



CAPITOL LAKE/LOWER DESCHUTES WATERSHED

Long-Term Management Project Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

Meeting Participants

Work Group Members

- Bud Blake, Thurston County
- Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
- Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater
- Chris Liu, Washington State Department of Enterprise Services
- Cheryl Selby, City of Olympia

Department of Enterprise Services

- Debra Delzell
- Kevin Dragon
- Linda Farmer
- Bill Frare
- Linda Kent
- Carrie Martin

EIS Consultants/Facilitators

- Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd | Snider
- Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
- Jessi Massingale, Floyd | Snider
- Meaghan McClure, EnviroIssues
- Ray Outlaw, EnviroIssues

Others/Members of the Public

- David Monthie, DERT
- Sue Patnude, DERT
- Bob Wubbena, CLIPA

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

Meeting Notes Summary

Opening Comments and Review of Agenda

The Executive Work Group (EWG) commenced with a welcome and introductions. Director Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services (Enterprise Services), introduced Linda Farmer, Enterprise Services Communications Director, who will attend EWG meetings on Chris's behalf if he is not available. He stated that when she does, she will have authority to represent Enterprise Services.

Ms. Hayman reviewed her role as facilitator, which is to respectfully keep the group on time and on track, ensure all EWG members have a chance to be heard, and ensure meeting objectives are being met. She reminded the EWG that they "own" the agenda, and she may occasionally intervene if agenda adjustments need to be made to compensate for discussions that appear to be going longer or shorter than anticipated.

The agenda was confirmed, including time at the end of the meeting to select a date for the next meeting.

Project Overview

Ms. Gardner-Brown provided a brief project overview, touching on the following key points:

- The public comment period ends November 13. A detailed schedule beyond this date will be clearer once the scope is defined through the review of comments received during scoping and preparation of the scoping report. The scoping report will summarize the issues raised and comments received by stakeholders and the community and begin to define the scope of the analysis and alternatives that will be considered.
- The draft environmental impact statement (EIS) is expected to be released in 2020, with a final EIS completed in 2021. The EIS will be a reader-friendly document containing an analysis of the alternatives.

Ms. Massingale reviewed the process map, noting changes from the October 2 version of the map and addressing questions from EWG members:

- The process map now reflects two meetings with the EWG in October.
- The next Funding and Governance Work Group (FGWG) meeting is scheduled for January.
- As in Phase 1, the general sequence of work group meetings is intended to be the Technical Work Group (TWG), FGWG, and then EWG, pending scheduling considerations.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

- The January EWG meeting is anticipated to be scheduled in mid-January, prior to completion of the scoping report and will include an overview or briefing of the scoping report content. This timing allows the EWG to provide input on the scoping report content before it is finalized.
- At this time, there are no additional interest group briefings scheduled. It is anticipated the community sounding board will be underway in the first or second quarter of 2019.

Discussion of Project Logo/Name

Ms. Massingale reviewed key points of the discussion regarding the project name and logo, from the October 2 EWG meeting. She reviewed options developed in response to that discussion (handouts provided of the documents emailed to the EWG on October 25). The project team noted the following considerations when choosing a project name:

- The name should reflect the project purpose, with “long-term management” incorporated.
- Project names generally don’t incorporate the names of alternatives because they cannot capture the nuances, and alternatives usually evolve throughout the process.
- Consistent name recognition is important to ensuring community identification and understanding of the project.

The EWG walked through each proposed name variation to provide input and feedback to the eventual Enterprises Services decision. The name would not change until after the scoping period. The following key discussion points were noted:

- The Legislative proviso/budget does not specify a particular project name.
- **The EWG agreed** it is valuable to retain the “long-term management” element of the project name, as it is central to the purpose and intent of the EIS.
- A potential value of retaining “Capitol Lake” in the title is that it denotes a feature recognizable to the community as the current name of the body of water under evaluation (rather than being one of the alternatives under consideration). The project has already been presented under the current name and may be confusing to the public if significantly changed.
- The EWG explored swapping the order of the names (“Lower Deschutes Watershed/Capitol Lake”) to address Mr. Dickison’s concern that the name may infer subordination of the estuary alternative. While most were receptive to this approach, the term “Lower Deschutes Watershed” is still problematic from some perspectives and was stated to be too vague.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

- Mr. Dickison also commented on the lack of a fish being represented in the project logo.
- The EWG brainstormed to find a potential replacement for “Lower Deschutes Watershed” that was geographically accurate for the scope of the project area (from the falls to the inlet) and recognizable. Suggestions included:
 - “Deschutes Estuary,” “Lower Deschutes River,” and “Deschutes Watershed.” The connectivity between watersheds and groundwater complicates the appropriate delineation/naming of this project area.
 - Broaden the project name by returning to a listing of alternatives in the title, such as “Deschutes Watershed Environmental Impact Statement, Estuary and Capitol Lake,” or “Deschutes Watershed – Estuary Capitol Lake”

Ms. Hayman confirmed the following areas of agreement from the EWG discussion:

- Importance of identifying an accurate geographic description
- Retain Deschutes in the name (in some manner)
- Retain Long-Term Management in the name
- Add salmon to the logo

Ms. Massingale clarified that the project team will take these ideas and feedback on the name from the EWG to support Enterprise Services decision making.

Update of EIS Scoping

Ms. Gardner-Brown provided an update of EIS scoping to date. In total, approximately 100 persons attended the two public meetings. All public comments will be available on the project website by early December.

Ms. Gardner-Brown shared that the team heard a handful of primary themes at the two meetings, with some overlap. She shared a summary of the primary themes, which include:

- **Stakeholder Engagement:** There were a number of questions related to project outreach with area Tribes, potential/recommended coordination with the Orca Task Force due to the project nexus with salmon recovery, and close work with interest groups – specifically, LOTT.
- **Economics:** The audience raised the question of an ecosystem services valuation, potential economic impacts to the Port and other downstream users, and general funding considerations for future implementation. We were asked to review economic impacts, economic benefits, and ecosystem service values in the analysis.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

We heard about potential economic impacts to LOTT and those users, and therefore the need to coordinate with LOTT in this process.

- **Process:** One of the most prominent themes from the public is the question related to when a decision will be made. The public (and all stakeholders) want a preferred alternative to be identified and for the planning process to reach conclusion. They're eager to "get on with it." Following the SEPA process, the public is interested in the steps and timeline associated with implementation of the preferred alternative.
- **Alternatives:** There were a number of technical and general questions around the alternatives. The public was interested in technical aspects such as feasibility of the hybrid retaining wall, how recreational opportunities will be maintained, and what species-specific restoration efforts the alternatives would support. The general process questions were largely around what alternatives will be carried forward for evaluation and how the alternatives will be screened.
- **Technical issues:** Various technical issues were raised. Questions were received about water quality, sea level rise, blue carbon science, bats and mosquitoes, and invasive species.
- **Sediment:** There continues to be interest in a closer look at sediment transport. Questions ranged from how much sediment may be settling in the Capitol Lake basin, to where it would go in an open system, whether it would cover contaminated sediments at the Port and within Budd Inlet, and if/how we would determine viability for dredging and disposal.
- **Comprehensive planning:** We heard a few variations of the comprehensive planning theme. This ranged from a request to look at the system in upstream and downstream directions; to define the geographic scope in a way that reflects interconnectedness of the resource; and to comprehensively include the community in these planning efforts because this is a community project. Related to community engagement, there was a suggestion to use a local mediated process for polarized issues.
- **Cultural resources:** The community commented on the importance of the lake to the original Wilder & White plan and the need to maintain consistency with the original campus design. Conversely, several commenters discussed the cultural heritage of the lower Deschutes Watershed that predates recent landscape architecture, and the importance of this waterbody to the local area tribes.

Ms. Massingale encouraged the EWG to have their respective agencies submit comments, online or in writing, by November 13. Comments can be submitted individually or collectively within an agency, whichever is most convenient (e.g. on behalf of an entire city council or by individual council members).

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

Initial Work Group Meetings

Ms. Massingale reported that the project team met with the TWG and FGWG on October 11, and the meetings principally focused on a project overview. She noted that LOTT Clean Water Alliance (representing Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, and Thurston County wastewater management activities) requested to participate in the project work groups. This idea was discussed with the TWG and FGWG, and both work groups agreed it could be beneficial if LOTT participated.

Ms. Massingale further noted the FGWG asked good questions about the EIS process and alternatives. The economic analysis was also briefly discussed with the FGWG and the approach to include impacts and benefits to commercial and industrial sectors as well as to ecosystem service values. The FGWG has the unique opportunity to evaluate and develop a shared funding and governance model for the preferred alternative identified in the EIS. Therefore, it is important to be well coordinated with the FGWG and have a two-way exchange of information; for them to provide guidance and input into the EIS at the same time information is provided to the FGWG for their work.

The following are key discussion points regarding the initial work group meetings:

- The EWG suggested that it would be beneficial to have LOTT represented on all three work groups (including the EWG). There was some question of whether Lacey would accept an invitation to join the EWG (previously declined invitation in Phase 1, though it was noted that Cynthia Pratt, Deputy Mayor of Lacey, serves on the LOTT Board and could simultaneously represent Lacey if invited to participate). Enterprise Services will reach out to LOTT.
- As a point of clarification, “ecosystem service values” are an attempt to quantify the economic benefits of qualitative values inherent in ecological systems. It is important to the process to have consistency with other environmental evaluations in the Puget Sound region as that information is available. (It was noted the Port of Olympia may have some experience and useful data for the project team).
- The Army Corps of Engineers have been invited to this process, but at this time the Corps has determined that they will only be able to participate in the TWG on a periodic basis. They will consider participation on an as needed basis, with meeting participation based on specific topics that are within the Corps purview and where they have ability to advise on technical or regulatory issues. The project team will provide the Corps regular project updates and will include them on the TWG emails. The project team has also been in coordination with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP).
- There was a question of if staff hours/participation in the work groups could be considered a financial contribution by the EWG organizations to the EIS process.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

When EWG organizations are collecting data and sharing it with the EIS project team (e.g. stormwater mapping), could that also count as a contribution?

Supplemental Engagement Opportunities

Following up from a request from the October 2, 2018 EWG meeting, Ms. Massingale provided a table that provided a list of meetings that the project team had participated in through September and October. She noted they had just met with the City of Olympia's Downtown Alliance, which would be later added to this table. The meeting list will be updated as additional meetings or briefings are scheduled and provided to the EWG for reference and project status updates.

Ms. Massingale shared a table displaying local area events from 2018 that could be reviewed for public engagement opportunities in 2019. She asked the group to review and provide feedback regarding potentially valuable events for project outreach (e.g. events with project nexus) at the January meeting. Outreach could include handing out flyers, staffing an information booth, or other activities depending on the event.

Round-table Feedback

Mayor Kmet pointed out that the public comments are covering a wide range of issues. He suggested the importance of focusing the EIS analysis in order to work within the scope of the project budget from the Legislature. He added that gathering additional data may be needed in specific topic areas, but we will want to find balance on the level of effort. *Mayor Kmet left the meeting early.*

Commissioner Blake asked about receiving the summarized scoping themes Ms. Gardner-Brown overviewed earlier in the meeting. She responded that these themes would be captured in the meeting summary, as well as being addressed in the scoping report.

Opportunity for Public Comment

Sue Patnude, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DERT), thanked the consultant team for adding scoping comments to the project website. She emphasized the importance of inviting LOTT to participate in the work group meetings. She requested the team make it easier to navigate the website to access the comments, as well as better communication of when meetings were taking place. Ms. Patnude encouraged the project team and Enterprise Services to include youth in the EIS process in relation to the environmental service value. She shared that many local schools have been studying environmental issues such as this and would likely impress the team with their understanding and comments. She invited the project team to attend the next Festival of the Steh-Chass on August 24, 2019.

Meeting Notes Summary

Date: October 29, 2018

Time: 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Location: 1500 Jefferson St., Olympia, WA

Topic: Executive Work Group Meeting

Bob Wubbena, Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association (CLIPA), thanked Enterprise Services and the project team for responding to their comments and concerns.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Massingale engaged the group to find a date that might work for the next EWG meeting (TBD--Monday, January 14 looked promising). She also asked for comments on the October 2, 2018 EWG meeting summary by November 2.

The consultant team committed to providing an update on the project name and logo following the meeting discussion and reaching out to LOTT to participate in the EIS and work group process.

Adjournment

The meeting ended at 2:20 p.m.