



# CAPITOL LAKE — DESCHUTES ESTUARY

Long-Term Management Project Environmental Impact Statement

## Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

### Meeting Participants

#### *Executive Work Group Members*

- Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
- E. J. Zita, Port of Olympia
- Tye Menser, Thurston County
- Kristin Swenddal, DNR
- Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater
- Lisa Parshley, LOTT Clean Water Alliance
- Cheryl Selby, City of Olympia

#### *Department of Enterprise Services*

- Carrie Martin
- Ann Larson
- Linda Kent

#### *EIS Consultants/Facilitators*

- Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
- Ray Outlaw, Floyd|Snider
- Jessi Massingale, Floyd|Snider
- Karmen Martin, ESA

#### *Observers from Funding and Governance Work Group Members*

- Sam Gibboney, Port of Olympia
- Rich Hoey, City of Olympia

#### *Observers*

- Dave Peeler
- Steve Shanewise
- Michael Pires

### Meeting Notes Summary

#### *Welcome and Introductions*

Ann Larson welcomed everyone and thanked the Executive Work Group (EWG) members for the time commitment and support of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Carrie Martin

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

then introduced the members of the EIS Project Team: Tessa Gardner-Brown, Ray Outlaw, Karmen Martin, and Jessi Massingale.

Jessi provided a quick overview of the [plan for the meeting](#) and noted there would be designated pauses to allow EWG members to ask questions and encouraged them to also use the chat feature. 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 determined the lowest water levels would typically occur in the day in summer and the night in winter.

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

## *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.

He then paused for questions relating to the slides thus far.

*Question: In the diagrams, it doesn't show the boardwalk that parallels the railroad tracks. Is that just because of the scale of the diagrams or was it the intent to take that out? That's something you might just want to clarify in the document or presentation.*

*Response: Are you speaking to the existing boardwalk? (Yes) It's because those don't change, so we haven't overlaid any work over it. Those would remain as they are today.*

*Question: I am interested in hearing your reasons for not going with a freshwater lake, so I hope you can cover that at some point during the presentation.*

*Response: The analysis that led us to a saltwater reflecting pool, which we believe best meets project goals and performed the best relative to objective criteria, is provided as [Attachment 19 of the Draft EIS](#), so you can see that reasoning there if we don't get to it in the level of detail you were hoping for today.*

*Question: I was also going to ask about the hybrid lake. As I recall, part of the analysis indicated that filling the lake with freshwater would be problematic because of growing demands for freshwater in the area.*

*Response: Yes, thank you for that comment, and we do describe that in better detail in the Draft EIS relative to the public interest test and the review by Ecology that would be required to use groundwater for a freshwater lake.*

*Question: In using the dredge spoils to help with construction of any of the alternatives—is there a concern for continued invasive species being a problem in any of these alternatives, and some of the chemicals that might be in there, for example that came out of the brewery a year ago?*

*Response: We do describe that in [Chapter 2.0](#). Based on the existing conditions and consultation with the regulatory agencies we understand that beneficial reuse is allowable within the Basin, recognizing that there would still be invasive species within those materials. There could also be a reduction in invasive species from the construction process.*

## *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.

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

## 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: In your flooding analysis, you did consider sea level rise, right?*

*Response: We did, yes, based on the City of Olympia sea-level response plan.*

*Question: I think I heard disposal/reuse of dredged material would only occur in the Middle and North Basins. Is that correct?*

*Response: The disposal (or “beneficial reuse”) of dredged material during construction would occur within the Middle and North Basin. There could be some offsite export of dredged material under the Estuary or Hybrid Alternatives but yes, the reuse would be in the basins.*

*Question: Did you consider any reuse along the shoreline of West Bay, and your sediment modeling only considered the status quo condition of the West Bay shoreline? There may be opportunity for sediment placement there.*

*Response: The modeling did assume the status quo condition of West Bay, correct. We did not assume placement of the material dredged during construction outside of the basin based on conversations we had with the Technical Work Group and resource agencies.*

*Question: Would dredging still be needed for the Managed Lake because it’s still getting 1.7 inches per year, but it will be more spread out. Is that correct?*

*Response: Yes. Maintenance dredging would occur under the Managed Lake in the North Basin only, at about a 20-year frequency. We didn’t show it on the Navigation slide because there would be no maintenance dredging in West Bay as a project action under the Managed Lake. Dredging by the Port of Olympia and marinas would still need to occur as they do today.*

*Comment: Thank you. I’ll end with a statement that I’m hearing out in the community that the Managed Lake won’t need to dredge West Bay. That’s technically not true.*

*Question: Did you model the idea of a jetty being constructed out partially into the West Bay area to push that sediment way from the marinas and avoid the frequent dredging that would needed there?*

## Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

*Response: We did and that's described in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS and also in [Attachment 5: Hydrodynamics and Sediment Transport Discipline Report](#). We did conclude that, after reviewing all the potential mitigation measures that could be constructed, that the most effective method for ensuring continuing navigation in the West Bay is maintenance dredging and annual sediment monitoring.*

*Question: When you were estimating dredge volumes, you were actually showing amounts that were greater than the deposition rate for some of the alternatives. Am I reading that correctly?*

***Response: The project team reviewed these data and responded via email following the meeting – see below. The calculations in the Draft EIS were determined to be correct.***

*We see that there may be confusion stemming from the wording in Table 2.3.4, specifically, the row labeled “approximate recurring dredge quantity” could have been better labeled “approximate dredge quantity over the 30-year project time horizon.” This row is intended to provide the projected dredge volume over 30 years, which is less than the rate of sediment deposition over 30 years, assuming an average deposition of 35,000 cubic yards each year.*

*The dredge volume is slightly less than the potential sediment deposition because some sediment would settle in the South and Middle Basins, and those areas would not be dredged under any of the alternatives. And under the Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives, some sediment would deposit in the North Basin and along the western shoreline of West Bay, and those areas would not be dredged either.*

*For more detail on the anticipated volume of sediment removed during long-term maintenance dredging for the Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives, refer to Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS.*

*Question: Regarding greenhouse gases, how does this align with the regional climate mitigation stated goals in almost all jurisdictions in Thurston County since this basin or lake exists within our region and the fact that we have heard from our consultants with very little wiggle room that sequestration is going to be critical for especially our 2050 goals that we likely won't reach them. Did you put that into the process in your consideration?*

*Response: We looked at Thurston County's climate action plan and considered how the alternatives would align with those goals and objectives. And I would point you to the air quality section where we talk about it, but my recollection is we do state that the Estuary, and Hybrid Alternative to a lesser extent, are more in line with the goals of the climate action plan due to the fact that they are expected to sequester more soil carbon.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

## 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: In your dissolved oxygen water quality analysis, did you also consider the impacts of increasing temperatures with climate change?*

*Response: The water quality analysis does have a discussion related to potential impacts from climate change and that's best captured in [Attachment 7: Water Quality Discipline Report](#).*

*Question: Could you explain why you think there's a difference between your conclusions regarding the impact of removing the dam on the water quality in Budd Inlet versus some of the earlier Ecology work.*

*Response: Both Ecology and this analysis assume that there is an improvement to dissolved oxygen levels in Budd Inlet as a result of the estuary. Both analyses note there would be continued violations of water quality standards in the critical months related to dissolved oxygen. The difference is that under SEPA, the State Environmental Policy Act, when there are data gaps or uncertainties, it directs the proponent, the lead agency, to look at a worst-case scenario and in this case worst case means lower levels of water quality improvement. That is what is reflected in the analysis. But there is alignment that there would be improvement. It's just that this analysis describes the potentially smaller level of improvement than what Ecology has predicted.*

## 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).

*Question: Olympia's sea level rise plan actually has some actions that will be building up the east side of West Bay to help address flooding. Was that considered?*

*Response: I believe the answer is no, it did not include flood mitigation measures that could happen in West Bay, or the berm that is proposed to be constructed in Heritage Park. That wasn't incorporated into the modeling. The flood maps show flooding that would occur without those measures being implemented. I believe if you look at [Attachment 5 Hydrodynamics and Sediment Transport Discipline Report for more information](#) there is a footnote that explains this in more detail.*

## 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).

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

*Question: Regarding fish and wildlife—specifically salmonids—I heard you characterizing the history of the basin and the nature of the runs. Is there language in the EIS that further characterizes the legal history, and the characterization of the salmon runs relative to their status, if you will, as far as protected natural resources. I ask this because some people tend to think hatchery fish or introduced runs are not the same as native runs in terms of the law. How is that aspect characterized in the EIS?*

*Response: We did not get into a legal analysis in the EIS. We do talk about the fact that salmon in the basin are largely of hatchery origin but of course there are likely wild, native salmon that enter the basin and move up Percival Creek.*

*Comment: I would just add that there are not likely, there ARE salmon that move up Percival Creek. I've seen them, so I know they're there.*

## Wetlands

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

## 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).

*Comment: One of the things that wasn't discussed was that the current lake does periodically have some pretty offensive odors. I don't know if that was covered somewhere but that's certainly something I've observed over time.*

## 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).

*Question: When we're talking about historical and cultural values, I'm having difficulty with—how do you value something that was built in 1949 versus something that's been there for thousands and thousands of years in terms of the weight for historical importance? I'm just having difficulty and I think the community will need to know if the Managed Lake is partly kept because*

## Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

*of cultural impact when you weigh those 70 years versus thousands. I'm just having difficulty with how you're going to value that.*

*Response: That's always a challenge. The role of the SEPA document is to disclose and identify impacts (and benefits for this project), benefits are a really important part of this EIS. SEPA doesn't try and balance those values. So, we disclose them and ultimately the decision-maker weighs this when they look to identify a preferred alternative and select an alternative for implementation.*

*Our historic resource lead, as part of this analysis, prepared historic property inventories of structures that would be affected by project alternatives. The Deschutes Basin Project relates to what the state legislature established back in 1937, it's the overall design of the basin, which was informed by Wilder and White and the Olmstead Brother's design work and included developing the dam, the bridge, and Deschutes Parkway. Our historic expert determined that this area, which is referred to as the Des Chutes Basin Project, appears eligible for listing in the National Register for Historic Places. That doesn't mean it is eligible for listing. It would need to be reviewed by the state Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and they would then determine if it is eligible. He evaluated the basin, and the dam, and other structures based on criteria used to evaluate historic structures and areas to come up with eligibility recommendations that the state would then review.*

*Question: There's no sponsor, per se? Or anybody that's requested it, is what you're saying?*

*Response: No. As part of this undertaking it was important to understand the potential historic integrity so that the team could make determinations of potential significance. There will be a formal process once the EIS is complete and once an alternative is selected to continue to do intensive level surveys and other research to determine eligibility.*

*Question: If the dam was listed, would that affect the ability to change that area?*

*Response: No. Generally the fact that a historic resource is determined eligible doesn't mean you can't do anything. It just means there is probably going to be some mitigation attached to that. Whether it's just documentation or some other types of mitigation to preserve the history.*

*Comment: An important cultural value that was not included in the analysis and will be a comment I make is the falls plummeting directly into a saltwater body, that's a pretty rare thing. In fact, it might be the only place in the state where that happens. I think that is part of the reason why it has significant cultural value and would probably even have tourism value. I think that's an important consideration that wasn't discussed in the report.*

*Comment: I'm just intrigued that we could designate a historical district based only on since settlers came here who happened to be white and not cultures that have been here for thousands of years. How are they going to determine that sort of historical designation? I'm having difficulty.*



## Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

*The lake versus having falls go straight into a saltwater basin is a cultural thing as well. And I'm just having difficulty because it would be a shame if the action that has been chosen by the EIS gets held up because of this.*

*Response: I would refer you to the cultural resource section of the EIS and for sure we would welcome any comments you have on the Draft EIS related to that. Our cultural leads can take a closer look at your comments and questions.*

*Question: The last bullet on the Cultural Resources slide said something about the Hybrid would reduce loss of the existing reflecting pool to less than significant levels. I don't really understand what that means.*

*Response: It was really hard to encapsulate some of these conclusions in these slides, but it relates to our last conversation about the potential new historic district, the Des Chutes Basin Project. What that bullet is saying is because the Hybrid would retain a smaller reflecting pool, it wouldn't have that significant of an impact with the removal of the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Dam. The Hybrid, in effect, would mitigate that effect relative to the Estuary Alternative.*

*Comment: I would just say that I would object to a dam being eligible for preservation or enhanced protection based on historical value in any circumstance. I think that's ludicrous.*

*Question: It seems like a conflict that the consultant is triggering a historic district designation review where there is not currently one to review. Are my sensibilities off base?*

*Response: We definitely hear the concern here and it will be helpful to receive this input in the Draft EIS comment letters. For the analysis to consider potential impacts on historic resources, it does require us to understand baseline conditions. So we reviewed potential historic resources in the project area (against prescriptive eligibility criteria). The analysis does note that the area itself is also historically and culturally significant (and that the historic estuary could be restored under the Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives). We definitely want to describe this sufficiently, please share your comments after reviewing these sections in the EIS and the associated discipline report.*

***Response: The EIS Project Team followed up via email with additional details on this topic – see below.***

*The work of the EIS Project Team was typical of SEPA EIS evaluations, and especially on projects that involve community and stakeholder interest in the historic context and potential impacts of a proposal.*

*In order for the analysis to consider potential impacts on historic resources, the EIS Project Team needed to identify the presence of any previously unevaluated historic resources and to understand the potential eligibility of resources that could be affected by the project. Potential*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

*historic resources were identified through a field survey and then the resources and associated characteristics were evaluated against specific criteria and aspects of integrity established by the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Based on the criteria, several resources were recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP. (The phrase “recommended eligible” means that they appear to meet the criteria for eligibility, but doesn’t suggest a position of advocacy by Enterprise Services or the EIS Project Team.) The EIS Project Team was then able to analyze potential impacts to those resources from construction and operation of the long-term management alternatives.*

*The Draft EIS and associated [Cultural Resources Discipline Report](#) provides the following important context when describing potential impacts, for example:*

*If the Des Chutes Basin Project Historic District is determined eligible for listing, this work would permanently diminish the integrity of the resource’s essential physical features such that the resource is no longer able to convey its significance for which it is potentially eligible for listing in a historic register and would be a significant adverse impact. The return of the estuary due to this work would re-establish pre-Des Chutes Basin Project tidelands and estuary functions associated with historic use patterns of the estuary.*

*The final determinations of eligibility will be made by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). This often happens during a SEPA process and must happen before permitting is complete. Enterprise Services will convey this discussion to DAHP and highlight the attempt of the Draft EIS to recognize the estuary’s pre-5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Dam significance in order to achieve a more balanced and complete history of the Capitol Lake – Deschutes Estuary.*

*As clarified in the meeting, an eligibility recommendation and/or determination does not preclude an agency from impacting a historic resource, so long as consultation occurs with DAHP and affected parties.*

## 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).

*Comment: I don’t know if it was intentional or not but—my understanding of the hybrid alternative was to create this reflecting pool. But you’ve essentially, with both the Hybrid and Estuary Alternatives, put an island right in the spot where that reflection occurs. It’s just kind of an awkward location for that island. The other thing I would note is that the visual representation shows trees growing on these islands and if it is indeed a saltwater environment, I think it’s unlikely trees are going to be able to grow there. I would add that from Tumwater’s perspective, of course, the saltwater—we know that, historically, the brewery had barge access and a lot of*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

*the trees that have grown up over the years in the wetland areas back there, weren't there historically. That was tideflat as well. So, that would really open up the ability to see the historic structures from the Tumwater Historical Park side of the river. And of course, similarly allow vistas out from those structures as well. I do think those are important observations that are not included in that analysis, and we'll try to make a comment about that.*

*Question: I would add, I was thinking about the wall. You raise an interesting point about the separating wall. But doesn't that depend on the height of the wall. It seems like if you only make the wall just barely above the current lake height then you don't end up with that visual impedance that you're showing. Is there a reason why you made it a little bit higher? Is that for flood protection purposes? What drove that design to make that pretty significant wall?*

*Response: There are a number of reasons for the height. One, obviously, it creates a separation between the reflecting pool and the rest of the estuary so that you don't have over-topping water. Also, because there would be a multimodal trail on top of the barrier wall. There are also safety and structural considerations.*

*Comment: I agree that if it's as tall as you're proposing it would be an interesting visual. I mean, it will be a dominant visual feature from the Deschutes Parkway as well. I hadn't really thought of that in that context. It would look pretty ugly, frankly, based on the diagram unless you did something to make it more aesthetically pleasing.*

## 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).

*Comment: The regional trails plan provides for a trail across the South Basin, connecting the Olympia Woodland Trail with the Tumwater-Deschutes Valley Trail, which is now completed through at least part of the Tumwater Falls Park area. I realize it's not part of the proposal, but it does seem that it should be mentioned at least in the report if not as a project that someone else will be doing eventually. It's an important trail connection. It also should provide access to the south and east side of the South Basin, which would provide for recreational opportunities as well as the ability to better patrol those areas than currently exist.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

## 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).

*Comment: You should note that we do have a lift station on the south side of the South Basin. I don't think it would be significantly impacted but there is a lift station there as well as a major sewer interceptor that parallels the railroad tracks in the South Basin. Those are two pieces of utilities that were not described in the report that probably should be included. Again, we will try to make a comment and just point out where those are for you.*

## Economics

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

*Comment: I noticed that you describe that there's no difference between the alternatives as far as mosquitos go. I'm wondering how you reach that conclusion since mosquitos don't breed in saltwater. In contrast, I would say, earlier you noted that there would be an effect on the population of bats that use the lake for feeding, well, what exactly would they be feeding on other than mosquitos. If you're going to have an effect on bats, but you're not going to have an effect on mosquitos, it sounds like there is an inconsistency there. You can't really have it both ways.*

*Response: I would have to look back at that section of the EIS but my recollection is that it describes how mosquitos are pervasive in urban environments. There are some mosquito species that do actually breed in brackish environments. There would still be pockets of freshwater in the basin. I would point you to the Environmental Health section to see how it was described. It was described in more detail than what we presented here today. I would suggest the same for the analysis of impacts to bats; to look at the Fish and Wildlife section to see how that was described.*

*Comment: The impact to LOTT, financially, should be at least noted, because LOTT's already at 2 to 3 times lower standards than any other discharger into Puget Sound. I think it should be highlighted at a much higher level economically because if our standards go even lower, I'm not sure how far LOTT can go and still discharge. And the impact of that is not in the hundreds of millions, it's in the billions of dollars. It's \$3 to \$4 billion to have a community like ours make alternatives to discharge our water treatment.*

*Response: Thank you for your feedback. We welcome LOTT's comments on the Draft EIS with those specific kinds of details.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

## *Construction*

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).

## *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 recommends that the EWG members read [Chapter 7](#) for a full understanding of the cost estimates shown here.

*Question: First of all, if we don't have a chance to say it, I want to say, what an incredible document and an amazing analysis of a wide range of topics. Good work, overall. We're really picking at the edges here from what I'm seeing. The big thing in the cost that concerns me, is that you have tried to reduce the cost of some of the alternatives by essentially moving the sediment around in the basin. My concern is, we know those sediments are eventually going to get moved out into the bay. Does that in essence transfer that cost from a capital cost, which hopefully will be largely borne by the state and federal government, to a long-term management cost that will likely be borne largely by local governments and local residents of the area. From an engineering perspective I understand you are trying to minimize capital costs and it makes a lot of sense, but I think from a finance perspective that's going to make it much more expensive long-term to the local area. I'm concerned about that. I'm not sure how to address it or if there should be an analysis done that looks at that in more detail in the final document. But it seems like an important consideration from a financing point of view that I think we really need to peel open a little bit more.*

*Response: Our numerical modeling didn't show that transfer. We did conduct the numerical modeling with the habitat islands and looked at deposition and erosion. Definitely submit that comment on the Draft EIS and we can look into it further.*

*Question: It looks like the most expensive dredging costs for the Estuary is still less than the cheapest option for the Managed Lake?*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

*Response: That's correct based on our existing assumptions and analysis.*

*Question: If I recall there are also federal funds potentially available for the long-term maintenance dredging.*

*Response: That's also what we understand, yes.*

## ***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.

Ann closed by saying that they assume community members and organizations will want to submit comments endorsing a specific alternative. That feedback is welcome and will be incorporated into the document. Ann also reminded the EWG that there will be another step after the comment period where Enterprise Services will be soliciting input from key stakeholders on which alternative could be supported. It is not a voting process. The decision-making process was developed to avoid the stalemates that have occurred in the past. Neither short- or long-term strategy can be implemented without completing this EIS. This information is in Section 1.12 of the Draft EIS.

## ***Public Comment***

One member of the public attempted to comment but was unable to be heard by the group due to technical difficulties. That comment was submitted electronically and is included below.

*Comment: Hybrid Pool*

*I hope that everyone now understands that the criteria used in the Measured Evaluation Process to choose the saltwater pool over a freshwater pool have been disproven or are at least in dispute. 1)The water permit necessary to use the artesian flows would not be difficult to get; 2) There is plenty of water available to maintain a freshwater lake; 3) A management plan to maintain water quality would be required for both saltwater or freshwater options, and the freshwater option would probably be more successful. Therefore, the choice of a saltwater pool over a freshwater pool needs to be rescinded, and the MEP should be done over.*

*And remember, NO ONE has stated on record that they want a saltwater pool in the Hybrid basin, but many people commented in favor of a freshwater pool during the Scoping process, and many, many more will within the DEIS comments. If the DEIS continues to evaluate and recommend the saltwater pool over a freshwater pool in the Hybrid Alternative it is doomed to failure.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

Date: July 12, 2021

Time: 1:00-3:00 pm

Location: Zoom

Topic: Executive Work Group

---

## *Hybrid Wall*

*Said to be 18' to 25' high in DEIS; current average depth of lake is about 6'; Mayor Kmet's comment that the wall seems a little large is an understatement.*

## *Heritage Designation for dam*

*Kudos to everyone who spoke up and said WTF; as someone said, this idea is completely absurd.*

## ***Adjourn***

Ray asked the group if they had any final comments.

*Comment: You have done careful and thorough analyses of all these areas. Tricky questions. You anticipated questions that we didn't even think of. And you've got independent third-party review. Really terrific job. And thank you for this really clear and useful briefing. And for a terrific public process, which is ongoing.*

*Comment: I want to echo others. I've read through this and I have a lot more reading to do because this is a lot of work. This is very well done. And I agree, we've been picking at the edges. I appreciate you listening to us and this hard work and wow. Way to go. A lot of people weren't sure we'd get here in this community so nice work.*

Carrie and Tessa thanked the group for attending and for their closing comments. Carrie adjourned the meeting.