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- Welcome and Introductions
- Draft EIS Engagement Recap
- Summary of Comment Themes
- Preliminary Final EIS Focus Areas
- Preferred Alternative Identification Process
- Preferred Alternative Selection Criteria Weighting
- Stakeholder Input on Decision Durability
- Schedule Update
- Public Comment
Draft EIS Engagement Outcomes

868 TOTAL SUBMISSIONS

FEDERAL 1
TRIBES 2
ORGANIZATIONS & BUSINESSES 26
INDIVIDUALS 816

LOCAL 7
HEARING 12

25 MEETINGS & ACTIVITIES

TRIBAL BRIEFINGS 1
PUBLIC HEARING 1
OFFICE HOURS 5
STATE & LOCAL BRIEFINGS 9
STAKEHOLDER BRIEFINGS 9

326 PARTICIPANTS

Participants

1,306 UNIQUE VISITORS
2,083 TOTAL VISITS
8 E-NEWSLETTERS
4,438 AUDIENCE

*All data subject to change.
Many comments indicate alternative preference. All comments will be considered during decision-making, but these alternative preferences will not be tallied because voting is not part of a SEPA EIS process.
Preliminary Final EIS Focus Areas

- Water Quality
  - Evaluate potential compliance with state water quality standards and anticipated TMDL allocations

- Funding and Governance
  - Reconvene Funding and Governance Work Group to confirm long-term funding and governance approach

- Transportation
  - Consider opportunities to avoid long-term closure of 5th Avenue

- Cultural Resources
  - Coordinate with DAHP regarding historic eligibility of resources in the project area
  - Better describe significance of project area to tribes
Preliminary Final EIS Focus Areas — continued

Navigation
- Discuss potential impacts to navigation if funding is not available for long-term maintenance dredging

Public Services and Utilities
- Consider potential regulatory and financial impacts to LOTT and ratepayers given additional information provided

Inter-Agency Coordination
- Coordinate with regulatory agencies as needed to confirm assumptions (e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Ecology, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Natural Resources)
- NOTE: Formal engagement with US Army Corps of Engineers will occur when a permit application is submitted following the Final EIS and identification of a preferred alternative

Alternative Design
- Hybrid Alternative is likely to include a freshwater reflecting pool
What To Expect From the Final EIS

- Recognize all comments received on the Draft EIS
- Provide responses to substantive comments from the public, tribes, agencies, and organizations
- Include revisions based on public comment and new information
- Identify any additional mitigation plans and measures that would avoid, minimize, or compensate for significant impacts at a high level
- Identify a preferred alternative and proposed funding and governance approach
Preferred Alternative Identification Process

Draft EIS Selection Criteria
- Performance Against Project Goals
- Other Environmental Disciplines
- Environmental Sustainability
- Economic Sustainability
- Construction Impacts
- Decision Durability
  - Stakeholder input on which alternative(s) are most likely to achieve long-term support from local tribes, stakeholders, and the community
A preferred alternative can be identified defensibly once Enterprise Services has:

- **The Draft EIS as the body of technical work** that adequately discloses impacts and benefits
- **Comments on the Draft EIS** that inform whether additional technical work is needed, and an understanding of whether additional technical work may substantively change findings in the EIS
- **Input from engaged stakeholders** on which alternative could be supported as the preferred

SEPA gives the lead agency wide discretion with regard to when and how to identify the preferred alternative.

“If used, the preferred alternative can be identified at any time in the EIS process—scoping, draft EIS, or final EIS. When designated early in the process, it should be expected that changes are likely to occur to the preferred alternative prior to issuing the final EIS. Early designation of a preferred alternative in no way restricts the lead agency’s final decisions.”

# Criteria Weighting Feedback (May 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>EWG</th>
<th>TWG</th>
<th>CSB</th>
<th>Average Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Against Project Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Environmental Disciplines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Durability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Sustainability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Criteria Weighting Results (May 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>EWG</th>
<th>TWG</th>
<th>CSB</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Against Project Goals</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Environmental Disciplines</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Durability</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Sustainability</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: Criteria Weighting Feedback

- Is there a compelling reason to change this order or adjust the weighting? If so, why?

- We will be asking the same question at the TWG and CSB meetings

- Please submit additional feedback in writing (to Carrie) no later than Nov. 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>EWG Average</th>
<th>Overall Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Against Project Goals</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Environmental Disciplines</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Durability</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Sustainability</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Themes from Executive Work Group Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Squaxin Island Tribe</th>
<th>Tumwater City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Tribe has for many years advocated for the restoration of an estuary environment. It is quite clear from the available information that an estuary would be better for fish, better for water quality, function better as an ecosystem, and be better for the culture and lifeways of the Squaxin Island Tribe.”</td>
<td>“The Council was unanimous in support of one or both of the estuary alternatives (either a full estuary or hybrid alternative).”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTT Clean Water Alliance</th>
<th>Port of Olympia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“LOTT finds that the Estuary Alternative would provide the greatest benefit to water quality in Budd Inlet, and this is of greatest importance to LOTT and LOTT ratepayers.”</td>
<td>Comments did not indicate a Preferred Alternative preference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olympia City Council</th>
<th>Thurston County Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Olympia City Council formally requests that the Estuary Alternative be selected as the Preferred Alternative.”</td>
<td>Comments did not indicate a Preferred Alternative preference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions to solicit stakeholder feedback on decision durability:

• Please identify the level of support by you/the constituents that you represent for each alternative and why.
• What about each alternative INCREASES your/your constituencies' support of each alternative?
• What about each alternative DECREASES your/your constituencies' support of each alternative?

Discussions in early December with each EWG entity regarding feedback on these questions
Decision Durability Timeline (EWG)

- Nov. 9 – Dec. 16: Internal Decision Durability Discussions
- December 17: EWG Decision Durability Feedback Due
Approach to Complete Final EIS

**October 2021**
- Analyze comments on Draft EIS
- Develop scope and focus areas for Final EIS

**November 2021**
- Work Group meetings to review comment themes and Final EIS focus areas
- Begin ongoing agency-specific coordination to support Final EIS

**December 2021**
- Continue steps in Preferred Alternative identification process
- Solicit input from EWG on decision durability

**Early to mid-2022**
- Reconvene FGWG to identify long-term funding and governance
- Prepare Final EIS, including findings from FGWG

**Mid-2022**
- Issue Final EIS with Preferred Alternative and approach to funding and governance
Public Comment
Thank You!