



## Meeting Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

### Meeting Participants

#### *Work Group Members*

- Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
- Cynthia R. Pratt, LOTT Board Member
- E.J. Zita, Port of Olympia
- John Hutchings, Thurston County
- Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater
- Cheryl Selby, City of Olympia
- Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services

#### *Department of Enterprise Services*

- Debra Delzell

#### *EIS Consultants/Facilitators*

- Tessa Garner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
- Jessi Massingale, Floyd|Snider
- Karmen Martin, ESA
- Ray Outlaw, EnviroIssues
- Kristen Legg, Floyd|Snider

#### *Others/Members of the Public*

- Steve Shanewise, DELI
- Wendy Steffensen, LOTT
- Ali Johnson, DERT
- Jack Havens, CLIPA
- John DeMeyer, Olympia Yacht Club

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

## Meeting Notes Summary

### *Opening Comments and Review of Agenda*

The meeting started at 9:03 AM.

Jessi introduced and welcomed the two new members of the group, Cynthia Pratt, Board President of LOTT, and Thurston County Commissioner, John Hutchings.

The focus of the first two meetings in October for this group were outreach and the scoping period. The goal of this meeting is to go over scoping period comments and how these themes and comments are influencing our expectations for the scope of the EIS. The meeting will also include discussion of the scoping report, provide an update on the sounding board, and our coordination with agencies. The group will also touch on engagement opportunities for 2019. Finally, the next EWG meeting will be discussed, as well as our reoccurring agenda items (round table feedback on the process and meetings and opportunity for public to comment).

The Floyd|Snider team has made observer comment forms available for members of the public who do not wish to speak at the meeting. The form provides guidance and room for comments.

**NOTE TO READER: The anticipated approach to the EIS analyses reflected herein and discussed with the work groups reflects the assumption for the scope of the EIS as of January 2019 and is subject to change. The information was provided to each of the work groups as an opportunity to provide input, for project team consideration before the EIS scope is finalized.**

### *Scoping Comments and Initial EIS Scope*

Jessi explained the project team will present major scoping comment themes and content (see presentation) that will be reflected in the upcoming scoping report. The format of the slides presented today is the template for how the project team will review information for the EIS with the work groups moving forward—both formal and informal. This is a great way to receive feedback and answer questions.

There were over 900 individual comments. The slides presented give you a sense of what the project team heard from stakeholders and the community.

Any feedback from this meeting and the Technical Work Group (TWG) and Funding and Governance Work Group (FGWG) meetings will be taken into consideration when deciding on the scope of the EIS and the best places to put the resources within the budget available for the EIS.

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

Jessi began the presentation by identifying the list of primary technical disciplines and teaming partners leading those disciplines, noting there are other supporting partners not on this list. The Floyd|Snider team includes firms best suited for each of the disciplines, or elements of the environment. The primary leads will be used in specific fields in scoping and in the draft EIS development. They will be introduced as needed as the technical EIS work advances.

The scoping period was extremely successful. During the scoping period, ESA bracketed over 270 comments from individuals, organizations, agencies, and tribes, to organize them by area of the environment, and that led to over 900 individual comments. This is helping the project team identify areas of the environment to address. All comments have not been validated, but today's presentation provides an overview of the breadth of comments received.

Tessa Gardner-Brown and Karmen Martin, the project team's EIS lead, began summarizing primary scoping comment themes (see presentation). Tessa explained the project team is working to define what the scoping comments mean in terms of how to move forward with the EIS.

## Water Resources

Water received the second highest number of comments during scoping.

Tessa explained that the potential scope of analysis for the draft EIS includes review and compilation of existing data. That includes Ecology's comprehensive dataset from Budd Inlet and Thurston County's dataset. The project team will look at those data against Best Available Science (BAS). There is a request for and value to additional water quality sampling from the lake and during storm events. This data will give us a better baseline for water quality within Capitol Lake, and the project team will use the data to evaluate water quality under an estuary alternative.

The project team has also had comments about potential water quality from upstream. Upper watershed water quality may be evaluated to the extent that it would help the project team understand existing conditions or potential future impacts.

*EWG question: Will there be sampling in Budd Inlet?*

Right now the project team is thinking just Capitol Lake because Ecology has a vast dataset of Budd Inlet samples.

*EWG question: It seems like this has been one of the main complaints from CLIPA is that some of the Ecology data are only for a certain amount of time. It seems in some areas, like dissolved oxygen in the inlet itself. The data are getting pretty old and that will become an issue if it's not addressed in some fashion. It seems like there would be value in collecting water quality samples in Budd Inlet contemporaneous with sample collection in Capitol Lake.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

The project team had an agency coordination meeting with Ecology and water quality was at the top of the list. When talking with Ecology, Ecology did not express that there were data gaps to be filled. Water quality is one of the areas where there is the greatest range of opinions, and the data from the lake are getting old, so putting the resources mostly into the lake across seasons seems best, due to allocation restraints. The project team agrees it is important to have current baseline water quality data.

*EWG question: Is monitoring going on in the inlet? LOTT does ambient testing, but do other area groups?*

The project team will look into the recency of existing water quality data in Budd Inlet and if there is ongoing data/sample collection at specific stations. *EWG question: Capitol Lake is not a finite box. It is important to look both upstream and downstream. LOTT would be affected by some of the stations unless you take into consideration the whole scope of the water quality as it moves through. I'm hoping that that kind of focus gets addressed.*

The project team agreed and acknowledged that it is important to recognize how interconnected the whole watershed is, and the lake basin to Budd Inlet. That's something that crosses all technical analyses and the project team will make sure through all technical analyses that the system is being looked at holistically. For each discipline the project team will define the scope of the analysis as appropriate. Some disciplines might have a smaller scope, but definition will be put around that at the beginning of the EIS development process.

*EWG question: Please provide clarification on what the acronym GEMSS stands for?*

This is Ecology's modeling process—Generalized Environmental Modeling System for Surfacewaters.

*EWG comment: It is important for data from Budd Inlet to be collected at the same time as data from Capitol Lake. It is important for the community to see this. One of the things that affects dissolved oxygen is temperature. If we are comparing month by month but in different years, dissolved oxygen levels could differ.*

*EWG comment: There is value in reviewing and there could be a gap if up river is not considered—way upstream in terms of what's coming in. The work would be more expensive, but it seems like something that must be considered.*

## Sediment Transport and Geomorphology

Many people who commented during the scoping period said this should be the key issue of the EIS.

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

This is an important issue and area of technical focus. The starting point is existing and available data. Existing bathymetry data collected over different time periods will allow the project team to better understand bathymetric trends. The project team plans to develop a numerical model to evaluate hydrodynamics and sediment transport for each alternative, which will inform plans to manage sediment.

*EWG question: In terms of all the scoping comments, will the team validate or invalidate the comments?*

In the scoping report, the comments are presented as they are submitted, without judgment or assessment of accuracy. As part of the EIS scoping and initial work, the discipline leads will review the comments and evaluate them relative to their expertise and BAS.

*EWG question: Will the results of those assessments be brought back to the group?*

The project team members have reviewed the comments to help decide what the scope for the EIS should be. The software used in collecting comments also helped us sort things out by topic. The project team will come back to these work groups to talk about measurable evaluation criteria. Basically, “given all that we’ve heard, here is how it all comes together and how to move forward.” There isn’t a matrix, however, that says here are all the scoping comments and here are their validation/invalidation determinations.

*EWG question: We haven’t heard anything about a discussion of sediment deposition management. You talked about dredging scenarios, but I heard it characterized as an “open-system.” The size and shape of an opening can influence deposition, introduction of baffles can influence deposition. Those considerations should be integral to evaluation of sediment management going forward. Will the team drill down to that level?*

Yes, the numerical modeling will have to have parameters around the size of the opening. The project team has also discussed modeling evaluation runs with sediment control components. It is anticipated that will be part of the modeling evaluation.

*EWG comment: In terms of management of sediment in the river system, there is already identification of bank erosion in the river. Historically, parts of the river have had log jams and such, which change the river. Part of the plan needs to look at how to manage the sediment before it even gets into the lake/inlet. Locations of sediment erosion are identified in the TMDL, so there isn’t really an extra workload to include this information, just incorporating the findings into the EIS.*

*EWG comment: This brings us back to the connections between the Upper and Lower Deschutes. It is challenging to evaluate these connections without full funding for the EIS. Mayor Kmet’s comments highlight the importance of evaluation as far as possible.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

*EWG question: What about the potential benefits of sediment? The Port has contaminated sediments due to past work at the Port. Is it possible for cleaner sediment upstream to cap these sediments?*

This is a good question and we have heard a range of opinions on sediment quality – and it is why it's appropriate to collect new sediment quality data. The last time sediment sampling was conducted within the Capitol Lake was in 2007. As discussed later in the presentation, the project team proposes sediment sampling within the lake basins, which will help in understanding how sediment movement affects Budd Inlet. Ecology's new South Puget Sound Regional Background Study compiled and reviewed sediment data within the inlets. The project team understands, through the agency coordination meeting with the Port, where they are in their cleanup process. The Port offered to share existing sediment data. This is particularly relevant not just to the Port but to West Bay; there are different concepts out there for sediment natural recovery or remediation.

## Aquatic Invasive Species

This discipline will also use the existing data, including the 5-mile studies and information on invasive species in the system. The project team will look at how that changes under each alternative. For example, in an open model—the project team will evaluate control options for invasive species (e.g., how salinity affects mudsnail).

*EWG question: Will this analysis be included only if WDFW says it's needed, or will it be included no matter what?*

In terms of control options and the impact of salinity, the project team is still in discussions about that as part of the EIS scoping process.

*EWG question: There is a large list of invasive species. Will there be equal attention to all?*

All invasive species will be evaluated, yes. The project team will be mindful of a range of invasive species and how they affect not just the lake, but also things like sediment disposal.

## Fish and Wildlife/Wetlands and Vegetation

Analysis will begin with existing conditions/reports. The project team plans to prepare habitat maps and conduct spatial analysis and then look at how habitat changes for each alternative and the potential impacts and benefits to various species.

*EWG question: If there is change under an open system, with a salt water habitat, it would change the whole ecosystem. The other side of that equation is, how will an open water system benefit the saltwater species. Will the EIS just look at what will benefit freshwater?*

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

The EIS is all about benefits and impacts. There were a lot of comments on how does this change the ecosystem? The project team will be looking holistically at how this affects the ecosystem.

## Sea Level Rise and Climate Change

Coordination with the City of Olympia is ongoing. The project team plans to complete numerical modelling to understand water levels and resiliency of each alternative at different water elevations. WSDOT sea level rise standards are expected to be used as a guide.

*EWG question: Has the City of Olympia done a lot of these studies already? Mayor Selby replied that they had done modeling, yes, and the joint City, LOTT, and Port Sea Level Rise Response Plan is available on their website.*

Members of the project team have met with the City of Olympia about the sea level rise response plan. Through the TWG, the project team has a door into each agency's current programs and projects. For instance, the project team just met with WDFW. Matt Curtis, a TWG member, included staff members that were knowledgeable about existing data and agency programs relevant to the EIS. The project team is working to make sure they are consistent with those agency programs and plans, and to maximum the use of existing data and studies.

*EWG comment: The Sea Level Report included a detailed elevation survey and looked at ways to mitigate/protect existing development. The team should be able to plug that into the EIS. The report also includes modeling of the Capitol Lake areas. The report is much more focused on the west side. There is not much about Deschutes Parkway or the South Basin. Additional information may be needed for that area.*

*EWG question: I assume that the team's experts will weigh the integrity of each report and datasets that were submitted during scoping?*

Yes, that is correct. There were several outcomes of Phase 1 that teed up Phase 2. And in addition to the draft purpose and need statement, we elevated BAS frameworks and identified the BAS approach that is most appropriate for technical data and information, consistent with State code. The project team and the work groups agreed on what the metrics are for review of technical information and identifying BAS. Our technical experts will use that BAS framework and their professional knowledge and expertise for all information that comes in.

## Air Quality and Odor

The analysis will begin by documenting historic conditions; it is important to understand how conditions that contributed to odor before the lake was constructed have changed. The project team will then look at existing conditions and how conditions change under each alternative. The EIS will also consider construction-related and greenhouse gas emissions.

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

*EWG question: We have had ample situations where the lake has been drained for a variety of reasons. I don't remember any odor issues. Certainly not like sewage smells. The tide goes in and out regularly. I'm not sure it needs a lot of effort in this topic.*

If there are topics in this EIS where less emphasis needs to be placed, the project team is open to hearing that and taking that into consideration as we are working on defining the EIS scope.

## Recreation and Land Use

The analysis will begin with a high-level consistency analysis to understand the compatibility of the long-term management alternatives with local area plans. The EIS will document existing recreational opportunities in the project area and evaluate how the recreational opportunities change under each alternative. For example, trails will likely look different under the various alternatives, and the project team will evaluate whether the opportunity to walk or run around the waterbody is maintained across the alternatives.

*EWG question: Is this limited to just downtown? What about marinas or harbors of East Bay and West Bay (Boston Harbor or Zittel's Marina)? Will those areas be included? For instance, if the yacht club were to shut down, that would push activities elsewhere in the county. It might be good to understand those impacts.*

Those are good question and are consistent with a land use discussion. One of the first things the project team will do as part of the EIS technical analysis is to define the geographic scope of each element of the EIS. For some disciplines, that could be something broader than just the basin. This is something that will be discussed within the context of the economic analysis too.

## Visual Quality

The majority of those comments that were received were general comments identifying individual preferences. The project team received a number of comments regarding the visual connection between the Capitol Campus and Capitol Lake. The EIS will include visual simulations from a number of view points in the project area for each of the various alternatives.

*EWG question: Because an open system would be dynamic throughout the years, would the EIS include doing scenarios over a certain time period to show how that changes over time? It might not look as attractive for a number of years until vegetation fills in.*

Yes, this will need to be assessed. It would be great to do a lot of simulations, but the scope will be somewhat limited. The project team expects to show a simulation directly after construction and then also a simulation from the same location once the system and vegetation are established.

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

*EWG question: The way this has been presented in the past is just a picture of each thing. A picture of the lake, a generic picture of a mudflat. Estuary is not a mudflat. Some of that is about the perspective throughout the tide. Also, how sea level changes will affect the look.*

The project team will look at tides and see how that affects the visual quality of the alternatives. This will not just include a standard photo of a mudflat, but will do visual representations of what this specific space will look like under high and low tide.

## Economics

There were almost 100 comments on economics. The EIS is required to consider an expanded area around Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet per the proviso. The project team is in the early stages of assessing how best to evaluate economics but anticipates including an analysis of direct downstream benefits/impacts, ecosystem services, and planning level costs. The FGWG will also be providing input and guidance on the economic analysis. The FGWG has a parallel task of identifying a shared funding and governance model. In the next round of work group meetings (anticipated to be in April), the project team will present analysis methodologies, including sharing the economics approach with the FGWG, for feedback.

*EWG question: What is an ecosystem service value?*

Value that an ecosystem can provide that is not otherwise monetized. For example, under an estuary alternative, the water quality benefits above and beyond a lake system could provide benefits to certain groups. That can generally be quantified. Also, general personal value that can be placed on a system.

*EWG comment: So, for instance, if keeping Capitol Lake is chosen, LOTT would end up having to address more TMDL requirements and water quality treatment, which would cost rate payers more. So that needs to get addressed.*

Yes, this is something that can be evaluated in the economic analysis.

## Historic and Cultural Resources/Tribal Resources

The project team will identify built environment and archaeological resources in the area and the potential impacts to them. The EIS will also document the historical significance of Capitol Lake in the context of historical plans (Is the history of Capitol Lake truly an expression of the Wilder and White homestead plans? How does that affect the historical influence of the waterbody?). Regarding tribal resources, the analysis will examine potential impacts to usual and accustomed areas and tribal treaty rights even though tribal treaty rights are not typically included in a SEPA EIS.

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

## Sediment Quality and Environmental Health

This topic was discussed earlier as part of the sediment transport comment and summary but, as we mentioned, there are various view points and assumptions regarding sediment quality within Capitol Lake and how it may affect Budd Inlet under different alternatives. Some people are concerned contamination could move into the project areas. Others think Capitol Lake sediments are clean, and may benefit Budd Inlet. Therefore, we see value in obtaining data to understand the current sediment quality in the lake basins.

## Transportation/Public Services and Utilities

The analysis will start by classifying existing transportation facilities and how they are used, then look at how those facilities may be impacted by construction of each alternative. The analysis will include construction traffic, dam removal, and long-term changes to facilities either directly or indirectly.

*EWG comment: As you look at utility impacts, it is important to keep in mind that there are a number of utilities in the South Basin. These include stormwater outfalls from I-5, a Tumwater sewage lift station located east of the Old Brewhouse area, and a sewer line east of the Old Brewhouse area that used to run along the RR tracks and was rerouted to the base of the slope when a slide took out part of the RR. There may be other utilities in this area. In general, don't forget the south basin has utilities to consider. There was also some discussion about whether utilities south of the falls need to be considered but Mayor Kmet noted it is unlikely any utilities south of/above the falls would be impacted by lake/estuary alternatives. Lastly, there is a LOTT lift station west of Deschutes Way near Marathon Park, which should be factored into the analysis.*

## Scoping Report

Jessi gave an overview of where things stand for the scoping report. Jessi, Tessa, and Karmen reviewed scoping with the other work groups and received feedback from them. Some of the members of the TWG had looked at the scoping comments and the project team asked them if there was anything they felt was missing from this scoping overview. The scoping report is now being completed. In addition to all the comments (the report will have those in an appendix), the report will have "CliffsNotes" of these topic themes in a summary. Also, the report will include a description of the primary alternatives and all additional alternatives that have come forward during scoping. The report is on track to be issued in February.

## Refinement of the Project Name and Logo

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

During scoping, Enterprise Services heard feedback regarding the project name and logo. Based on this feedback Enterprise Services determined a name refinement was needed to ensure the project name reflects the project area, both present and past.

The refined project name, Capitol Lake - Deschutes Estuary Long-Term Management Project Environmental Impact Statement, changes from Lower Deschutes Watershed. A Steelhead Trout was also added to the logo.

The name refinement does not indicate a change in scope for the EIS; the EIS will evaluate, at a minimum, the three primary alternatives previously identified.

## *Community Sounding Board Update*

Ray Outlaw provided a brief overview of the Community Sounding Board formation and recruitment process. The board will be a diverse group of stakeholders engaged in focused discussions to help inform the EIS analysis. The group is separate from existing work groups and will be composed of individuals with specific interests in the project (see presentation).

The group will meet on a schedule similar to the current work groups. The project team will work to form a diverse board through an application process that will begin after the release of the scoping report. The first meeting is expected in early spring.

*EWG comment: Perhaps this could involve young families too.*

*EWG question: What is the time commitment?*

It is currently expected that there may be 3 to 5 meetings before the draft EIS is released. So approximately quarterly, similar to the timing of the work group meetings.

*EWG question: How long will the meetings be?*

Some topics may be done in 2 hours, some may be more complex and need a bit longer.

*EWG question: How many people will be involved?*

That will somewhat be determined based on the applications received, but we are planning on less than 20 people so that the logistics and discussions will be manageable.

*EWG question: Can these community sounding board slides be sent to the WGs?*

They can be posted to the website, yes. Mostly, this presentation is to let the work groups know that the sounding board development is about a month away.

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

*EWG question: This is optional in the EIS. In our current state of affairs, where the scope of the EIS is constrained by funding, if any technical analyses are given the short stick because of this, that is a problem.*

The project team is working with Enterprise Services to ensure that the technical analyses that are needed to prepare a robust and defensible EIS are completed, and still include a community sounding board.

*EWG comment: Without this community sounding board, the general public doesn't have an opportunity to really be involved until the draft EIS comes out. It seems reasonable to do this as long as it's balanced and there is participation by the members. It might be challenging to involve high school age participants as they have a lot going on.*

*EWG comment: This sounding board is an important part of the public process.*

To the point about funding, it is important to appropriately communicate with participants what the sounding board is and what it is not. This might help in finding common ground. Also, it makes sure the measurable criteria are understood, so that as the EIS process advances, members of the community groups were part of that early foundational step and understand the process.

## ***Engagement Opportunities***

The sounding board will provide engagement opportunities for some community members. However, the larger community will want to know what is going on as well. The anticipated timeline shows the draft being issued in 2020. That means it is approximately 1.5 years before there is a milestone for community engagement again. There are two opportunities for summer 2019, the Capitol Lake Fair and the Festival of the Steh-Chass, to give community members information about the current state of the project. In 2020, when the draft EIS is issued, there will be a public comment period and public meeting.

*EWG comment: If anyone thinks the team should be at an event of yours, let us know early. These things need to get on the schedule, so we know what the costs will be, and we can evaluate the event.*

*EWG outreach ideas provided included: the county fair, Harbor days, and spring arts walk. The Tribe will get back to the group on additional events they can think of.*

*EWG comment: We might consider events outside these group, as it's not just Olympia that are impacted. People from the surrounding communities, like Lacey, would be interested too. Possibly Fun Fair, as it's not just limited to Lacey. The Thurston County Fair may also be a good option.*

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

*EWG question: Are we tracking in-kind work from the other agencies? Can that be quantified as some kind of match later?*

Director Liu responded that Enterprise Services didn't track this internally until recently. He encouraged everyone to do that now. It is good to understand how much of a commitment each entity has in our staff time and how staff have been directed to participate. While it may not be considered in-kind, it's still good for people to understand what it takes to get to a solution.

It is so meaningful that all local governments at this table were involved in the Phase 1 Work Groups, signed letters of support for the Phase 2 EIS, and have continued to be committed and engaged in this process.

*Mayor Selby left the meeting at 10:38*

## ***Agency Coordination***

Over the last month, the project team participated in or has scheduled agency coordination meetings with each agency represented on the TWG to identify agency programs and/or projects with a nexus to the EIS. The goal is to ensure the project team is well aware of this information when moving forward with the EIS. Jessi thanked the group for staffing these meetings and helping maximize and leverage existing data.

Meetings have been completed with Port of Olympia, LOTT, Olympia, WDFW, WDNR, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and DAHP. Meetings with Tumwater and Thurston County are scheduled for the week of January 14.

The project team has developed and provided an updated meeting roster with this meeting's agenda.

Additional understanding and input were provided by these agencies, and existing data, such as traffic count data and LIDAR imagery have been provided, which results in direct project savings. Going forward LOTT will be represented on all three work groups. DAHP will participate in the TWG providing expertise around cultural resources and historic properties. The Port of Olympia is reassessing staff assignments. And Commissioner Zita hopes to continue her role on the EWG.

The Corps is not routinely participating in the TWG due to resource limitations but will be a resource going forward through guidance and materials sharing. The project team is mindful of agency coordination and efforts with the goal of streamlining permitting for Phase 3.

*EWG question: Do we have participation with the tribe on historical?*

Yes, definitely. The Squaxin Island Tribe is represented on the TWG and we have reached out to other tribes during scoping.

# Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

*EWG question: Who are you meeting with at the County?*

Brad Murphy is the project team's contact and he gathered some staff who have information around stormwater and watershed existing data. We will be having a call with the County soon.

## ***Next EWG Meeting***

The current plan is for work groups to meet quarterly (roughly) for 2019. The next series of meetings will be in mid-April. **Jessi will send a Doodle poll to identify a date.** We will aim to schedule the TWG and FGWG prior to the EWG, similar to this month, so we can relay feedback we have received to the EWG.

At the next meeting, the scoping report will be complete and public. The plan is to review the approach and construct for measurable evaluation criteria that will be used to screen alternatives. Each of the work groups will be asked to review and provide feedback in a format like today's discussion.

Following discussion of measurable evaluation criteria, the work groups will move to a discussion of analysis methodologies.

## ***Round-Table Feedback***

Jessi opened the meeting to round-table feedback. The members agreed that these meetings are very valuable, and that having LOTT at the table is great.

## ***Public Comment***

Steve Shanewise commented that he likes the name change, especially because it's close to DELI. He feels it is important that when the project team members refer to a combo system, that they drop the word "hybrid" and use "dual" or something else, because "hybrid" has a kind of negative concept around it. Hybrid doesn't do it justice, as it sounds like it's not purebred.

Jessi replied that the project team has been using open system to represent any alternative that includes exchange in tidal water.

Jack Havens mentioned that he is quite concerned about the potential health of juvenile Chinook salmon. He feels that right now Capitol Lake is a sanctuary and that there are a good number of contaminants in Budd Inlet. He feels that if an open system is determined the best alternative, those contaminants would go into the lake. Mr. Havens mentioned that the Governor's Orca Task Force outlines the extensive damage that can occur to juvenile chinook. He believes that who loses are the fishermen and the orcas. He wonders if any action has been taken in the last 10 years to study this.

## Meeting Notes Summary

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Location:** 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

**Topic:** Executive Work Group Meeting

---

Mr. Havens also wished to address the concept of sprawl. He would like to see those who are evaluating the environmental health issue look at how do people value housing. He believes there is a difference between estuary property and lake property. People vote their value with their dollars. Mr. Havens said that lake real estate is a multiple in dollar value as opposed to the estuary value. He thinks this needs to be looked at.

Ali Johnson first thanked the group for considering flyering at the Steh-Chass festival. She advocated for bringing high school students into the community sounding board, as she thinks the local youths are very up to date on the lake/estuary issue. She also wished to provide two contacts for working with the Squaxin tribe—Rhonda Foster, Cultural Resources Director, and Charlene Krise, Vice Chairman of the Tribal Council, both a wealth of information.

Ms. Johnson also asked about the numerical models. She wondered if that is something that would be included in the draft EIS and open for public comment.

Jessi responded that yes, it will be.

### *Closing Remarks*

Jessi thanked everyone for their time and commitment and reminded the EWG to look for a Doodle poll. She also mentioned that the EWG will receive emails when the scoping document is issued, and when the community sounding board application is available.

### *Adjournment*

The meeting ended at 10:55.