-term management of Capitol Lake?*” Suggestions will be forwarded to staff and those working on the DEFS for evaluation and consideration. He reviewed the brainstorming ground rules:

- Defer judgment
- Take a risk – no idea is too wild – every idea is valid
- Tag on, build on, the last idea to make it better
- The more the merrier – quantity is wanted
- Be polite - don’t monopolize.

Mr. Kliem asked that each group choose a recorder to write down public involvement ideas and a reporter who will present the suggestions to the entire group at the conclusion of the exercise.

In response to an inquiry of when a final decision concerning the long-term management of Capitol Lake will be made, Ms. Carlson explained the DEFS is one of 13 objectives of the CLAMP 10-Year Plan. A decision will come with completion of all of the plan objectives. The DEFS is the objective the CLAMP Steering Committee is actively engaged in currently. Mr. Jones said some of the 13 objectives have been completed and the CLAMP Steering Committee is moving through the study process. A question for the focus group is, “where is the best place for public involvement?” Should it be at the end, are there milestones in the process where it’s important to gain public input, and ultimately how is the decision best made? Next week’s public meeting is important. Funding is required for any management decision whether it’s the lake, estuary, or something else. It is expected the legislature will allocate funding; however, there could be other sources. How will the public communicate to the legislature what the outcome should be? *The Olympian* has suggested a public vote is appropriate. There may be other ways to accomplish the same result.

A participant asked if there are other alternatives anticipated. Mr. Jones replied there is the “do nothing” alternative - turn the lake into a freshwater marsh. The 13 objectives include a broad range of goals. The steering committee doesn’t want to take any action that presupposes a lake or estuary alternative and will suspend any actions that forces one of the outcomes.

An attendee commented turning Capitol Lake into an estuary is not the only alternative. Part of the question is how to involve the public in choosing the alternative. Staff agreed. Mr. Jones added another component of the question is what level of public information is required in order to do an effective job of public involvement. Other focus group participant comments included:

- The broader community does not have the prerequisite information to make an informed long-term lake management decision.
- Give the public all best available information regardless of how the decision is made. The public should have the same information to make the best decision.
- Don’t inundate the public with scientific information. The public will be interested in knowing the costs when evaluating the alternatives.

Mr. Jones conveyed it is GA's intent to release all information as it becomes available. He asked participants to provide recommendations concerning how to best relay the information to the community such as through a series of public meetings, lectures, pamphlets, or brochures. He asked attendees to consider suggestions to manage a public process to reach a decision.

An interested citizen asked if the group could provide good and complete information without knowing the other plan objectives. Ms. Carlson replied yes.

Mr. Kliem recessed the meeting from 7:09 p.m. to 7:40 p.m. while focus group participants brainstormed public involvement ideas. The results from each group include:

Group One

- Workshops at periodic times as information is available
- Events, booths, outreach, updates
 - Lakefair
 - Wooden Boat Festival
 - Procession of the Species
 - Arts Walk
 - Harbor Days
 - Fish docents
- Chamber, councils, neighborhood groups, service clubs, organizations
- TCTV, newspapers, radio
- College, universities, high schools, K-12, scouts (develop relevant curriculum)
- Public vote
 - How widespread (local versus state)
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review
 - Comment periods
 - Hearings
- Kiosks around the lake
- Opinion surveys, polls, more focus groups
- Stakeholder/citizens advisory committee to CLAMP (with a student representative)
- Theater performances
- "Basin Days" Festival
- Debate (structured) public
- Tribal engagement
- Multi-lingual materials
- To summarize study findings
 - Poster contests
 - Documentary (film?) contests
 - Song contests
 - Essay contest and/or speech contest
- Engage adjacent businesses
- Legislature
- State Capitol Committee (SCC)
- Website (interactive and fun)
- Estuary mural
- Engage youths
 - Simulated debates/role playing
 - Senior projects (high school) current conditions/predicted future conditions
 - Include student representatives on CLAMP citizens advisory board/committee

- Send surveys home with students

Group Two

- Do not put it to a public vote
- CLAMP Steering Committee presents studies/findings to all interest groups
- Audio tapes on buses that change weekly covering different aspects of the project
- PowerPoint presentation to give away
- Pill gets smaller and smaller to swallow through repeated presentations
- Input from public concerning their values (like we did on March 7, 2006)
- Ask different age groups (5-85 years) and social groups (low to high income)
- Seek a balance of public involvement
- Members of the focus group serve as “value gatherers” in the community
- On radio (a.m. and p.m.) value statements to trigger thinking and discussion
- What if the March 21, 2006 meeting isn’t enough public involvement?
- Don’t close the “value” book too soon
- Engage the community at the value level – not at solution level

Group Three

- Web page
- Talk to Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) and others who do lots of public involvement
- Presentation to organizations (neighborhoods, interest groups, etc.)
- Legislature
- Informational signage at the lake
- Wait until good information is available
- Series of advisory ballots
- Inform organizations like Farm Bureau, Timber, Tribes, Fisheries, Ecology, etc. at least once a year
- CLAMP press releases on a regular basis
- Vote that stipulates cost of alternatives
- TCTV and TVW forums
- Be sure all affected state and local agencies are involved (e.g., WSDOT, LOTT)
- Get park users informed (Lakefair, Senior Center, Olympia Yacht Club, West Bay Marina, Farmer’s Market)
- Inform private property owners around the basin, developers, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF)
- Newsletter/flyer for those who do not have internet access
- Colleges and universities
- CLAMP annual meeting
- Develop visual aids to show what alternatives look like
- Don’t overwork public involvement

Group Four

- Voters’ advisory ballot
- Information published through *The Olympian*
- Neighborhood meetings
- Involve high school in interdisciplinary classes
- Visitor interviews
- Surveys
- Public tours of the basin
- GA Blog
- Public workshops

- Threaten to put in a Wal-Mart
- Campaign platform item
- Information on websites
- Outreach to local college kids
- Fundraiser
- Throw a party and have information there
- Legislative hotline
- TCTV coverage
- Pay people to come
- Town meeting – county and state levels
- Signage on city/Intercity Transit vehicles
- Banners
- Door to door
- Lakefair theme
- Fliers at Procession of the Species, Arts Walk, etc.
- Choose a candidate to champion the cause
- Airplane advertisement
- “Buy a piece of the basin” auction
- Basin stewards/sponsors
- Subcommittee of cities and county government
- Evergreen and SPSCC involvement
- Get kids involved/informed – parents will follow
- Address interest groups
- Basin Bash!
- Popular vote
- Sound truck (loudspeaker on roof) to drive through neighborhoods
- Public input throughout the process
- Corporate sponsorship (“Safeco Basin”)
- Do nothing
- Fliers from an airplane
- Quasi- Duck Dash
- Contact owner of Olympia Beer – put information about the basin in a six-pack
- Leave it to the legislature
- Leave it to the youth legislature (YMCA)
- Raise taxes for the basin
- Charge for usage (user fee)
- Talk to Eyman
- Run a series of public opinion polls on major alternatives (lake, estuary, river park) and see shift in opinion with release of information
 - Every six months with the same questions

Group Five

- Involve John Dodge (*The Olympian*) – periodic articles
- Kiosks at lake for comment cards, information, etc.
- Random survey of large number of visitors to the basin
- Presentations at neighborhood associations, community group (Rotary, Lions, Elks, etc.)
- Provide information in simple, concise way – summaries
- Provide comprehensive qualitative and quantitative information
- Involve public before study is started (involvement at each sub-goal level)
- Use creative new methods to diversify study/group

- Don't assume everyone has internet access: use multi-media, presentations, TV, newspaper
- Include League of Women Voters to design public involvement methods
- Activate interested community group one-on-one to "pound pavement" door-to-door
- Involve Evergreen and SPSCC environmental classes to do outreach
- Consider local and state-wide citizens for all impacts (taxes, initiatives, dollars, budgets)
- A vote: lake, estuary, "other"?
- Do a mailing to disseminate information – "dumbed down" so it's understandable
- Do focused information pushes with targets: legislators, citizens, etc.
- Give details of exact funding costs and needs so all persons can make informed decisions: newspapers, meetings, utility/power bill mailings (because everybody gets them), etc.
- Open up CLAMP meetings to allow for more (longer) public input and participation
- Create narrative stories to help people envision choices. Example: what would the sailboat regatta look like if it were an estuary? Display at the library and/or other public places.
- Hold a two-day forum for legislators and staff to give best available information
- Hold forum for public (or video-tape legislative forum)
- Share how CLAMP objectives overlap to let public know how the 10-year plan works
- Help "uninformed" citizens get informed

Additional thoughts offered included:

- The meeting on March 21, 2006 should be the first of two or three meetings: not everyone can attend a single meeting
- Get the labor unions and the Port of Olympia involved – get information
- Try to do more active participation throughout the process (like the Focus Group). It was a very successful process. There was almost 100% participation from those invited.
- "Access Olympia" website. The neighboring jurisdictions could also post information on their websites.

An attendee inquired about final decision responsibility. Mr. Jones explained the CLAMP Steering Committee will forward a recommendation to the State Capitol Committee (SCC). SCC will guide what takes place on the Capitol Campus. Ultimately, the legislature will appropriate funding for the long-term management decision. An attendee commented the legislature does not control the area north of the bridge. Mr. Jones said the impact of what happens on the Capitol Campus extends beyond the campus itself. He clarified the Port of Olympia is represented on the CLAMP Steering Committee. Further comments from focus group participants include:

- Citizen Advisory Committee to CLAMP should include representatives from a wider audience than Olympia and a student representative
- Taking the matter to a public vote will do no good unless it's a statewide initiative. There needs to be a balance between people not listening because there's too much information, versus those who feel they haven't been informed or given an opportunity to review the data. Any public vote should be considered very carefully.
- Call-in hotline to record messages/ideas
- Can't string-out public involvement. In five years, a majority of the public will not be familiar with the information. Time it to coincide with information coming out. Otherwise, the CLAMP Steering Committee should rethink the public involvement piece.
- It makes sense why the public is being asked to participate at this juncture and she's okay walking away from it at this point.
- Identify some clear public participation points such as dates and schedule for the March 21, 2006 meeting
- Focus group participants could volunteer and assist the Steering Committee with upcoming activities

Mr. Jones stated there will be four distinct reports related to the environment, economics, social, and cultural elements as part of the study, as well as a final report. A public involvement process is included to review the reports. Independent technical reviews are also planned.

Mr. Tanner added the DEFS will be released in late 2007 or early 2008. The CLAMP Steering Committee scoped the overall study. Rather than waiting to proceed with the study until all of the funds were in hand, it decided to implement different pieces as the funds became available. It is a complicated and expensive study, and a complex question. Studies will be released to the public as they are completed. The community has said the CLAMP Steering Committee should be involved with the public and do a better job with the outreach component. Many of the public involvement ideas expressed by focus group participants are the subject of a grant recently submitted by the steering committee. Mr. Tanner said he is particularly intrigued by the "Citizen Advisory Committee" idea.

In response to an inquiry regarding how the steering committee will move forward with the information provided during the meeting, Mr. Tanner answered in the short term, development of a strategy to engage the state legislature in the process is necessary. He said he is interested in evaluating the Citizen Advisory Committee concept with a member having direct involvement with the Steering Committee. A website is a way to distribute and access information. The technical reports should be made available online.

Ms. Carlson explained how the products created by the focus group will be used in the future. The steering committee will forward a comprehensive report to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The focus group will have an opportunity to provide comments on the report. The focus group's words and value cards will exist as an appendix in the Net Benefits Analysis. The products will be used to help scope the analysis, which will also receive community review. A draft report is due by April 30, 2006. A copy will be distributed to focus group participants for comment.

Discussion followed about the CLAMP 10-year plan and the timing associated with completing the plan objectives and using information gathered to help inform the next phase of the process. Ms. Carlson invited participants to stay after the meeting and talk with staff if they have additional questions they would like answered.

Ms. Carlson solicited focus group volunteers to attend the March 21, 2006 public meeting and act as "mentors" or "docents" and provide a brief presentation concerning the process and information gathered from the two focus group meetings to the larger community.

Mr. Kliem illustrated a suggested format for the public meeting. Following presentations, the public will be given an opportunity to review the value cards with focus group "mentors" and/or "docents." The public can submit additional value ideas either verbally or written on cards.

In reply to inquiries and comments from the audience, Ms. Carlson explained a goal of the focus group process is to solicit values to help scope the net benefits analysis. It is important to give the broader community an opportunity to also express values and public involvement ideas that might have been missed. There will be eight "stations" representing the value clusters and a station for the public information process at the public meeting. Another goal was to create a series of meetings that offers a variety of ways for people to provide comment that is less intimidating when compared to other government style meetings.

A participant suggested changing the cluster title, "Go Play Outside" to "Come Play Outside." There was general focus group consensus to change the title.

Mr. Kliem asked focus group participants who wish to volunteer and act as mentors at the March 21, 2006 public meeting to let him know at the conclusion of the meeting. Ms. Carlson said staff will forward the

results from tonight's meeting to focus group participants by the end of the day on March 15, 2006. Staff will work with the volunteers to prepare additional materials necessary for presentation during the public meeting.

Mr. Kliem reviewed the last focus group exercise. He asked participants to note any special details, or the "recipe" to clarify or expand the value and/or quantitative or qualitative suggestions on the back of the value cards. Participants are welcome to take the card down, note any additional comments, and then return the cards to the "sticky" wall.

The facilitator thanked everyone for their attendance and participation.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Kliem adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services

IX. Appendix C: Public Meeting

MINUTES OF MEETING

Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee

Public Meeting

Tuesday, March 21, 2006 6:00 p.m.

Olympia School District's Knox Building

First Floor Board Room

1113 Legion Way SE

Olympia, WA

(As the public entered the meeting, a PowerPoint Presentation showing a Historic Photo Tour – Capitol Lake and Deschutes River – prepared by Thurston Regional Planning Council in 2004, was displayed on an overhead screen. TCTV videotaped the meeting.)

Call to Order

Facilitator John Kliem convened the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee public meeting at 6:03 p.m.

Welcome & Introductions

Mr. Kliem welcomed everyone and introduced Peter Antolin, Deputy Director, Department of General Administration (GA). Mr. Antolin introduced CLAMP Steering Committee members and staff. Those in attendance included the following:

Linda Villegas Bremer, Director of GA

Peter Antolin, Deputy Director of GA

Sue Patnude, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)

Scott Robinson, Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

Dick Blinn, Thurston County

Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe

Curtis Tanner, WDFW, Project Manager for the overall Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS)

Nathaniel Jones, Asset Manager for GA

Steven Morrison, Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC)

Margen Carlson, WDFW, Net Benefits Analysis Study Manager

Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services

Mr. Antolin conveyed that the purpose of the meeting is to solicit public input as GA proceeds with the future of Capitol Lake. The CLAMP Steering Committee is looking at a number of alternatives and the feasibility of the options. Public input will help in the decision-making process. The steering committee conducted two focus group meetings on March 7 and 14, 2006 resulting in input displayed around the room. The objective of the public meeting is to share the focus group work product and solicit further thoughts from the public. He emphasized public participation is an important piece of the project.

Purpose of Open House, Agenda, & Background Information

Mr. Kliem, facilitator, described the purpose of the open house and reviewed the agenda:

- Purpose:

- Share information on work of citizen focus group
- Provide an opportunity for the public to add data
- Agenda:
 - Hear about management of Capitol Lake, Estuary Study, and Net Benefits Analysis from staff
 - Review focus group results
 - Sharing your ideas at work stations
 - Consult “experts” on questions
 - Voice your opinion on TV

Nathaniel Jones, Asset Manager for GA, announced that General Administration is responsible for the management of the Capitol Campus, which includes Capitol Lake, Heritage Park, and the Deschutes Parkway. The lake was created in 1951 with the installation of the 5th Avenue dam. There are challenges related to lake management. In 1997, GA established a partnership with state natural resource agencies and local governments to guide the overall management of Capitol Lake. GA created an advisory group, Capital Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee that developed a plan outlining how to proceed with lake management. The nine jurisdictions serving on the Steering Committee include:

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| ● State Department of Ecology | ● Port of Olympia |
| ● State Department of Fish and Wildlife | ● Squaxin Island Tribe |
| ● State Department of General Administration | ● Thurston County |
| ● State Department of Natural Resources | ● City of Tumwater |
| ● City of Olympia | |

The CLAMP Steering Committee advises GA concerning management of Capitol Lake. Current challenges include sedimentation, dredging issues, flood hazards and dam challenges to control flood hazards, water quality, habitat, and noxious weeds. As GA worked with the steering committee it posed the question “what would the challenges be if GA didn’t manage it as a lake but as an estuary or some other system.” At this point, GA doesn’t know the best management technique. In November 2003, GA was asked to move forward with an estuary feasibility study. The study has three components: economic, environmental, and social/cultural impacts. The public meeting and the focus group process relates specifically to the socio/economic issues associated with alternative ways of managing the lake as a resource for the community. Presentation topics include:

- | | |
|--|---|
| ● Capitol Lake Management | ● Restoration Design Alternatives |
| ● What is an Estuary? | ● Overview of the Net Benefits Analysis |
| ● Overview of the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS) | |

Mr. Jones reviewed the decision-making process. A decision is not expected for some time, as there is an ongoing study. The groups involved in the decision-making process include:

- Washington State Legislature
- State Capitol Committee (SCC)
- Washington State Department of General Administration
- CLAMP Steering Committee
 - Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan
 - Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS), one of 14 CLAMP objectives
 - Net Benefits Analysis is a part of the DEFS.

Curtis Tanner, Project Manager, Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS), explained his task as project manager is to ensure the DEFS studies are completed on time, that funding is aligned with resource needs, and most importantly the information gathered is distributed to those interested and who have a need for the data.

Mr. Tanner presented a PowerPoint show prepared by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), “*What is an Estuary?*” Mr. Tanner explained an estuary is a partially enclosed body of water where freshwater from rivers and streams flows into the ocean. Estuaries are places of transition. A defining feature of an estuary is the mixing of fresh and saltwater. Estuaries provide important habitat for fish and wildlife, improve water quality, and provide direct economic and cultural benefits including tourism and recreation. He reviewed a 1940s photograph showing the basin prior to dam construction. It is estimated that 75% of historic estuaries have been lost in Puget Sound. Mr. Tanner reviewed the DEFS purpose and study components as follows:

- Purpose:
 - CLAMP Objective #2: “Complete an estuary feasibility study to determine a long-range management decision.”
 - Determine whether a feasible alternative for restoring the Deschutes River estuary exists
 - Inform future decisions regarding long-term management of Capitol Lake
 - Study Components:
 - Bathymetric survey
 - Hydraulic and sediment transport model
 - Reference estuary study
 - Engineering design and cost estimates
 - Net benefits analysis
 - Final feasibility report
 - Independent technical review
 - ✓ Conclusions supported?
 - ✓ Data gaps?
 - Community review
 - ✓ Right questions?
 - ✓ Understandable answers?

Mr. Tanner presented restoration design alternatives that include removal of the 5th Avenue dam and the restoration of an opening approximately 500 feet in width. Basin modification alternatives include removal of the railroad fill and widening the existing 200-foot bridge opening to 500 feet, and a division of the north basin with a dike or levee that would result in a freshwater lake on the east and a Deschutes estuary basin to the west.

Margen Carlson, Net Benefits Analysis Study Manager, acknowledged there are a variety of components in the DEFS, including studies that look at ecological and engineering aspects of estuary feasibility. The net benefits analysis will look at social and economic aspects. The analysis will evaluate potential affects or changes expected with estuary restoration on social and economic values important to the community. Rather than make assumptions concerning which social and economic values to study, the CLAMP Steering Committee determined it made sense to ask the community. A focus group comprised of citizens and representatives from a variety of community organizations took a first attempt to create a list of social and economic values. The focus group also provided suggestions for ways to keep the public engaged in the decision-making and study processes as the steering committee moves forward. Focus group “mentors” will present the work product. The public will have an opportunity to talk with focus group representatives and add values to those already identified. She emphasized it is important to keep in mind that the meeting is not a forum to debate the future of Capitol Lake. The focus is to talk specifically about the social and economic values the community holds related to the Deschutes Basin that should be part of the net benefits analysis study. Staff will incorporate all ideas presented into the “cluster” lists and they will become part of the

record. The feedback and values will be forwarded as a recommendation to the steering committee about what the scope and content of the net benefits analysis should be. The steering committee has the ultimate responsibility to evaluate the recommendations against the available net benefits analysis budget. The steering committee might add some values to the list. Ms. Carlson reviewed net benefits analysis milestones:

- Final focus group report – May 2006
- CLAMP Annual Meeting – December 2006
 - o First look at preliminary results
- Final net benefits analysis report – March 2007

Focus Group & Work Product Results Presentation

Focus group representatives introduced themselves:

- John Demeyer, Olympia Yacht Club
- Gary Franklin, South Capitol Neighborhood Association
- Nancy Stevenson, Tumwater Historic Preservation Commission
- Angela Ruiz, Citizen
- Sara Carter, South Sound Green, Thurston Conservation District
- Donna Smith, Citizen
- Eve Fagergren, Citizen
- Doug DeForest, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce
- Paul Seabert, Olympia Downtown Association
- Donna Nickerson, Black Hills Audubon Society
- Paul Allen, Friends of the Deschutes Estuary
- Tom Hanson, Capital Lakefair.

Mr. Kliem explained the purpose of the focus group was to help define the scope of the study. The question before the focus group was “*How does the Deschutes Basin fit within your “mental map” of our community?*” The Deschutes Basin area encompasses the waterfall in Tumwater and extends to West Bay Marina. The focus group process included individual work, followed by forming small teams to review ideas and choosing the most important to share with the entire group. The focus group worked as a whole to share the ideas. The focus group developed eight “clusters” of values related to their “mental map,” which are posted. Focus group “mentors” explained the values and thoughts behind each “cluster” chapter to those in attendance.

SUSTAINABLE FUTURE	HEALTHY ECONOMY	EVERYBODY’S BASIN	WEB OF LIFE	GO PLAY OUTSIDE	IT’S THE WATER	FROM HERE TO THERE	SPIRITUAL CONNECTIONS
A place to teach kids about nature	Safe haven for mooring boats	Unique cultural amenity (community celebrations, Capitol, history...)	Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown	Old Brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point	Aesthetic value of water	Connects Chehalis & Woodland Trails	<i>A wonderful, broad learning experience</i>
Model for thoughtful stewardship	Destination for visitors	“Central” public resource	Seasonal change	“Green Lake” atmosphere	Reflecting pond for our grand Capitol	Various basin areas unique & integrated	Causes me to pause/ slow down
Risk management of water level rise (climate change)	Drawing card for economic activity	Shared community asset	Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space	Community events (Proc. of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)	Views of Puget Sound & mountains	Waterway connects from West Bay to Falls	Spiritual connection to something larger

Demonstrates sustainable environmental practices	Not a large tax burden	Lake is point of civic pride	Ecological & social link to Puget Sound & Pacific Ocean	Expand and develop use	Castle @ St. Helier, Jersey, C.I.	All the improvements completed @ Heritage Park	Close-in, quiet space
Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting	Economic driver (inc. transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)	Waterway tells story of the history of the community	Wildlife habitat	Family & romantic getaway	A reflecting estuary for our Capitol		
Deal with sewage pollution	Help keep downtown alive & healthy		A place to observe salmon	Walk, run safely			
Provide flood protection	Lake/estuary attracts downtown business		Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna	Picnicking & watching kids swim			
	Ecotourism and wildlife viewing		Extension of Puget Sound	Wonderful, safe area to exercise			
	Promotes water based activities			Canoe/kayak to experience tides			
				Swimming			
				Getaway boat fantasy			

A citizen inquired why the monies spent to date are for a feasibility study of an estuary and not a lake. Ms. Carlson explained the values listed on the cards will become part of the net benefits analysis. The analysis will look at potential costs and benefits associated with a restored estuary alternative. Where that is not possible, the analysis will describe in words the kinds of changes anticipated with an estuary restoration option.

Mr. Jones added the estuary feasibility study will evaluate estuary alternatives. The study is done within the context of knowing that there certainly is a lake option. There is a good deal of information available related to lake management. The steering committee is developing baseline information for other alternatives for comparison. The decision-making process will compare the alternatives against each other. The same citizen commented there is no funding to study the economic benefits of the downtown as we know it. Mr. Jones said the net benefits analysis will look at the different economic outcomes of alternatives including both lake and estuary to the community, as well as to the state budget.

Mr. Franklin said the history of the Deschutes Basin should be part of the presentation so the public has a complete picture. The vision for the basin and Heritage Park began in the 1920s.

Another member of the public said she doesn't know of a single place on the lake where you can go without getting your feet in the mud. Is there any place people can swim without having to go through inches and inches of mud? Ms. Carlson indicated if that is something the citizens feels is important and should be part of the analysis, the value can be added to one of the posters around the room. Members of the public will have an opportunity to add values following presentations by the focus group attendees.

A citizen asked if the focus group presentation is pro-swamp, pro-lake, or general. Mr. Kliem emphasized the purpose of the focus group was not to debate the future of Capitol Lake but to inventory the special values the community holds for the area, collect the data, and begin cataloguing the values.

A member of the public asked how much the study is costing to turn the lake back into a swamp and who commissioned the study. Mr. Jones said as a whole, the feasibility study is a four-year process with a budget of approximately \$1 million. The state legislature allocated a majority of the funding for the feasibility study. Other funding resources have come from WDFW, GA, Port of Olympia, and the Squaxin Island Tribe.

Mr. Kliem explained the second assignment requested by focus group participants was to identify values that could be measured quantitatively and qualitatively. He explained the difference between the two and provided an example: Bird watching in the basin is good for the local economy (quantitative) versus bird watching in the basin is spiritually satisfying (qualitative). The net benefits analysis will look at both and help to develop the scope of work.

The third task consisted of focus group participants working in small groups to brainstorm the public involvement question, "*How should we involve the public in the final decision-making about the long-term management of Capitol Lake?*" Paul Allen, representing Friends of the Deschutes Estuary, provided some examples of the public involvement ideas developed by focus group attendees. Based on questions posed already about why the study is underway, what are the options, and where is the money going, indicates there is a need to outreach to the community and get the information out. There is a "blank sheet" on the wall for attendees to note their ideas for how to best involve the public in the process.

Linda Villegas Bremer, Director of GA, stressed the public's opinions are crucial and it is vital to share them. There may be other alternatives in addition to a lake or estuary that offers a richer, more diverse solution. The state has invested \$12 million in Heritage Park. A citizen asked why destroy that investment and turn the lake into an estuary. Director Bremer said it is important the citizen note that value on a card and place it in the cluster titled "Healthy Economy." Another consideration is to acknowledge the investments already made and how to protect them. She referred to the earthquake that occurred several years ago and said the impacts to the lake are yet unknown. All of the information is important regardless of a lake or estuary alternative. Again, there might be other alternatives the study will help GA, the steering committee, and community to understand. GA has more knowledge compared to when the lake was designed and additional investments have been made. The estuary feasibility study will help inform a balanced decision as the CLAMP Steering Committee moves forward. She noted there are public comment opportunities with the legislative process as well.

Ms. Bremer encouraged those in attendance to add their ideas of what's important to them to the "cluster" lists around the room. She said she is hopeful something richer can come out of the process.

A discussion ensued concerning how values that are shared by more people would influence a decision. Ms. Carlson explained this stage of the process is about gathering information. The steering committee is not "shutting any doors" on any of the values the public wants as part of the net benefits analysis. Values shared by a "majority" will be important in the eventual decision-making process, but a decision is not part of the meeting or the net benefits analysis.

A citizen said that she is troubled by term "restoration." What are we restoring the basin to? Years ago, the basin consisted of mud flats. The lake is better now than it was many years ago. She said she would prefer using the term "creating" in conjunction with the estuary alternative rather than referring to the option as "restoring an estuary." Olympia never looked like the Nisqually mud flats. Mr. Kliem encouraged those speaking to record their ideas on cards.

In reply to additional comments from the public, Mr. Tanner explained alternatives not being considered include removal of downtown Olympia, Bayview Thriftway, or the digging up to Plum Street. Those are not feasible or realistic alternatives. Removal of the 5th Avenue dam and restoring tidal influence into Capitol Lake is restoration of the Deschutes River estuary. It is restoring where fresh water and seawater mix, and

where mud flats, salt marshes, and tidal swamps flourish. The study is only looking at the feasibility of restoring the Deschutes River estuary as a management alternative from the falls to the West Bay Marina.

Another member of the public asked if there is any question that an estuary similar to what existed in the 1940s would not benefit salmon and fish. Will the net benefits analysis address that issue? Ms. Carlson replied the net benefits analysis will evaluate values related to the Deschutes Basin that the public indicates are important to the study. The audience member said there are thousands of bats at the lake. He asked if there will be science in addition to the Herrera Study that will provide information on what will be lost with an alternative scenario where fresh water is replaced with brackish water, and when the information would be available. Ms. Carlson replied some of the data about the kinds of wildlife and habitat that could be expected with a restored estuary is part of the DEFS or could be inferred from the data gained from reference estuaries.

Public Participation Activities

Mr. Kliem redirected the focus of the meeting and asked the public to share its values as to how the Deschutes Basin fits with their “mental map” of the community. It is important the ideas expressed by citizens are documented by writing each value on a card, and placing the card in the appropriate category on the wall. He estimated it would take approximately one hour for everyone to review the displays and have one-on-one conversations with staff. He pointed out there are nine workstations to visit that include the eight “cluster” lists and a workstation for suggestions on how to keep the public engaged in the process. Participants are welcome to share their thoughts on TVW, with staff and steering committee members, and make additional suggestions regarding quantitative and/or or qualitative measurements.

Additional comments offered by citizens included a majority of downtown Olympia is built on mud flats. An audience member said he doesn't understand how the study will change the fact that sediment is traveling into the basin. He hasn't heard anyone talk about who's going to pay for dealing with the sediment issue. Ms. Carlson said that kind of comparison and analysis will be part of the net benefits report. Sediment transport will be addressed in the DEFS.

Adjournment

Mr. Kliem adjourned the meeting at 7:51 for the public participation activities.

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services

X. Appendix D: Focus Group Attributes

KEY:

Quantitative Analysis	Qualitative Analysis	Both Recommended
-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

SUSTAINABLE FUTURE	HEALTHY ECONOMY	EVERYBODY'S BASIN	WEB OF LIFE	COME PLAY OUTSIDE	IT'S THE WATER	FROM HERE TO THERE	SPIRITUAL CONNECTIONS
A place to teach kids about nature	Safe haven for mooring boats	Unique cultural amenity (community celebrations, Capitol, history...)	Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown	Old Brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point	Aesthetic value of water	Connects Chehalis & Woodland Trails	A wonderful, broad learning experience
Model for thoughtful stewardship	Destination for visitors	"Central" public resource	Seasonal change	"Green Lake" atmosphere	Reflecting pond for our grand capitol	Various basin areas unique & integrated	Causes me to pause/ slow down
Risk management of water level rise (climate change)	Drawing card for economic activity	Shared community asset	Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space	Community events (Proc. of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)	Views of Puget Sound & mountains	Waterway connects from West Bay to Falls	Spiritual connection to something larger
Demonstrates sustainable environmental practices	Not a large tax burden	Lake is point of civic pride	Ecological & social link to Puget Sound & Pacific Ocean	Expand and develop use	Castle @ St. Helier, Jersey, C.I.	All the improvements completed @ Heritage Park	Close-in, quiet space
Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting	Economic driver (inc. transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)	Waterway tells story of the history of the community	Wildlife habitat	Family & romantic getaway	A reflecting estuary for our Capitol		
Deal with sewage, pollution	Help keep downtown alive & healthy		A place to observe salmon	Walk, run safely			
Provide flood protection	Lake/estuary attracts downtown business		Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna	Picnicking & watching kids swim			
	Ecotourism and wildlife viewing		Extension of Puget Sound	Wonderful, safe area to exercise			
	Promotes water based activities			Canoe/kayak to experience tides			
				Swimming			
				Getaway boat fantasy			

Sustainable Future

- **Model for thoughtful stewardship**
 - Utilize this opportunity to showcase an effective public process resulting in a sustainable end
- **Risk management of water level rise (climate change)**
 - Active climate change is leading to increased unusually high flows in the Deschutes and higher water level in South Sound. The 55-year-old dam is aging and needs repair/upgrade. A restored estuary will protect Olympia and surrounding areas from flooding and act as a buffer to the effects of climate change more than a Capitol Lake Reservoir.
- **Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting**
 - A Deschutes Estuary restoration project will provide a showcase model of habitat/wetland restoration for WA State and the nation at our State Capitol Campus. The current lake is not sustainable.
- **Deal with sewage, pollution**
 - An estuary with increased tidal flushing, eelgrass will help reduce pollution and decrease the concentration of pollutants in South Sound/Budd Inlet.
- **A place to teach kids about nature**
 - Whether it is a lake or an estuary, the basin serves as a springboard for discussion and experience of nature for children.

Healthy Economy

- **Ecotourism and wildlife viewing**
 - Ecotourism and wildlife viewing will be enhanced by a properly restored estuary with boardwalks, viewing stations, and interpretive centers/signage. This will enhance our local economy.
- **Economic Driver (including transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)**
 - How much business would “Mud Fair” attract?
 - How much would the downtown economy be affected if the lake were an estuary?
- **Not a large tax burden**
 - No – lost opportunity
 - What is the annualized cost of dredging versus the loss of income?
 - How much would it cost each citizen to make up for the losses?
- **Destination for visitors**
 - # of visitors: where from? Frequency?
 - Restaurant revenues
 - Existing survey data from ODA, Chamber, Capitol Visitors’ Center ~ new survey?
 - Marine-oriented visits: Tugboat Races, Wooden Boat Festival, Lakefair, Harbor Days, etc.
 - Conduct a random sample of actual basin visitors regarding the value of the basin to them
- **Safe haven for mooring boats**
 - Re: sediment changes, effects on port operations
 - Look and feel ~ aesthetic values
 - Model slip loss associated with ~~slip loss~~ [sediment deposition?]
 - # of boats currently moored, revenues from moorage and boat repair
 - tax revenues
 - DNR lease revenues – impact on recreational and other programs (state matching grants)
 - Boat cleaning, repair, canvas works
- **Lake/Estuary attracts downtown business**
 - Future condos

- Anchoring at new Anthony's, Budd Bay

Everybody's Basin (community celebrations, Capitol, history) [very important!]

- **Unique cultural amenity**
 - Quantity/number and types of uses by all groups and individuals
- **Central public resource**
 - A downtown park
 - On the bus line
 - Very public (minimal private property)
 - Within city limits
 - Easy to get to, even by walking!
 - Central, visible site
- **Shared community asset**
 - Develop a way to quantify this statement
- **Lake is point of civic pride**
 - Community-wide survey to assess level of civic pride and/or attachment to lake, and the same set of questions about Capitol Basin
- **Waterway tells story of the history of the community**
 - Public access along the waterway provides an opportunity to interpret the history that took place here and tells a story about how the community has evolved.

Web of Life

- **Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown**
 - # of people using the area
 - # of species in census
 - Annual biomass
- **Seasonal change**
 - Plant life cycles
 - Visitors by month
 - # of migratory birds, fish, etc.
 - Productivity
- **Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space**
 - Decibel levels by location
 - Contributes positively to human health factors
- **Ecological & social link to Puget Sound and Pacific Ocean**
 - Foreign visitors
 - # of boats visiting
 - Nutrients released into Puget Sound
 - Anadromous fish species
 - Numerous bird species
 - Powerful/strategic beginning of (for) Puget Sound
- **Wildlife habitat**
 - Protection of critical areas that are part of a larger ecosystem – the Deschutes Basin
 - # of species (flora and fauna) in fresh water and salt
 - Provides many ecological services that can be measured
 - Provides support for the species

- **A place to observe salmon**
 - Fishing
 - Boating
 - Enjoyment and learning
- **Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna**
 - Honoring = protecting
 - Community and ecological heritage
- **Extension of Puget Sound**
 - Extension of Puget Sound was meant to mean that the basin is part of Puget Sound
 - History of basin (200 years)
 - As Deschutes River runs into Puget Sound, it is a physical part of Puget Sound – for 1000 years, except for the last 50 years.

Come Play Outside

- **Old Brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point**
 - Survey interest in future awareness of historical value
 - Making the Old Brewhouse a vital focal point will reflect the community’s past as well as providing public space to serve the community today
- **“Green Lake” Atmosphere**
 - Use old Brewery
 - A serious attempt at analysis should be made about development of the stretch from the Old Brewery to West Bay Marina and the reflecting basin to see which part, parts, or whole would/could reflect that sense of “Green Lake” in Seattle. If you need to ask what “Green Lake” means, you need to go there 2 or 3 times to see it and feel it.
- **Community events (Proc. of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)**
 - Survey, measure economic impact
 - Cost of events if relocated
 - Attendance #s at events
 - Accessibility
 - It isn’t Lakefair without a full time Lake
- **Expand and develop use**
 - Measure usage now
 - Population versus projections available
- **Family and romantic getaway**
 - Count families and times used and the variety of activities
- **Walk, run safely**
 - Measure usage, crime indicators
- **Picnicking and watching kids swim**
 - See the “family” card
- **Wonderful, safe area to exercise**
 - See the “walk, run” card
- **Canoe/kayak to experience tides**
 - Survey canoe place – how many, where, etc.
 - Sea kayak from the historic Brewhouse in Tumwater, with the tides, to Percival landing. Anthony’s for dinner/drinks
 - Kayak rentals on the estuary

- **Swimming**
 - This is a long term goal in water quality that could allow swimming
- **Getaway boat fantasy**
 - I like to go down to the marina at Percival Landing at lunch time on a busy day at work and dream about getting away from it all on one of the beautiful sailboats I wish I owned!

It's the Water

- **Aesthetic Value of Water**
 - There is a distinct feeling that comes with sitting by a body of water and how it enhances the view no matter what is on the other side
- **Reflecting pond for our grand capitol**
 - A part time reflecting pond caused by tidal changes doesn't work or hold the value of the vision
 - Be sure that a full calculation of costs of each alternative is provided
- **Castle at St. Helier, Jersey, Channel Islands**
 - The environment we have in the three basins is enhanced by having a water surface at all times. Tidal transition lands (mud flats) are not a positive image for some people.
- **A reflecting estuary for our capitol**
 - A restored estuary will honor the heritage of the Deschutes Basin and our Capitol Campus. Approximately 70% of the time, tides in an estuary would reflect the Capitol (if there is sun).

From Here to There

- **Waterway connects from West Bay to above the Falls**
 - Measure: distance, map it
 - Identify gaps in the connections, depth of navigable waters
 - This is about having public access along the water to walk (run, ride a bike, or float a boat) from the West Bay Marina to above the Tumwater Falls to Pioneer Park. (This can provide for interpretation of the habitat/history of the community as well.)
- **Various basin areas unique and integrated**
 - Each of the three basins has a unique nature and function
- **Connects Chehalis and Woodland trails**
 - Measure: the cost, distance, timeline, map it, identify gaps in trail connections, environmental impacts
 - Build a bridge over lake/estuary to connect trail system
- **All the improvements completed at Heritage Park**
 - Measure: plan is completed

Spiritual Connections

- **A wonderful, broad learning experience**
 - Educational opportunities/subjects (e.g., environmental education, water quality, ornithology, limnology, etc.)
- **Spiritual connection to something larger**
 - "The ocean refuses no river." The Deschutes river basin serves as a visual metaphor for life.
- **Close-in, quiet space**

GIS – area within city divided by use (e.g., business, nature, residential)

XI. Appendix E: Public Meeting Attributes

Capitol Lake Public Meeting: Values Summary

Sustainable Future

- We have taken too much away from healthy cleansing process by eliminating estuaries – that must be renewed for sustainability to happen
- Eliminate toxic cover up
- Natural cleansing of waste from whatever needs to be allowed to happen for sustainable longevity
- Guide natural habitat flow rather than spend money dredging and battling Nature
- Consideration of constructed value of existing assets (e.g., parkway, dam)
- Indigenous shellfish farming – Olympia oyster beds (money and knowledge)
- Habitat for shorebirds, feeder fish, salmon, trout, that are found in estuaries
- We are stewards of our environment. Make wise decisions.
- What birds and animals will *relocate* under estuary option
- Lots of discussion about a million a year spent to study. Nothing as to reclamation as to monetary to come back to help pay for the clean up. I've had 22 years as a resident engineer appointed to many jobs of soils engineering. I would welcome a further discussion for a solution to your problems.
Calvin R. Lockwood, Retired Highway Engineer, 515 Floravista Avenue, Oly, WA
- Sustainable hatchery program
- Consider flooding [due to] global warming (50-100 years from now)
- Take the corset off of Mother Nature
- Which is more important: Man vs Nature? Open the lake and give it back.
- Make downtown safe from floods
- Increase of healthy estuary grasses and other plants – exchange of fresh/salt water

Healthy Economy

- Healthy port, marinas, marine businesses
 - Port of Olympia turning basin
 - Cost of dredging for local marinas
 - DNR lease payments from local marinas
 - Businesses with marine connections: grocery stores, restaurants, repair shops, etc.
 - Water-oriented tourist trade
 - Festivals: Olympia Wooden Boat Festival, Harbor Days, etc.
- Entry way to downtown – lake, spiritual pathways, reflective pond. People enjoined in unity of a whole town as it's the water guides. A capitol with magnificent aura. A learning for nature while keeping clean deep water. Healthy businesses and recreation bring future love for real values and love of life.
- Avoid spending 1 million to 1.5 million taxpayer dollars every year to keep the lake
- Financial reimbursement for any impacts to large public and private investments
- Consider investments: road, park, bridge, downtown, etc.
- What has the investment in the lake/Heritage Park already been?
- Beneficiaries of dam (port, yachts, downtown) should pay for a piece of the dredging costs
- The lake provides a beautiful edge to our downtown and Capitol. I can't imagine how mud flats would be visually compatible.
- Studies should include the use of a bulkhead to protect OYC from sediment build-up under the marina. Direct the build-up to an easier dredge and less costly project.
- To the extent that the lake increases tourism it is actually a detriment to the local economy. I can provide an explanation. Bob Jacobs 352-1346. Let's just look at the value to cities of the two options.

- Source of public attraction to support downtown commerce – business and restaurant
- Study car plates @ Nisqually – compare with Capitol Lake. Could local rest. Bring more \$\$ downtown?
- Beauty attracts visitors \$. Human as well as critters
- Maintaining the investment of millions of dollars of our money that created Capitol Lake and its improvements. Protect the investment
- Who will “Foot” the bill for sediment in Budd Inlet?
- Study what would happen/costs to sediment in harbor if estuary.
- Clean up Budd Inlet so we can eat and farm shellfish.
- Sailing classes on Capitol Lake. Small boat rentals.
- Lakefair
- Shellfish farms
- From an economic and engineering perspective, would an estuary do a better job of flushing sediment than the present lake?

Everybody’s Basin

- The lake or estuary is an important part of the capitol campus and will become ever more important in the future for all Washingtonians.
- Citizen participation
- Partnerships framework for ongoing decisions
- Tourism \$\$ from state visitors into city
- Remember the Port. They have big plans that could alter all dreams for the lake/estuary.
- Tradition – last 50-75 years
- Native Americans fished and canoed the Deschutes before Wilder and White were born
- Tradition of what has been good, including LAKEFAIR and realization of our forefathers’ vision of lake reflecting the Capitol.
- A basin for fishin’, swimmin’, not just reflectin’
- Public uses of the lake, including water skiing, El Toro boats, etc. Would deepening the lake and fixing upstream sources of pollution achieve this?
- I miss the tide flats of 1945 and 1946 – they were part of my early life – they were replaced twice a day with high tide.
- Capitol Lake is a part of our forefathers’ vision, a dream we have realized. We should protect it for future generations
- Wilder and White vision for the Capitol should be revisited
- People like the peace that open waters provide (lake), although it is expensive to maintain.
- Mosquito-free area

Web of Life

- Fish live here too
- A place to observe wintering birds and summering bats. Study the ecosystem, not just the salmon.
- Estuary at site of OLD BREWERY and maintain Capitol Lake!
- I miss the big trees that used to be by the lake.
- Biodiversity should be a goal of our stewardship.
- Fate of sediment with dam removed. Effects on water quality of Budd Inlet
- Place for salmon cycles
- Increase surf smelt and sand lance spawning habitat in Budd Inlet’s shorelines. Need clean sand and gravel, not mud.
- Please make sure that when this estuary study is done, there will be comparable data about the values of the freshwater environment. At this point there appears to be a strong pro-estuary bias. I hope that is not so.

Come Play Outside

- Swimming is a possible option now. It would not be with an estuary. This would be a loss of a community value.
- Boating, etc. Open lake for view of city. Brewery
- Where do people play? Capitol Lake and Percival Landing – where the water is. Where are the people on the nice grass at East Bay between State Street and Swantown?
- Vibrant community of walkers, morning, noon and night!
- Get rid of concrete liner of lake. It is ugly and detracts from natural setting.
- Hike on trails
- A place to throw rocks and sticks
- Paddle around
- Meet and walk around the lake – social, view, and friendships
- Swimming in Capitol Lake. We were the idyllic American city. Let’s maintain and restore that treasure.
- What do “Capitol” visitors like/want?
- A natural, educational downtown. Welcoming to active and passive learning. Compare with Nisqually.
- The State and the City have spent a lot of our money to make Capitol Lake the center of attraction for both the Capitol and the City, and they have done a wonderful job.

It’s the Water

- Open up water of Capitol Lake to polluted water of Budd Inlet.
- Fleets of sailboats and classes to learn to sail on Capitol Lake. It was a beautiful sight for sailors and landlubbers, alike.
- Lake feeds the state’s largest nursery colony of bats.
- Decrease use of herbicides and pesticides! This is a water quality issue and a sustainability issue.
- Estuary odor and aesthetics versus lake
- Establish eel grass beds to remove pollutants in an estuary – Arcata, California
- Why restore Little Hollywood?
- Because there won’t be raw sewage and sharks on the shore, so we won’t be restoring Little Hollywood.
- Safe, inviting to swim and play in
- Silt and sludge will not be dredged as promised and will filter in to navigable water of Budd Inlet.

From Here to There

- Ability to kayak from waterfall to Priest Point Park
- On historical info. it lists Capitol Lake
- Want sand?! Move to Florida!!
- Waterways are ancient roads. I want to travel to Olympia’s. Boat, tube, swim
- Boat access from Percival landing to the historic brewery (our history)
- Dredging does not get terminated under the estuary alternative – it just gets moved “from here to there”.

Spiritual Connections

- Reflection: waterfall, pond, estuary, lake. Sense of place: self. Visual centerpiece of my community from River to Bay.
- I remember that this area is about more than human needs – fish, animals, birds.
- We are not the ONLY ones who use this water: eagle, fox, mink, salmon, jay, sparrow, salamander
- I believe human needs are just as important as wildlife needs
- I believe my ability to make \$ in a biz downtown Oly is very important spiritual need.
- It is very calming for me when I walk around the lake. I suspect this would change under an estuary environment, but I don’t know how. I suspect it would be less calming because there would be less to attract my mind.
- People will pay for beauty and spirituality. Both are good for business and a satisfying life.

- Natural ecosystems as a value. Mudflats are rich, beautiful, ever-changing, what God put here.
- Appreciation for natural systems.

XII. Appendix F: Public Involvement Brainstorm

FOCUS GROUP

Group One

- Workshops at periodic times as info is available
- Events, Booths, Outreach, Updates
 - Lakefair
 - Wooden Boat Festival
 - Procession of the Species
 - Arts Walk
 - Harbor Days
 - Fish docents
- Chamber, Councils, Neighborhoods, Service Organizations
- TCTV, newspaper, radio
- College, universities, high schools, K-12, scouts (develop relevant curriculum)
- Public vote
 - How widespread (local v state)?
- SEPA review
 - Comment periods
 - Hearings
- Kiosks around lake
- Opinion surveys, polls, more focus groups
- Stakeholder/citizens' advisory committee to CLAMP (w/ a student representative)
- Theater performances
- "Basin Days" Festival
- Debate (structured) public
- Tribal engagement
- Multi-lingual materials
- To summarize study findings:
 - Poster contests
 - Documentary (film?) contests
 - Song contests
 - Essay contest and/or speech contest
- Engage adjacent businesses
- Legislature
- State capitol committee
- Website (interactive and fun)
- Estuary mural
- Engage youths
 - Simulated debates/role playing
 - Senior projects (HS) current conditions/predicted future conditions
 - Include student representatives on CLAMP citizens' advisory board/committee
 - Send surveys home with students

Group Two

- Do not put it to a public vote
- CLAMP presents studies/findings to all interest groups
- Audio tapes on buses
- Information re: issues that would change every week w/ new info.
- PowerPoint presentation to give away
- Pill gets smaller and smaller to swallow through repeated presentations

- Input from public concerning their values (like we did on 3/7/06)
- Ask different age groups (5-85 years) and social groups (low to high income)
- Seek a balance of public involvement
- Members of the Focus Group serve as “value gatherers” in community
- On radio (am and pm) value statements to trigger thinking and discussion
- What if 3/21/06 meeting isn’t enough?
- Don’t close the “value” book too soon
- Engage community at value level – not as solution level

Group Three

- Web page
- Talk to TRPC and others who do lots of public involvement
- Presentation to organizations (neighborhoods, interest groups, etc.)
- Legislature
- Informational signage at the lake
- Wait till good information is available
- Series of advisory ballots
- Inform organizations like Farm Bureau, Timber, Tribes, Fisheries, Ecology, etc. at least once a year
- CLAMP press releases on a regular basis
- Vote that stipulates cost of alternatives
- TCTV and TVW forums
- Be sure all state and local agencies that are affected are involved (e.g., WSDOT, LOTT)
- Get park users informed (Lakefair, senior center, Olympia Yacht Club, West Bay Marina, Farmers Market)
- Private property owners, developers, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF)
- Newsletter/Flyer
- Colleges and Universities
- CLAMP annual meeting
- Develop visual aids to show what alternatives look like
- Don’t overwork public involvement

Group Four

- Voters advisory ballot
- Information published through Daily Olympian
- Neighborhood meetings
- Involve high school in interdisciplinary classes
- Visitor interviews
- Surveys
- Public tours of Basin
- GA Blog
- Public workshops
- Threaten to put in a Walmart
- Campaign platform item
- Information on websites
- Outreach to local college kids
- Fundraiser
- Throw a party and have information there
- Legislative hotline
- TCTV coverage
- Pay people to come
- Town meeting – county and state levels
- Signage on city/IT vehicles

- Banners
- Door to door
- Lakefair Theme
- Fliers @ Procession of the Species, Arts Walk, etc.
- Choose a candidate to champion the cause
- Airplane advertisement
- “Buy a piece of the Basin” auction
- Basin stewards/sponsors
- Subcommittee of cities and county government
- Evergreen involvement
- Get kids involved/informed – parents will follow
- Address interest groups
- Basin Bash!
- Popular vote
- Sound truck (loudspeaker on roof) to drive through neighborhoods
- Public input throughout process
- Corporate sponsorship (“Safeco Basin”)
- Do nothing
- Fliers from an airplane
- Quasi- Duck Dash
- Contact owner of Olympia Beer – put info about the basin in a 6-pack
- Leave it to the Legislature
- Leave it to the Youth Legislature (YMCA)
- Raise Taxes for the Basin
- Charge for usage (user fee)
- Talk to Eymann
- Run a series of public opinion polls on major alternatives (lake, estuary, river park) and see shift in opinion with release of information
 - Every six months with the same questions

Group Five

- Involve John Dodge (Daily Olympian) – periodic articles
- Kiosks at Lake for comment cards, information, etc.
- Random survey of large number of visitors to basin
- Presentations at neighborhood associations, community group (Rotary, Lions, Elks, etc.)
- Provide information in simple, concise way – summaries
- Provide comprehensive qualitative and quantitative info
- Involve public before study is started (involvement @ each sub-goal level)
- Use creative new methods to diversify study/group
- Don’t assume everyone has internet access: use multi-media, presentations, TVW, newspaper
- Include League of Women Voters to design public involvement methods
- Activate interested community group one-on-one to “pound pavement” door-to-door
- Involve evergreen and SPSCC environmental classes to do outreach
- Consider local and state-wide citizens for all impacts (taxes, initiatives, dollars, budgets)
- A vote: lake, estuary, “other”?
- Do a mailing to disseminate info – “dumbed down” so it’s understandable
- Do focused information pushes with targets: legislators, citizens, etc.
- Give details of exact funding costs/needs so all persons can make informed decisions: newspapers, meetings, utility/power bill mailings (because everybody gets them), etc.
- Open up CLAMP meetings to allow for more (longer) public input

- Create narrative stories to help people envision choices. Example: what would the sailboat regatta look like if it were an estuary? Display at the library.
- Hold a 2-day forum for legislators and staff to give best available info
- Hold forum for public (or video-tape Legislative forum)
- Share how CLAMP objectives overlap to let public know how the 10-year plan works
- Help “uninformed” citizens get informed

Additional Thoughts

- The meeting on March 21st should be the first of 2 or 3 meetings: not everyone can attend a single meeting
- Get the labor unions and the Port of Olympia involved – get info
- Try to do more active participation throughout the process (like the Focus Group)
- “Access Olympia” website
- Citizen Advisory Committee to CLAMP should include representatives from a wider audience than Olympia
- Call-in hotline to record messages/ideas
- Can’t string-out public involvement. Time it to coincide with information coming out ~ 2007-2008 for the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study
- Identify some clear public participation points – dates and schedule

PUBLIC MEETING

- Make drafts available before the meetings where the public is to provide input. This produces much better input. Should have been done before tonight’s meeting.
- Look at Charrette model for final decision making process
- A chance for public to know costs associated with each choice (e.g., \$1.5 million/year to dredge)
- Provide community w/ pro’s and con’s on environment, economy, cost, visual, etc. levels. Then Q and A and even debate. People don’t have the info. to make educated statements, opinions, etc. Thanks!
- Do random polling in the community to get objective survey results of public opinion/values.
- Website and BLOG (announce this to public via radio, T.V., and newspaper)
- Involve youth and students: K-12 (watershed education, senior projects), college
- Input should be weighted. It can’t be useful otherwise. Is a value important to one person in the community or all of them? These should not get equal weight.
- Provide details on habitat value and costs of lake versus estuary to the public. Yes!
- Publicize heavily a meeting at which we can speak up and debate, preceding a public VOTE!
- Inform public through multiple media venues of full schedule of meetings in advance – (not all read Olympia Daily)
- Assure public involvement in final decision on Lake vs. Estuary through a similar process as this – make data available to all interested in advance.
- Put it to a county-wide “binding” vote.
- Ask people’s opinion and values AFTER giving them all the information, - their opinion may change drastically!
- Identify the media that reaches the largest number of Olympians and use it to publicize these issues.
- Make clear what is going on. Right now it strongly appears that this is a steamroller headed toward an estuary – strongly biased. If that is the case, tell us and we can save our time.
- Ongoing citizen input to CLAMP, more than just an annual meeting.
- YIKES! You folks are off to a good start. Good job tonight, keep it up!
- Creating an estuary will simply move sediment into Port, marinas and shorelines of Budd Inlet. Who will then pay for sediment removal? It will become Port’s responsibility, which is funded by property taxes of Thurston County.

- The last thing we need is to go back to smelly mud flats, reduce property values and destroy a major asset of Olympia.
- Put up a comment board at the trail/pathway around the lake.
- Put out a questionnaire!!
- Education is the key for success
- TCTV coverage of all informational meetings. Especially the December '06 annual meeting.
- Info posters at the Interpretive Center
- First get equivalent data on all alternatives. Tonight's overview of the process did not mention getting similar data on the lake alternative. How can we choose with unequal information?
- Questionnaire!! There should have been one at this meeting and there should be others (perhaps published in Olympian?)
- Community awareness/appreciation/understanding of estuaries and their importance seems limited – or at least widely varied. A website w/ FAQ section might help public learn about aesthetic, ecological, and economic tradeoffs.
- Forum at SPSCC – “debate”
- Brown bag lunch sessions with GA where information is presented, a forum
- Force the Olympian to cover this issue better – they do a half-hearted job now.
- Create a citizen's advisory council that has permanent representation on CLAMP Steering Committee
- Make clear that this study is about the estuary alternative and perhaps the mixed alternative, not the lake alternative. Many of tonight's comments should have been quashed. But maybe people don't trust that the study is unbiased.
- Get school students' input views for their future. Press releases to school newspapers. Our future voters
- Committee should be more balanced... You appear to be pro-estuary. I am concerned about objective information in your study.

XIII. Appendix G: Attribute “Translation”

The purpose of this appendix is to provide analysis and description of the goods and services provided by the Deschutes Basin, as identified by participants in the focus group sessions and public meeting convened as a part of Net-Benefits component of the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility study. Focus group and public meeting participants provided extensive input on what they viewed as the goods and services and broader benefits provided by the Deschutes Basin in its past conditions, current state, and under alternative future management scenarios. Participants grouped those goods and services into “chapters” or categories based on their interrelationships, and then assigned the chapters informal names.

In the next stage of the Net-Benefits Assessment, a professional economist, using both market and non-market valuation techniques, will assess potential changes in the values of these goods and services under various Deschutes Basin management alternatives. As many of these benefits are not monetary in nature, additional qualitative information will be gathered to ensure that a full accounting of the possible changes in all of the values identified through the Deschutes Estuary focus group sessions and public meeting are captured. This appendix is intended to facilitate the economist’s assessment by re-grouping, describing, and “translating” into more specific language those goods and services identified by focus group and public meeting participants.

The re-categorization and organization of the material from the focus group session in no way replaces or attempts to assign levels of importance to the particular goods and services identified by focus group participants. Rather this appendix is an effort to more concisely and clearly define those benefits and group them based on the types of data that will be collected during the formal economic assessment. Focus group and public meeting chapter names are referenced in each category of goods and services below.

A. Outdoor Recreation—*the goods and services related to outdoor recreation were primarily captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Come Play Outside” and “From Here to There.”*

The Deschutes Basin offers residents and visitors alike a public space with much opportunity for outdoor recreation. Participants described two broad categories of outdoor recreational goods and services provided by the basin—marine recreation and land-based recreation. Marine recreation includes water-dependent activities such as canoeing, kayaking, swimming, water skiing, sailing and recreational boating, and recreational fishing. Land-based recreation includes activities occurring around the periphery of the basin such as running, walking, hiking, biking, sunbathing and picnicking. Basin users currently engage in many of these activities, but some activities are more likely under alternative basin management scenarios. Participants attributed intrinsic value to these recreational opportunities, and they also attributed value to the industries supported by recreation, such as those offering recreational equipment rental.

Participants emphasized the importance of physical connectivity in the context of recreation. They described value in the interconnectedness of waterways within the Deschutes Basin in that this connectivity allows uninterrupted marine recreational experiences. Participants also described value associated with connectivity of land adjacent to the basin including amenities such as trails and parks. Participants valued the integration of land and water resources within the basin to create a unique recreational experience, and some desired an experience such as that created by Green Lake in Seattle, Washington where a central location for land and water-based recreation becomes a part of the community’s identity.

B. Tourism—*the goods and services related to tourism were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Healthy Economy,” “Everybody’s Basin,” and “Come Play Outside.”*

As a centrally located public resource, adjacent to the Olympia capitol complex, the Deschutes Basin serves as a focal point for visitors and drives much of the economic activity in its immediate vicinity. In the area surrounding the lower basin, there are multiple types of business supported by traditional tourism including restaurants, retail establishments, and hotels. The basin also offers opportunities for nature-based

or ecotourism such as wildlife viewing. Participants associated value with both of these types of tourism, and felt that basin management impacts these values.

Additionally, participants noted that the basin currently serves as a venue for local events popular among tourists and residents alike. The basin hosts a number of events such as Lakefair, the Wooden Boat Festival, Harbor Days, and Tugboat Races that are social and economic assets for the city. Participants valued these events and noted that alternative management scenarios for the basin could have major impacts on the events.

C. Aesthetics and Spirituality—*the goods and services related to aesthetics and spirituality were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Healthy Economy,” “It’s the Water,” and “Spiritual Connections.”*

Focus group and public meeting participants attributed value to several aesthetic functions of the Deschutes Basin. In addition to serving as a reflecting pond for the state capitol building, the basin currently serves as the “entrance” to the city and offers a visually attractive public space of relative quiet and tranquility in the midst of an urbanized area. The basin also offers views of nearby features such as Puget Sound, Budd Inlet, and the Cascade Mountains. Participants were concerned with the potential changes to aesthetic values under alternative management scenarios, including the appearance of tidal flats and the odors possibly associated with alternative basin management.

In addition to the aesthetic value of the basin, focus group and public meeting participants also identified a “spiritual” or symbolic importance of the basin in that it provides solace from everyday life and embodies the connectivity of all things. In their chapter entitled “Spiritual Connections,” participants attributed value to the basin’s ability to promote a sense of place and self, its importance to wildlife, and more generally its connection to larger natural systems.

D. Ecosystem Functions—*the goods and services related to ecosystem functions were generally captured in the focus group chapters “Sustainable Future,” “Web of Life,” and “It’s the Water.”*

The Deschutes River Watershed spans the foothills of the Cascade Mountains to Puget Sound. Prior to the damming of the river’s lower basin in Olympia, the basin included a healthy estuarine system where salt and fresh water mixed. This changed in 1951 when the dam was built to create Capitol Lake. Focus group and public meeting participants attributed value to multiple ecosystem functions performed by the basin in both its natural and modified states.

First, participants valued the risk management functions of the basin, particularly those capabilities related to flood control and water quality. Participants valued the ability of the basin to absorb high waters and buffer the city from flooding. Additionally, participants valued the capability of the Deschutes Basin to improve water quality. Participants described and valued the ability of estuary systems to cleanse water and reduce the concentration of pollutants locally and in the larger Puget Sound system.

Focus group and public meeting participants also attributed value to the healthy natural habitat and biodiversity in the Deschutes Basin. They noted that the basin functions as habitat, a nursery, and a source of food for a great variety of marine and terrestrial wildlife. Participants valued the presence of this wildlife as well as the role that the basin plays in the survival and life cycles of this wildlife.

Finally, participants attributed value to consumptive uses of basin resources. In the past, the basin was home to harvestable shellfish populations. Participants placed value on the ability to fish and harvest shellfish and other resources from the basin, and they attributed value to use of the basin for hatchery purposes.

E. Cultural, Civic and Historical Pride—*the goods and services related to cultural, civic, and historical pride were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Everybody’s Basin,” “Web of Life,” and “Come Play Outside.”*

The Deschutes Basin has played a defining role in the history of Olympia, and the basin now serves as a source of cultural, civic, and historical pride for many residents. Participants valued the basin as a

unique, central, and accessible public resource that brings together the community and visitors. Participants identified the basin as a focal point for the area and viewed the basin as a place where the natural environment, history, and community could be displayed, protected, and honored. Participants also valued that the basin in its current state is the realization of the vision of important figures in Olympia history.

Some participants attributed great value to the improvement of specific historical sites within the basin, namely the Old Brewhouse. Participants valued the Brewhouse as a historically significant site that, if included in management of the basin, could potentially contribute to the historical significance and pride associated with the region.

F. Education—*the goods and services related to education were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Sustainable Future” and “Everybody’s Basin.”*

The Deschutes Basin offers students, residents, and tourists extensive opportunity for education about the natural environment, sustainable environmental practices, local and regional history, outdoor recreation, and relevant local natural resource issues. For tourists in particular, the basin can offer an insight into the history and evolution of the cities of Olympia and Tumwater and the surrounding communities. Participants attributed value to this educational capacity and viewed the basin as an appropriate setting in which to interpret local history, culture, and nature.

Additionally, focus group and public meeting participants value the basin’s potential to inform environmental management and decision-making beyond the area itself. They believe that the basin provides a service in that the public process and citizen participation used in the Deschutes Estuary Net Benefits Assessment may serve as a model for environmental stewardship and management. Furthermore, participants value the educational capacity of the potential outcomes of the decision-making process, namely the educational value of a model habitat/wetland restoration project. Located adjacent to the state capitol complex, management efforts in the lower Deschutes Basin can serve as a model for all the citizens of Washington.

G. Marine Commerce—*the goods and services related to marine commerce were generally captured in the focus group chapter entitled “Healthy Economy.”*

The Deschutes Basin is home to the Port of Olympia, which was established in 1922 and serves as an important economic catalyst in the area. The publicly owned port also owns and operates a recreational boat marina and repair facility in the basin. Several commercial marinas and one yacht club provide moorage for many commercial and private boats. Focus group and public meeting participants recognized value in these water dependant activities and were particularly concerned with the way that altered hydrology and sedimentation patterns might impact these values. Capitol Lake experiences sedimentation from the Deschutes River and requires periodic dredging to maintain its current state. Participants noted that alternative management scenarios for the basin must address potential sediment impacts to the water dependant activities and the basin as a whole.

Within the context of marine commerce, participants also recognized value in marine-related businesses connected to the basin. Numerous Olympia businesses are supported by marine traffic and commerce, including yacht clubs, boat repair and supply shops, grocery stores, and restaurants. Participants attributed value to these businesses and recognized that their value could be affected through changes to basin management.

H. Infrastructure—*the goods and services related to infrastructure were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled “Sustainable Future,” “Healthy Economy,” and “Come Play Outside.”*

Focus group and public meeting participants attributed value to the existing infrastructure that has been constructed to support the current uses of the Deschutes Basin. Existing infrastructure includes the dams, bridges, parkways, walkways, parks and roads associated with Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet. Participants noted that the creation of Capitol Lake required considerable public investment and that the value of this existing infrastructure, along with the value of new infrastructure requirements, should be assessed for basin management decisions.