



CAPITOL LAKE — DESCHUTES ESTUARY

Long-Term Management Project Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: June 2, 2020

Time: 1 to 3 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

Meeting Participants

Work Group Members

- Abby Barnes, Department of Natural Resources
- Holly Borth, Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP)
- Eric Christensen, City of Olympia
- Lisa Dennis-Perez, LOTT Clean Water Alliance
- Rachael Jamison, Port of Olympia
- David Kloempken, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
- Gwendolen Lentes, Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
- Brad Murphy, Thurston County
- David Palazzi, Department of Natural Resources
- Allen Pleus, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
- Dan Smith, City of Tumwater
- Scott Steltzner, Squaxin Island Tribe
- Kristin Swenddal, Washington Department of Natural Resources
- Leanne Weiss, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Department of Enterprise Services

- Kevin Dragon
- Ann Larson
- Carrie Martin

EIS Consultants/Facilitators

- Jennifer Barnes, Heffron Transportation
- Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
- Nicole Lobodzinski, EnviroIssues
- Karmen Martin, ESA
- Jessi Massingale, Floyd|Snider
- Ray Outlaw, EnviroIssues
- Tim Sturtz, Ramboll

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: June 2, 2020

Time: 1 to 3 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

Observers

- Steve Shanewise

Meeting Notes Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Jessi Massingale welcomed attendees to the June 2, 2020 Technical Work Group (TWG) meeting and walked through the agenda.

EIS Schedule Update

Jessi began the meeting referencing the updated process map ([see presentation page 4](#)) and walked through revisions. She provided a schedule update, and noted the state allocated supplemental funding for the EIS and stipulated the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) be completed by June 30, 2021. She noted the plan is to connect with the TWG again in the summer, and there will be continued engagement with the Funding and Governance Work Group (FGWG).

Jessi provided a fieldwork update that the bathymetric survey and sediment sampling are complete. She noted the results from both the survey and sediment sampling are being incorporated in the discipline reports and EIS analysis.

EIS Technical Analyses - Methodology Review and Discussion

Transportation

Jennifer Barnes introduced herself and her role as the EIS lead for the project Transportation analysis. Jennifer explained that transportation includes multi-modal surface transportation facilities that would be affected by construction or operation of the project alternatives, and walked through the study area. She noted what is included in the transportation technical analysis and methodology, including:

- Reviewing existing transportation plans, reports, and policy documents
- Taking inventory of the multimodal transportation network in the study area
- Conducting planning-level assessment of construction impacts to the transportation network and parking facilities

She explained this is a planning-level analysis and that for the most part, includes where the project intersects with any mode of transportation, including pedestrians, bicycle, transit, freight, and automobile.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: June 2, 2020

Time: 1 to 3 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

She also explained the analysis of impacts ([see presentation page 8](#)).

Air Quality and Odor

Tim Sturtz introduced himself and his role as the EIS lead for the project air quality and odor analysis and noted he would talk about air quality and odor separately. Tim explained the difference between the study areas in air quality and odor, and walked through the different analysis of existing conditions and impacts ([see presentation pages 10 and 11](#)).

Tim noted that odor is a bit more subjective and less quantifiable. He explained that his team used literature to understand the different odor rates that could be expected from an estuary on a square meter basis.

Visual Resources

Karmen introduced herself and her role. She explained that the study area is the project area including adjacent parks and roadways, and this area could experience changes from onsite or offsite areas ([see presentation page 12](#)).

Karmen reviewed the analysis of existing conditions ([see presentation page 13](#)). She walked through the two different changes – the character of water views and availability of views. She explained the three locations in the north and middle basins were selected based on sites that would have the most visible change. Karmen noted the team recognizes there are other areas of interest for the community, and photos of other locations will be included in the EIS with annotations about what changes could be included.

Karmen explained the analysis of impacts ([see presentation pages 14 and 15](#)).

Sea Level Rise and Climate Change

Karmen explained the sea level rise and climate change study area is defined as the project area. She noted the team evaluated best available science, including consistency with the City of Olympia SLR response plan, on sea-level rise to determine modeling of two feet of sea level rise. She walked through the methodology and analysis questions ([see presentation page 17](#)).

Question: What is the estimated project life?

Response: Karmen noted they will be evaluating a two-foot rise, regardless of when that will occur in relation to the 30-year project horizon.

Karmen explained the analysis of impacts between the natural environmental and built environment ([see presentation page 18](#)).

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: June 2, 2020

Time: 1 to 3 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

Public Services & Utilities

Karmen reviewed the study area for Public Services and Utilities. She noted there will be a high-level analysis given the conceptual nature of the EIS and that construction impacts will be the focus. She explained the methodology and analysis of impacts ([see presentation pages 20 and 21](#)).

Recreating Assumptions in the EIS

Tessa explained the recreation assumptions. She noted current regulations allow for motorized boating in the middle basin of Capitol lake, but given the focus of habitat enhancements, motorized boating will not be supported in any project alternatives. She noted the assumption is to support non-motorized boating throughout the project area. She described how boating is restricted today, and the project would restore the ability to boat in the basin by providing decontamination stations at points of entry and exit to prevent spread of the New Zealand mud snail. She explained these assumptions were discussed with the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

She noted that the project would rebuild the pier near Interpretative Park for fishing and include a decontamination station.

Tessa explained that organized swimming facilities are not supported, because the basin is not considered to be suitable for swimming, as determined by Thurston County Public Health. She noted point and non-point discharges, periodic spills (oil, sewage), and other factors make Capitol Lake unsuitable for swimming and that will not change as part of the project. Tessa noted that in the future if water quality can be demonstrated as improved enough to support swimming and there is stakeholder interest, a separate environmental review could be conducted.

Feasibility of a Freshwater Reflecting Pool

Tessa reviewed the feasibility considerations associated with the Hybrid alternative including a freshwater reflecting pool ([see presentation page 24](#)). She noted a saltwater reflecting pool had fewer technical feasibility issues and referred to the Measurable Evaluation Process the EIS team completed. Carrie added that during the process Enterprise Services thought it was important to revisit this topic and share this evaluation.

Comment: What does decontamination for boating look like, and how can we ensure that process is effective?

Response: Tessa explained that boats and equipment contacting the water would be treated with pressurized hot water. There can be additional chemicals, if needed. She noted they are considering whether a station needs staff or no staff and there are benefits to both approaches. She mentioned the assumption that ongoing monitoring would occur in tandem with the use of

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: June 2, 2020

Time: 1 to 3 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

decontamination to track effectiveness and ensure invasive species are not being transported elsewhere.

What is Pre-Decisional Information?

Tessa explained pre-decisional information such as the results of the modeling, fieldwork, technical analyses, draft documents, and other data that could contribute to the selection of a preferred alternative. She noted the team has provided the extent of information possible, and the remaining information will be shared in the DEIS. Tessa mentioned the next phase will be to process data. She explained that consistent with SEPA process, the technical analyses and results will be presented in the DEIS. Karmen added this is an important time for the team to be doing work. Carrie noted she understands people are anxious to receive information, but this process will ensure everyone can provide feedback at the same time.

Jessi noted the team will send out a Doodle poll for future meetings.

Comment: Are you still assessing the hybrid with the saltwater reflecting pool? Has there been any thought into how water exchange would happen to prevent water quality problems?

Response: Tessa explained that this is part of the alternatives analysis for water quality for that specific alternative.

Comment: Has the work for the cultural resources begun or is it on hold? Who are you coordinating with at DAHP?

Response: Jessi responded that work is proceeding and is part of the technical analysis being conducted now as part of the EIS. Coordination was with Stephanie and the discipline report reflecting that analysis will inform the DEIS.

Public Comment

Comment: I have several questions. For transportation, are you looking at the feasibility of using rail to bring rock to the site to build the basin for the hybrid alternative to build the wall for containment?

Response: Rail is not being considered for materials for initial construction, but could be a possibility for long-term maintenance dredging activities.

Comment: I've spoken to the operator of the quarry who noted they can bring the rock to the site at a considerable lower cost than truck, and minimize damage caused by trucks.

Response: This would be appropriate to pass on to construction management.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: June 2, 2020

Time: 1 to 3 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

Comment: It would be useful to have the traffic analysis alternative include the option to leave the dam in place and open it to tidal flow. For odor, it would be useful to get on-the-ground analysis from odor on mud flats and visit restaurants with balconies that overhang over the tidal flat and ask guests what they think about the odor. If the hybrid alternative was a freshwater lake, that would eliminate all the water quality issues mentioned for swimming. As far as stormwater pipes, they could be extended. Referring to the issue of testing for a freshwater lake, I oppose the statement there is no known jurisdictional support for a freshwater lake. I have talked to thousands of people and can guarantee that reestablishing a freshwater lake for swimming is the #1 issue in the public mind. As far as testing for the availability of water, I question the 30-38 million gallons of water. That seems like an excessive amount just to keep the lake clean. I don't see the logic in dismissing testing to see if water is available by saying it might be costly to do. I thought that was the point of the EIS.

Response: Thank you for your comments.

Adjourn

Jessi thanked the participants and adjourned the meeting at 2:09 p.m.