



CAPITOL LAKE – DESCHUTES ESTUARY

Long-Term Management Project Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting Summary

Date: November 1, 2022

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Community Sounding Board Meeting

Meeting Participants

Community Sounding Board Members in Attendance

- Joel Hansen
- Clara Hard
- Jack Havens (alternate for Bob Wubbena)
- Jeanette Laffoon
- Doug Mah
- Alanna Matteson
- Chris McCabe
- Allen Miller
- Cory Miller
- David Nicandri
- Sue Patnude
- Drew Phillips
- Kathi Rafferty
- Stuart Reed
- Alicia Rose
- Nancy Stevenson
- Jenny Wilson
- Nancy Zabel

Community Sounding Board Members not in Attendance

- Jack Mongin
- Gretchen Nicholas
- Steve Shanewise
- Robyn Wagoner
- Bob Wubbena
- Bruce York

Department of Enterprise Services

- Bill Frare
- Carrie Martin

EIS Project Team

- Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
- Karmen Martin, ESA
- Sarah Reich, ECONorthwest
- Susan Hayman, Ross Strategic
- Tori Bahe, Ross Strategic

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: Nov. 1, 2022

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Community Sounding Board Meeting

Meeting Notes Summary

Welcome, Introductions, and Noteworthy Items

Bill Frare, Washington Department of Enterprise Services (Enterprise Services/DES) welcomed and thanked the Community Sounding Board (CSB) members for their attendance and engagement throughout this whole journey. Bill noted that the Decision Durability exercise conducted with the CSB last year helped to inform the identification of the preferred alternative. He noted other specific contributions that supported the alternatives analysis, including feedback regarding recreation in the project area, and identification of locations for visual simulations.

Bill then called on project team members to introduce themselves.

Susan Hayman, facilitator, reviewed the meeting agenda and noted that towards the end of the meeting there would be an opportunity for CSB members to provide overall reflections and for the public to provide comments.

The CSB presentation closely mirrors the presentation given to the Executive Work Group and Funding & Governance Work Group (FGWG) and is not repeated here. The Executive Work Group meeting recording has details for each section of the presentation and can be accessed on the [project website](#). The CSB [presentation](#), with slide numbers referenced throughout this summary, is available on the project website. The summary below captures key information and CSB member questions and comments.

Description of the Preferred Alternative

Tessa Gardener-Brown noted that the Estuary Alternative is the Preferred Alternative and reviewed major aspects of the alternative, including maintenance dredging, and how the preferred alternative was identified (see [11:01 of the Working Group Recorded Presentation](#)).

Additional information can be found at the following links:

- Slide 6: [Final EIS Supporting Chapter 2.0](#)
- Slide 7: [Final EIS Supporting Chapter 4.0 \(Section 4.2\)](#)
- Slide 8: [Final EIS Summary](#)
- Slide 9: [Final EIS Attachment 14](#)
- Slides 10, 11, and 12: [Final EIS Attachment 21](#)

Key Findings and Updates in the Final EIS

Karmen Martin reviewed the key findings and updates in the Final EIS including modifications to the alternatives based on Draft EIS public comments and discipline specific updates (see [25:55 of the Working Group Recorded Presentation](#)). Karmen noted that the main modifications included

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: Nov. 1, 2022

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Community Sounding Board Meeting

a revised 5th Avenue Bridge design for the Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives to avoid a long-term closure of 5th Avenue, and consideration of a groundwater-fed freshwater pool only for the Hybrid Alternative. Karmen noted the top five discipline specific updates were related to navigation, water quality, aquatic invasive species, cultural resources, and fish and wildlife.

Additional information can be found at the following links:

- Slide 14: [Final EIS Supporting Chapter 2.0](#)
- Slide 15: [Final EIS Supporting Chapter 4.0 \(Sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4\)](#)
- Slide 16: [Final EIS Supporting Chapter 4.0 \(Sections 4.5 and 4.9\)](#)

Question: *Would there be any period when the 5th Avenue Bridge would not be available/accessible with the new, revised design?*

Response: *There will be a short-term closure of approximately 1 month during the road connection period at the bridge ends. This short-term closure is similar to the estimated closure in the Managed Lake Alternative.*

Comment: *I am concerned that if the sediment removal does not go according to plan, there will be impacts. Sediment removal is important, what happens if funding lapses?*

Response: *It's recognized in the EIS that maintenance dredging and monitoring are key to avoiding significant impacts related to sediment deposition in West Bay. The EIS findings were predicated on funding for dredging during the 30-year evaluation period. The concern raised here was also a concern the team heard in the Draft EIS comments and from project stakeholders. In response to these concerns, the team modeled scenarios where dredging is delayed (due to funding lapses or other reasons).*

Comment: *It is inspiring to see that the new 5th Avenue Bridge will utilize the Deschutes Parkway. The Parkway is an underused corridor and this will help create a link from the West side to Tumwater instead of directing people through downtown Olympia. I am happy with this.*

Response: *The team wants to thank the City of Olympia team for their suggestion of the Deschutes Parkway Roundabout, allowing for more connectivity.*

MOU for Shared Funding and Governance

Sarah Reich presented on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for shared funding and governance and noted the FGWG initial recommendations and shared benefits (see [35:25 of the Working Group Recorded Presentation](#)). Sarah provided an overview of the MOU's shared governance and funding approaches.

Additional information can be found at the following links:

- Slides 19 and 20: [Final EIS Supporting Chapter 7.0](#)

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: Nov. 1, 2022

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Community Sounding Board Meeting

- Slides 21 and 22: [Final EIS Attachment 23](#)

Question: *Is it accurate that the maintenance dredging for the preferred alternative is dependent on sustained funding from the State legislature? If so, how do the Decision Durability results address continued statewide/legislative support? The preferred alternative is not a fully funded project and there are a lot of unknowns that may not go according to plan.*

Response: *The MOU represents a strong statement of local support to move forward toward a binding Interlocal Agreement and outlines shared funding (not just state) that would be provided for maintenance dredging. Additionally, the MOU notes a two-part process. First, the state would fund the design, permitting, and construction of the preferred alternative. Then, once construction is completed, the entities would share the funding needs for maintenance dredging and deposit funds on an annual basis after construction funding, beginning once construction funds had been allocated.*

Comment: *It is important to note that the MOU is non-binding.*

Response: *One thing that we heard from the FGWG is that these signatures are meaningful. Signatories did not sign the MOU unless there was good faith to move forward, and this represents their commitment to move forward to a binding agreement. The team encourages members to read the MOU for additional details.*

Question: *What is the timing for the Interlocal Agreement?*

Response: *There is no deadline for the Interlocal Agreement, but it will come during design and permitting. The FGWG has discussed beginning the process to negotiate the Interlocal Agreement in 2023.*

Comment: *One of my primary concerns is the uncertainty when it comes to long-term funding.*

Comment: *The community has waited over 30 years for dredging. It is possible that the entities involved may drag their feet regardless of the community's commitment.*

Comment: *In the MOU, the writers anticipate some of the predicaments that we are discussing regarding entities moving forward in good faith. As we move forward, it would be good for us to understand the best way to ensure full funding for construction.*

Response: *The State can receive funds from a range of sources. Once funds are received, the FGWG will begin to deposit annual payments. If an entity decides to withdraw, they are responsible for paying the full amount committed to in the MOU. These payments ensure that the stream of benefits will continue once the project is implemented. Also, in response to a question about the term of the MOU, the MOU does not have a term and is a bridging document to the Interlocal Agreement.*

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: Nov. 1, 2022

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Community Sounding Board Meeting

Overview of Next Project Phases

Carrie Martin provided an overview of the project's next phases including design and permitting, estuary restoration, and the timeline (see [44:43 of the Working Group Recorded Presentation](#)).

Additional information can be found at the following links:

- Slides 24, 25, and 26: [Final EIS Supporting Chapter 7.0](#)

Question: *When will the remediation of toxics in the sediment occur and how long will it take?*

Response: *The remediation effort is being led by the Port of Olympia and they are currently looking at remedial designs. The team anticipates that remedial design could take 2-3 years and involve pursuing funds from a range of sources. The actual remedial phase would take a couple of years and is expected to happen before the removal of the 5th Avenue dam.*

Question: *How much of a capital request did DES make yesterday?*

Response: *The decision on whether to move forward with the preferred alternative is still being considered by Enterprise Services in accordance with SEPA timing requirements. Enterprise Services has put in a placeholder for its capital request. The Office of Financial Management is aware of the SEPA timeline and is standing by for an update once Enterprise Services has made an official decision pending a seven-day wait period.*

Closing Comments from the Community Sounding Board

Susan provided an opportunity for each CSB member to provide overall feedback on the process.

Comment: I am thrilled with the preferred alternative. I know there are questions on uncertainty in the future but we understand and are here to support and make the preferred alternative a reality. Also I want to compliment DES and the whole EIS team for their level of detail and engagement.

Comment: I appreciate this thorough process. Initially I supported the Hybrid option but through this process have accepted and do support the estuary option. I will continue to share my support with my neighbors and friends.

Comment: I agree that the process was interesting and the team did an excellent job. The timeline is long but I am glad that I was included in this process.

Comment: I agree with other members that the process was thorough, and I appreciated the transparency. The preferred alternative is not necessarily my preference but I respect the process that we took. One concern that I still have is about the funding and effect this project will have on West Bay.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: Nov. 1, 2022

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Community Sounding Board Meeting

Comment: I am curious about the State Capitol Committee and their involvement in this, and the capital request. Also some historians still argue that the Capitol Lake area is a historic area and should be protected. There could potentially be litigation over this issue in the future.

Comment: I appreciate the work of DES and the EIS team for making this possible. I share the same concerns as other members in regard to the non-binding agreement as it is a set of tenuous and fragile ideas.

Comment: I echo the member's sentiments on the fragility of the proposed ideas. However, it has been a fascinating and thorough process. I am hopeful about coordination and cooperation of jurisdictions moving forward. I am also pleased there is real movement on the removal of legacy pollutions in West Bay.

Comment: I am feeling hopeful and know there is a long road ahead. I think there is beauty in estuaries and tidal mudflats, and I am excited for what is to come. I appreciate the facilitation and deep research during this process.

Comment: Thank you for including us in the process and appreciate the staff working with us through the technical questions on sediment deposition. As far as the EIS, I understand there is uncertainty and appreciate that the uncertainty was included in the EIS. There are some issues that I want to follow up on: first, the cost per slip in a no action alternative and second, dredging and the future funds. I think we can have the greatest plan in the world but there are still unknowns. As DES moves in design/permitting, we would like to stay engaged with the agency.

Comment: I appreciate the team and all the work that have been done. I am happy with the preferred alternative and will continue to promote getting funding at all levels. I appreciate the mindfulness and input of the Squaxin Tribe in their preference and scoring of the Estuary Alternative. If there is a renaming process, I think we should be mindful of the Tribe's history and allow them to rename.

Comment: I was stunned by the number of comments submitted on the Draft EIS, it is a positive sign that people are engaged. I hope to be able to see the influence of tidal action in the future.

Comment: I appreciate DES and the consultant team. You all were given a tough thing to work on. I think you did a good and creative job that took in varied opinions. One thing that I would caution is that this local project requires statewide support. We have incredible data but, in the end, you need to make a statewide appeal for the political process. Transportation has taken this approach and, for instance, articulated the state-wide impacts on climate change from local transportation proposals.

Comment: I remember the first meeting and the timeline that was proposed. I think the team delivered on those promises and I felt heard during this process.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: Nov. 1, 2022

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Topic: Community Sounding Board Meeting

Comment: It has been an amazing experience even through COVID. It was great to hear opposing views and enjoyed seeing us come to a common ground.

Comment: It has been fun to be part of this group and it has been a long time since our first meeting. I am grateful for the experts on the team.

Comment: I appreciated being part of this group and support the preferred alternative.

Comment: Thank you to everyone for this process. I hope that we can move forward with the preferred alternative.

After the CSB member comments, Carrie noted that Enterprise Services is on the November and December agenda with the State Capitol Committee.

Public Comment

Susan provided an opportunity for public comment and one public comment was given.

Comment: I want to thank the group for their work and understand it took a lot to get to this point. I appreciate your work and want to thank the CSB and the public for their involvement.

Adjourn

Susan thanked the group for their collaboration and participation during the CSB meetings and in between.

Carrie thanked the members for participating and sharing their insights throughout this whole process. She noted her appreciation and urged members to continue following this work in the coming years.