



# CAPITOL LAKE — DESCHUTES ESTUARY

Long-Term Management Project Environmental Impact Statement

## Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 7, 2021

Time: 9 to 11 a.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

---

### Meeting Participants

#### *Work Group Members*

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

#### *Department of Enterprise Services*

- Linda Kent
- Ann Larson
- Carrie Martin

#### *EIS Consultants/Facilitators*

- Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
- Karmen Martin, ESA
- Ray Outlaw, Floyd|Snider
- Amanda Sweet, Floyd|Snider

#### *Observers*

- Dave Peeler
- Joel Carlson
- Lindsay Marquez
- Michael Pires
- Steve Shanewise

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 7, 2020

Time: 9 to 11 a.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

---

## Meeting Notes Summary

### *Welcome and Introductions*

Carrie Martin welcomed the attendees. She introduced the speakers Ray Outlaw, Tessa Gardner-Brown, and Karmen Martin, and provided an overview of the [agenda items](#). The presentation, with slide numbers referenced throughout this summary, is [available on the project website](#).

### *Project Area and Long-Term Management Goals*

Ray provided an overview of the project area (Slide 3), which includes the 260-acre Capitol Lake that is managed by the Department of Enterprise Services under long-term lease with the Department of Natural Resources and extends to the northern point of West Bay of Budd Inlet.

Ray then described recent work Enterprise Services has performed around development of the EIS (Slide 4). The alternatives should improve water quality, manage sediment accumulation and future deposition, improve ecological functions, and enhance community use of the resource. The alternatives should also be economically and environmentally sustainable. Phase 2 began in 2018 and has included development of the Draft EIS.

### *Elements Common to All Action Alternatives*

Ray provided an overview of the elements common to all action alternatives, as detailed in [Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS](#) (Slide 5). Action alternatives refer to the Managed Lake, Estuary, and Hybrid Alternatives collectively.

Ray also reminded the group that formal swimming facilities are not included in any of the action alternatives. Operating swimming facilities does not align with the mission of Enterprise Services, and that is not expected to change in the future. The swimming facilities present from 1964 to 1986 were operated by the City of Olympia. The project does not preclude an entity from negotiating a lease to operate swimming in the future, should water quality be suitable and following separate environmental review.

### *Overview of Action Alternatives*

Ray overviewed the Managed Lake, Estuary, and Hybrid Alternatives, which are described in detail in [Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS](#) (Slides 6 through 8).

Ray provided an overview of tidal conditions under the Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives (Slide 9). Tidal conditions would be similar to Budd Inlet. An inundation curve was developed to determine the amount of time the estuary would be covered in water (approximately 80%). Representative tidal charts were also developed to show typical winter, summer, and fall days. From these it was

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 7, 2020

Time: 9 to 11 a.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

---

determined the lowest water levels would typically occur in the day in summer and the night in winter.

## *Draft EIS Contents*

Ray quickly provided an overview of the [chapters of the EIS](#) (Slide 10), and which information would be covered in this meeting.

## *Technical Evaluations & Key Findings*

Tessa provided an overview of the elements evaluated in the Draft EIS and reminded the group that this briefing was meant as an overview and to look to the Draft EIS for more in-depth discussion (Slide 12). Information on the analysis for each discipline and key findings was summarized from Chapters [3.0](#), [4.0](#), and [5.0](#). Questions on various elements are included with the topic discussion below.

### **Hydrodynamics and Sediment Transport**

Tessa provided an overview of Hydrodynamics and Sediment Transport, which are discussed in Sections 3.1, 4.1, and 5.1 (Slides 13 through 17).

### **Navigation**

Tessa provided an overview of Navigation, which is discussed in Sections 3.2, 4.2, and 5.2 (Slides 18 through 20).

*Question: Does dredging harm salmon recovery and would a sediment wall or other protections to protect the yacht area reduce the need for dredging?*

*Response: Dredging during prescriptive in-water work windows would minimize effects to salmon. Various types of mitigation to potentially redirect sediment deposition were considered, but long-term management dredging was determined to be the most effective way to avoid impacts to navigation in Budd Inlet.*

*Question: Does the sediment management plan envision that all dredged sediments over the 30-year plan would be deposited within the lake/estuary area? What about navigation dredging spoils?*

*Response: All materials dredged during construction would be beneficially reused to construct habitat and improve ecological diversity. After construction, sediment dredged for the Managed Lake would primarily be taken to an upland site for disposal although there may be some opportunity for reuse onsite (described in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS). Sediment dredged from*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 7, 2020

Time: 9 to 11 a.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

---

*West Bay under the Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives is assumed to be disposed of at an approved open water location.*

*Question: Wouldn't the previous dredging episodes have already disturbed any cultural resources?*

*Response: The area of maintenance dredging under the Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives (West Bay only) is different than the area of construction dredging (Middle and North basins). This is described in more detail in Chapter 2 and in Section 4.2.*

## Water Quality

Tessa provided an overview of Water Quality, which is discussed in Sections 3.3, 4.3, and 5.3 (Slides 21 through 24).

*Question: Can you speak to the level of consultation and coordination with Ecology regarding water quality in Budd Inlet and Ecology's total maximum daily load (TMDL) findings?*

*Response: There is ongoing consultation with Ecology on specific technical topics through their role as a Technical Work Group member. Ecology also had an opportunity to review the methodology for the water quality analysis, like the 3<sup>rd</sup> party review.*

## Aquatic Invasive Species

Tessa provided an overview of Aquatic Invasive Species, which are discussed in Sections 3.4, 4.4, and 5.4 (Slides 25 through 27).

## Fish & Wildlife

Karmen provided an overview of Fish and Wildlife, which are discussed in Sections 3.5, 4.5, and 5.5 (Slides 29 through 31).

*Question: Does the Draft EIS evaluate biodiversity under the alternatives?*

*Response: The EIS did address habitat functions and their ability to support fish and wildlife, but it does not use the term "biodiversity."*

## Wetlands

Karmen provided an overview of Wetlands, which are discussed in Sections 3.6, 4.6, and 5.6 (Slides 32 through 33).

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** July 7, 2020

**Time:** 9 to 11 a.m.

**Location:** Zoom

**Topic:** Technical Work Group Meeting

---

## Air Quality and Odor

Karmen provided an overview of Air Quality and Odor, which are discussed in Sections 3.7, 4.7, and 5.7 (Slides 34 through 35).

## Land Use, Shorelines, and Recreation

Karmen provided an overview of Land Use, Shorelines, and Recreation, which are discussed in Sections 3.8, 4.8, and 5.8 (Slides 36 through 38).

## Cultural Resources

Karmen provided an overview of Cultural Resources, which are discussed in Sections 3.9, 4.9, and 5.9 (Slides 39 through 41).

## Visual Resources

Karmen provided an overview of Visual Resources, which are discussed in Sections 3.10, 4.10, and 5.10 (Slides 43 through 48).

## Environmental Health

Karmen provided an overview of Environmental Health, which are discussed in Sections 3.11, 4.11, and 5.11 (Slides 50 through 51).

## Transportation

Karmen provided an overview of Transportation, which are discussed in Sections 3.12, 4.12, and 5.12 (Slides 52 through 54).

## Public Services and Utilities

Karmen provided an overview of Public Services and Utilities, which are discussed in Sections 3.13, 4.13, and 5.13 (Slides 55 through 56).

## Economics

Karmen provided an overview of Economics, which are discussed in Sections 3.14, 4.14, and 5.14 (Slides 57 through 59).

*Question: Will this presentation be made available on the project website?*

*Response: The presentation will be posted on the project website following the meeting.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 7, 2020

Time: 9 to 11 a.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Technical Work Group Meeting

---

## *Construction Impacts*

Tessa discussed the duration of construction, significant impacts, and mitigation of the action alternatives as described in Chapters [2.0](#) and [5.0](#) (Slides 61 through 63).

*Question: Is there any other federal agency involved in permitting besides the US Army Corps of Engineers?*

*Response: Yes, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would be the primary federal permitting agency.*

## *Planning-Level Cost Estimates*

Tessa provided an overview of the planning-level cost estimate provided in [Chapter 7](#) (Slide 65). Planning-level costs include estimates for design, permitting, and construction; and then sediment management over 30 years after construction. Planning-level cost estimates are based on conceptual design and reflect an accuracy variation of -25 to +35%.

[Chapter 7](#) also includes a recommendation from the Funding and Governance Work Group around the potential allocation for these costs. The table also notes potential impacts if there is a lapse in funding after construction. The final column provides potential significant additional costs not associated with construction and maintenance dredging.

Tessa recommended the TWG members read [Chapter 7](#) for a full understanding of the cost estimates shown here.

## *EIS Project Timeline and Outreach*

Ray provided a reminder on the EIS Project Timeline (Slide 67). He reminded the TWG that the comment period extends through August 13. **[Following this meeting the comment period was extended through August 29, 2021.]** The Final EIS is expected in 2022, pending additional analyses required.

Ray also overviewed opportunities to comment and learn more.

*Question: Who chooses the preferred alternative?*

*Response: The process is described in detail in [Chapter 1](#). Enterprise Services will identify the preferred alternative using established criteria that incorporates findings of the EIS and feedback from Tribes, Work Groups, and stakeholders.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** July 7, 2020

**Time:** 9 to 11 a.m.

**Location:** Zoom

**Topic:** Technical Work Group Meeting

---

*Comment: I appreciate the opportunity today and at future presentations to ask questions ahead of the comment due date. The EIS represents an impressive amount of work. Thank you to the team.*

*Question: What is the length of time that the public has to speak at the public hearing?*

*Response: 3 minutes per person.*

## ***Adjourn***

Ray reminded everyone of the comment duration period and the various ways to submit comments formally. Carrie thanked the group for attending and adjourned the meeting.