CAPITOL LAKE/LOWER DESCHUTES WATERSHED
COMMUNITY MEETING
Jefferson Building
Conference Room 1213
1500 Jefferson Street
Olympia, Washington 98504
October 5, 2016
5:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

DES STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:
Bob Covington, Deputy Director
Carrie Martin, Asset Manager
Ann Sweeny, Special Assistant
Curt Hart, Communications

MEETING PRESENTERS:
Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider

OTHERS PRESENT:
Mark Dahlen, Citizen
Ed Crawford, Olympia Yacht Club
Dan Chevey, Citizen
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Kathy Leitch, Citizen
Steve Trapp, DERT
Bob Wubbena, CLIPA
Dennis Burke, E^3
Jim Lengenfelder, Citizen
Beth Doglio, Citizen
Peter Heidi, Citizen
Jane Sherman, Citizen
Brad Murphy, Citizen
Steve Masse, OFM
Greg Schundler, Citizen
Colin Stewart H20
Robert Holman, CLIPA
Penny Black, Citizen
Dave Peeler, DERT
Steve Shanewise, DELI
Stewart Gloyd, Citizen
Sue Patnude, DERT
Hewitt Lorie, Citizen
Jen Masterson, OFM
Rachel Newmann, SCNA
Les Purce, Citizen
Skip McConkey, Citizen

Open House, Review of Meeting Materials
Bob Covington, Deputy Director, Department of Enterprise Services (DES), convened the meeting at 5:42 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

Welcome and Introductions: Review of Meeting Ground Rules
Deputy Director Covington reviewed the meeting agenda to include a review of the proposed Final Draft Purpose and Need Statement, second touch on Review of Existing and Hybrid Options, a first touch review of Relative Range of Costs for Components of Long-Term-Management Options, a discussion on next steps for transitioning from Phase I to Phase II, and an open house to receive written input and to review materials.

Deputy Director Covington introduced Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported the meeting is the last organized community meeting of the Phase I series that began with community meetings in March, and continued in April, May, June, and July. A summer recess took the place of an August meeting, so the August topic was combined with the October 5 meeting. The next meeting is scheduled in December to provide a year-in-review and an opportunity for all stakeholders to review the final materials and the Proviso Report.

Phase I was prompted by a legislative proviso issued as part of the 2015-2017 Capital Budget. The proviso requires the submission of a report to the Washington State Legislature by December 31, 2016, summarizing the Phase I process. The December meeting will be held from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on Friday, December 16. Announcement of the meeting room will be posted on the website.

Proposed Final Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Overview of Input Received

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported the Purpose and Need Statement is a tool used during environmental reviews to assist in solidifying and congealing common project goals identified by stakeholders. Throughout the process, stakeholder comments have helped identify and understand community goals. Those comments served as the basis for development of a draft Purpose and Need Statement, which is vital to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process and permitting documents prior to moving forward with implementation of a project. As part of the Phase I process and to position for Phase II, a draft Purpose and Need Statement was developed. The draft statement was reviewed by the community in June and July. Results from the last survey showed 80% of the respondents indicating the draft Purpose and Need Statement accurately captures the goals of the project.

Ms. Gardner-Brown outlined the review cycle process beginning with reviews by the Technical Committee, Executive Work Group, and the Community. The Technical Committee and the Executive Work Group reviewed and approved the proposed final draft Purpose and Need Statement for inclusion within the Proviso Report. When DES moves to Phase II, the statement can be updated or revised; however, at this point, the statement represents a good springboard to move forward to Phase II.

Ms. Gardner-Brown provided an overview of changes to the document since the June and July review cycles.

The first paragraph is a succinct high level description of the goals and the purpose and need for the project. The language acknowledges that sediment management and sediment accumulation are a high priority. A watershed approach must also be considered.

The second paragraph focuses on context and has evolved through the various review cycles. The paragraph describes the value of the resource both before construction of the lake and in its current condition. Feedback in July spoke to the importance of retaining the context paragraph.

The third paragraph describes the problem and identifies the issues. Input from the community spoke to the importance of acknowledging the distinction between active uses of the water body currently restricted today. The paragraph has not relevantly changed since the first draft except for improving the description of active and passive uses.

The fourth paragraph describes the reason for action now. The information has evolved around ensuring the project is consistent with other watershed restoration plans upstream and downstream. The last sentence was added from input from the community and vetted through the process reflecting the following, “Once completed, the project is expected to have a beneficial effect on the ecosystem service value, economic value, and community value of the resource.”

Ms. Gardner-Brown read the proposed final draft Purpose and Need Statement.

Based on recent feedback from the Technical Committee and Executive Work Group, proposed changes include:

- Added "and adjacent watershed" at the end of the last sentence in the last paragraph.
- Revision of the second sentence in the second paragraph to state, "The Deschutes watershed continues to be used for ceremonial, subsistence, and commercial harvesting of natural resources and is a place of strong cultural and spiritual value."
- Within the third paragraph, excessive nutrient loads will be cited that are causing algal blooms and freshwater plant growth.

Ms. Gardner-Brown invited feedback from the community.

Jim Lengenfelder said the inclusion of the second paragraph contributes nothing to the document and doesn't pertain to the EIS need statement. Further, it reflects an imbalance and insensitivity to what's really occurring in the community. The last sentence in the third paragraph speaks to historic and personal values for many people. He suggested that if the paragraph is included, the last sentence should be expanded to include the impact on the Chinese community that was historically on the lake and its commercial use. None of that is mentioned. As the first four sentences of the paragraph are directed to the Native American community, he doesn't believe that it really reflects a good balance.

Bob Holman pointed out that the dam construction in 1950 was to create a reflecting pool and to enhance the Capitol Campus. It's that feature of Capitol Lake that is foremost to the majority of people who reside in the area, as Capitol Lake is part and parcel of the Capitol Campus, which is an historical district. There is no mention in the statement other than it speaks to "personal value to many people." Mr. Lengenfelder is right, as the document lacks discussion about the value of the resource aesthetically and historically with respect to the capital city. The lack of such inclusion is a real shortcoming in the document.

Dave Peeler, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DERT), referred to a comment shared during the last Executive Work Group meeting to include additional language in the last paragraph referencing the TMDL under development by the Department of Ecology (ECY) and the goal to improve conditions to meet water quality standards.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said the comment was considered by the consultant team. However, because the purpose of the statement is a high level view, additional information was provided in the Proviso Report. The Proviso Report may also be a good place to describe the significance of the Capitol Campus as a historical district.

Dennis Burke commented that everyone is taking a very narrow view of the project and the need statement. For example, the essence of the problem is algae, as it dies in the lake and travels to Budd Inlet creating oxygen demand and leading to problems with low levels of dissolved oxygen. Algae grow from nutrients from the Deschutes River. The effects are not only present in the lake but also in Puget Sound. If not addressed in Puget Sound, all inlets will be affected, as well as the Pacific Ocean, all of which are suffering because of high nutrient load and excessive algae and low dissolved oxygen. If the project only focuses on Capitol Lake and doesn't consider all the consequences, it would be a big mistake. For example, none of the plans address nutrients or algae. Restoration of the estuary will only result in nutrients traveling through

the estuary adversely impacting Budd Inlet and then Puget Sound. It's important to consider a global view of the problem and how it affects other activities downstream.

Ms. Gardner-Brown acknowledged the impacts or the effects of Capitol Lake and potential issues affecting downstream environments. The first issue speaks to how far the agency with jurisdiction over the lake is able to extend its reach. The river and lake drains into the Sound and then the ocean, but DES has a limited reach that is generally bounded by the 260-acre waterbody. Earlier this week at another conference, discussions centered on ECY's guidance on greenhouse gas emissions. A question was posed regarding an environmental review for a coal terminal and where the agency's reach terminates for environmental review of emissions. The agency considers potential emissions entering the site as well as combustion generated on the site. However, the agency doesn't consider emissions generated in other locations. In terms of the extent of the reach, the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) guides the department's jurisdiction over the Capitol Lake basin as the 260 acre waterbody. However, that doesn't ignore the interconnectedness of the system and how the process attempts to make connections to upstream and downstream projects in the Purpose and Need Statement. The process is cognizant of that fact and that all projects or potential long-term management options should be compatible with those upstream and downstream efforts because it's one system.

Ms. Gardner-Brown spoke to the question of why they are not looking into specific methods to address the goals identified in April. Water quality and ecological function are two of the 10 goals the community agreed were important. Essentially, the reason more detailed mechanisms to address these issues haven't been identified is because the process hasn't advanced to that stage yet. The intent is to complete that technical analysis as part of the Environmental Impact Statement in Phase 2. The current focus is for all stakeholders to discuss goals, consider long-term management options, and then move forward to those detailed conversations in Phase 2.

Stewart Gloyd said he's an interested community resident but has been unable to attend all the community meetings. He was struck by the fact that out of the entire page, the word "aesthetics" doesn't appear. He suggested "aesthetics" belongs in each paragraph because the purpose of the project should include some recognition that it's the aesthetics of the lake or the estuary that are important to the community and should be part of the purpose. As far as history, the previous speaker didn't indicate why the lake was created. It should be the first point in the statement if history is mentioned. Within the third paragraph, the sentence speaking to water drawdown and back flushing gives the appearance that the practice occurred frequently and then stopped. The language implies that the reason it was stopped was because it was an inconvenience to boaters. That's not the reason it was stopped.

Mr. Gloyd said his recollection was that the drawdowns were an effective technique and perhaps should be considered in the future under any of the scenarios.

Ms. Gardner-Brown pointed out that similar to her response to Mr. Burke's comments, the process has not entered the phase of identifying specific methods or mechanisms to address freshwater plant growth. It would be analyzed later in the process. Comments surrounding aesthetics and why the lake was created are important.

Colin Stewart suggested that if history is to be considered, it should begin with the Indian removal act because in the discussion surrounding aesthetics he questioned whether it speaks to the utility or something else in terms of the function. The first three paragraphs are balanced because they recognize how long the

other society was in the area compared to the tens of thousands of years First Nations occupied the area. When considering balance, it's important to consider where biases are factored within that balance.

Greg Schundler supported the mention of aesthetics and reflection. Aesthetics are definitely subjective and any objective data on aesthetics should be considered. In the last community survey in 2009 by Elway Research, as he presented in previous testimony, 11% of the local population rated "retaining the look of the lake" as their most important priority regarding the project. However, if there is belief that the survey should be updated, it ought to be determined what the studies are now as opposed to what they may have meant in 1951. Part of the awareness previously alluded to by Mr. Stewart would likely be included in the interpretation of reflections. For the current generation, a reflection could be the desire for a water body that reflects values as residents of Washington State, as millennials, and as global citizens of ecological function, history, distribution of wealth, and aesthetics. It might be beneficial to conduct a new survey. Existing data points and data from surveying by the National Parks Service and the National Fish and Wildlife Service document estuary restoration has increased visitation at the Nisqually (Refuge) and at Elwha 25% and 300%, respectively. People are voting with their feet and aesthetics and that restoration is indeed an aesthetic benefit.

Ms. Gardner-Brown commented that at this time, this discussion of aesthetics highlights how the process generates goals from different perspectives. The materials released in May considered community feedback on goals and objectives, and included comments submitted by the community that showed the variation in interpretation and meaning of the common goals. Some comments indicated the aesthetics of the historic reflecting pool couldn't be topped while other comments spoke to the natural system as the most beautiful. The material includes quotes reflecting how aesthetics can be important to both camps in support of a managed lake or restoration of an estuary. She encouraged community members to review the material, which would be included within the Proviso Report.

Second Touch on Review of Existing and Hybrid Options and Overview of Input Received

Ms. Gardner-Brown referred to revised materials from the July meeting of existing and new options. Since the initial review, changes in the material were made to titles, notes, and the graphic depiction of new and existing options. The Technical Committee and the Executive Work Group agreed the CLAMP options (existing options) of the Managed Lake, Hybrid Option (Dual Basin), and the Restored Estuary should be featured as one graphic because those options were analyzed during the CLAMP process. Newly identified hybrid options of the Managed Lake Sub-Option and the DELI Option are featured together as a second graphic. Additional notes are included on the graphic of the newly identified hybrid options to describe other concept ideas offered by the community, but that lacked the same level of detail as the proposals of the two new hybrid options. Those options are also described in the Proviso Report. It was important to ensure all visual representations were included within the Proviso Report because the proviso dictated the inclusion of visual representations of the proposals to aid the public in understanding and evaluating options.

Bob Wubbena remarked that several emails were forwarded regarding misrepresentation of the graphic referred to as the Managed Lake Sub-Option – Percival Creek Rechanneling and Salmon Habitat Restoration Plan. The proponents of the option were unable to review or respond to the new representation of data provided by the consultant team.

Ms. Gardner-Brown pointed out that the team worked closely with Jack Havens, CLIPA, on developing the document's language and graphic to ensure accurate representation of the option, just as they worked closely with the proponent of the other Hybrid Option – Dual Estuary/Lake Idea (DELI) to populate that

data. They worked hard to make sure that none of the option information was misrepresented, and used language provided by the option proponents.

Mr. Wubbena disagreed with the assessment. Although the graphic depiction of the lake from CLIPA is valid, the representation of the data in the table of comparisons is not correct. Information transferred to the cost comparison is also inaccurate. Until proponents were able to review the revised documents, proponents were unable to respond and clarify that the information was misunderstood.

Ms. Gardner-Brown offered to follow up with Mr. Wubbena with an email to verify how the information was cross-checked with Mr. Havens, and included a copy to Mr. Wubbena. Mr. Wubbena said he would continue to take exception with the presentation of the information in the accompanying tables.

Ms. Gardner-Brown invited feedback on how the graphics were revised and retitled. No other feedback was offered on the two graphics.

Ms. Gardner-Brown referred to the table on Potential Components of Conceptual Long-term Management Options. The first touch of the material was at the July meeting. The intent of the draft was to promote a brainstorming exercise acknowledging the many ideas for components that shouldn't be overlooked because they haven't been fully analyzed. One example is the eradication of the New Zealand mudsnail. While not an independent management option, it's an effort that could be included within any option to increase consistency with project goals. The table acknowledges many ideas and serves to solicit other ideas of importance to the project. Changes since the first review are the addition of two items resulting from conversations with the Technical Committee. The items include fish access management and natural woody debris management plan. An additional column was added (middle) to clarify how the component is consistent with the goals for long-term management. The Executive Work Group recommended excluding the third column and including sub headers. For example, the component of "Installation of an adjustable weir for sediment management" was moved under a sub header titled "Improve and support sediment management." Executive Work Group members also requested the inclusion of the sediment trap and installation of the deflection berm or jetty. None of the components were evaluated for technical feasibility and are not included as stand-alone options. The goal is to ensure all ideas are acknowledged during the process and captured.

Mr. Peeler said another comment offered by Executive Work Group members was prefacing the column, "Benefit of Incorporation" by including "Expected or Intended." Other activities are planned for upstream erosion control at various points along the Deschutes River, which would reduce the volume of sediment traveling through the river. Although the activities are outside of the 260-acre area of focus, those activities would help with the outcome of the project.

Ms. Gardner-Brown added that the Technical Committee and the Executive Work Group also recommended identifying which stakeholder group offered the suggested components in the figure by denoting the identity of each stakeholder group.

Mr. Holman commented that dissolved oxygen in Budd Inlet is an important element. Algae have been determined not to be an issue within the lake itself. There are several ways to improve dissolved oxygen, which should be included within the components.

Mr. Burke referred to the presentation and the inference of the need to dredge the lake. He contended that dredging is not necessary because dredging the lake would only accomplish removal of particulate phosphate that might be at the bottom of the lake that leads to the formation of algae. Removing lake

inputs continuously would eliminate the reason to dredge the lake, which should be considered in the economic analysis. The only reason to dredge the lake is to stabilize the level if the lake remains. However, removal of sediments entering the system would lead to the eventual consolidation of sediments. During high flows, much of that sediment would flush out to Budd Inlet. There is no real reason to dredge the lake.

Ms. Gardner-Brown replied that yes, opinions vary on the need for and extent of dredging.

Mr. Schundler said he understands that as the lake fills with sediment, there is less room for water from a volumetric perspective, which presents an eminent threat for flooding in downtown Olympia.

Ms. Gardner-Brown mentioned that all comments are also accepted during the current two-week comment period closing on October 6. Stakeholders with comments should submit them on the DES website.

First Touch on Relative Comparison of Costs for Options; Feedback from Technical Committee and Executive Work Group

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed the background and methodology for comparison of costs for the options. Comparison of costs is required by the proviso. Cost comparisons have generated many opinions. As the review is the first touch of the materials, input from stakeholders will be factored when the materials are revised and resubmitted during the review cycle.

The effort to estimate long-term management costs is required by the legislative proviso. The task has been interesting because of the level of design. Typically, design cost estimates associated with a project are completed when design has progressed to at least a 30- or 60-percent level. At this time, some of the option designs are even below the conceptual level. Additionally, the process includes two new options not vetted to the same degree for technical feasibility. However, the options are similar to existing options. The consultant team is considering a vast spectrum of information as they attempt to develop cost estimates fairly.

The cost estimates are graphically displayed using the best information available to the team. Most of the information was derived from the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Final Report and the Alternatives Analysis.

The Y axis of the bar chart reflects total option costs in hundreds of millions of dollars by general order of magnitude. Each of the five bar charts include information on five construction cost factors and three maintenance cost factors.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed the graph notes:

1. Previously reported cost estimates for the long-term management options have been reviewed but do not serve as the complete basis for the cost information provided on this figure because many of the primary assumptions or existing conditions have changed. For example, the primary previous assumptions regarding open water disposal or in-water beneficial use for dredged sediment is affected by the presence of New Zealand mudsnail, a changed condition that results in a significant increase to one of the largest cost components (DMMP communication 2012).

   Ms. Gardner-Brown reported the original assumption included dredging of sediments prior to implementing any long-term management option, and the dredged sediment would be disposed of through open water disposal, for use either in targeted locations for habitat rehabilitation or open

water disposal. Open water disposal sites are regulated by the Dredge Material Management Program (DMMP). During conversations and coordination with DMMP representatives, information was conveyed that because of the presence of invasive species, disposal of dredge materials would be precluded from open water disposal as previously evaluated and reflected in earlier cost estimates. Because open water disposal is restricted, other disposal options include upland disposal either at a reclamation site for extra fill or at a landfill. Regardless, the cost for upland disposal is substantially more than the previously assumed in-water disposal.

2. Due to the conceptual level of the proposed long-term management options, cost estimates could not be generated for all factors or design components related to construction and maintenance (such as stormwater infrastructure, control of invasive and nuisance species, etc.).

   Essentially, the information wouldn't be valuable if the level of cost is unknown, because this relative cost estimate represents a snap-shot in time, and would be immediately superseded once the EIS begins in Phase 2.

3. Preliminary design, technical analyses, and feasibility reviews would occur as part of the future Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Phase 2. At that time, more detailed cost estimates for construction and maintenance would be developed.

   The EIS process is the typical time for identifying dollar values because design has progressed to a level enabling technical analyses. All options would include a level of equal design to afford an opportunity to assess costs evenly between the different options.

4. The Department of Enterprise Services (DES) cannot confirm the accuracy or validity of the presented long-term management options due to the absence of preliminary design, technical analysis, and feasibility review, which inform the cost estimating process.

5. Completion of an EIS is required before DES can select or implement any long-term management option. Permitting and design would also be required for all options. These costs would be incurred prior to, and separate from, construction and maintenance, and therefore are not reflected on this figure.

6. All long-term management options would require initial dredging. As part of the Managed Lake Option and Sub-Option, the dredged sediment would be disposed of at an upland site (likely a landfill) due to the presence of purple loosestrife seeds and the New Zealand mudsnail. For the Restored Estuary and Hybrid Options, the initial dredge sediment would be used for the slope armoring and habitat rehabilitation included as part of these previous designs.

   For open management systems (Restored Estuary or Dual Basin), some initial dredging of sediment is removed and used to armor the Deschutes Parkway as an in-system placement of much of the material whereas the other options include an initial dredging of sediment that do not include slope armoring, and that additional material is disposed of upland, resulting in increased cost compared to on-site reuse.

7. Quantities for the initial dredging were sourced from the Capitol Lake Alternatives Analysis (CLAMP 2009) for the existing long-term management options, as that analysis represents the most current information prepared as part of the DES-led planning effort, and the designs of these options have not been advanced since that time. The dredging quantities for the new long-term

management options are based on the estimates provided in that analysis because the effort for dredging under the new Hybrid Option and Sub-Option would be similar to those of the Dual Basin Option and Managed Lake Option, respectively.

To treat and represent each option objectively and in lieu of having further technical analysis or design, the team wanted to acknowledge the components proposed by the proponents of the DELI and the Managed Lake Sub-Option Percival Creek Rechanneling options. In lieu of detailed information and because of similarities between the options, cost information was used from CLAMP that most closely matched the options, and was scaled accordingly.

8. A 50-year duration has been used to estimate relative maintenance cost factors, with a maintenance dredging frequency of every 5 years for the Restored Estuary and Hybrid Options, and every 10 years for the Managed Lake Option and Sub-Option.

   These maintenance durations were derived from the CLAMP Alternatives Analysis.

9. Mitigation for maintenance dredging is anticipated due to impacts from construction access that would affect upland habitat or park space, and impacts to the lake basin, as indicated in agency discussions that occurred to support the 2013 Permitting Recommendations Report.

   Mitigation is required when impacts are either temporary or permanent. Mitigation can be required for impacts onsite, such as those from access or dredging within the lake system, and mitigation activities would be require within the same watershed. Mitigation is not estimated for long-term maintenance of the Restored Estuary option because restoration of the estuary is viewed as an environmental benefit that would exceed baseline conditions.

One additional component to assess fairly was the DELI option for the cost of the reflecting pool barrier construction. As previously discussed, one of the key differences between the DELI and Dual Basin options is the nature of the reflecting wall. Within the Dual Basin option, a sheet pile wall is included while the DELI option reflects a rock wall. This difference in materials and construction technique resulted in the inability to provide an equal comparison because of different materials. The team consulted with a constructability specialist to identify the relative costs, which are reflected within the bar chart.

The order of magnitude for costs is consistent with a single dollar year.

Ms. Gardner-Brown invited comments and questions.

Mr. Burke said he was disturbed that the information was presented to the Executive Work Group, as it's impossible to un-ring a bell. He believes the economic analysis is terribly flawed and hopes that future analysis considers other factors. Three basic factors of focus are the volume of sediment, the type of dredging excavation, and the value factor of the material. It appears no one is considering the value of sediment management versus the amount of expenditure. The largest volume of sediment disposal would be in Budd Inlet and for the formation of the estuary. The lake wouldn't need to be excavated; however, if dredged, the volume could be considerably less. Additionally, the techniques of dredging the lake would be at much less cost. He referred to his submittal of technical articles to DES on techniques for excavation. One method is vacuum excavation of the bottom layers of sediment at less cost. In terms of the value of the material, sediment from the Deschutes River is valuable similar to sediment from the Nile River that made farms along the river profitable. The same circumstance is occurring in the Deschutes River. Sediment is valuable and could be sold at $26 a yard. However, sediment moving into the lake begins to

accumulate pollutants from the snail and seeds from invasive plants. The value of the sediment should be established and should be added to the equation, as well as the amount of sediment for removal and the method of removal.

Ms. Gardner-Brown affirmed the three suggestions to consider dredge volume, dredge mechanisms, and the value of the dredged materials. In terms of volume, because the Phase I process is not advancing design, the process has not examined the volumes established in the CLAMP process. Regardless of the option, a dredging design would be needed for any option based on existing bathometry, the location of the increased depth, and other factors, such as placement of a sediment trap. That level of effort requires an advancement of design not included in the Phase 1 process. Subsequently, the last technical analysis was used as the method to provide an estimated cost. Proponents of the two new options might want to provide different calculations, such as dredging less, but we do not have the ability in this process to analyze the feasibility and reasonability of those assumptions, so existing design information is used and scaled accordingly.

Ms. Gardner-Brown shared that she recently worked on a dredge operation involving hydraulic dredging, and it was very difficult to implement on that process. The type of dredging system would be analyzed in the EIS. The CLAMP process explored hydraulic dredging. In terms of the value of sediment, the team is including some information provided by Mr. Burke within the Proviso Report, to support his option proposal.

Mr. Wubbena commented that even with relative costs, a baseline must be established to judge whether the estimates are close. Costs for the Restored Estuary alternative were from the CLAMP study; however, recent costs by the Corps of Engineers were completed in 2012. He asked whether the figures are based on 2006 or 2012 data. Clarity needs to be provided because it doesn't provide the ability to understand the baseline. The source of the baseline is important. Additionally, Ms. Massingale, during the last Executive Work Group meeting, conveyed that the consultant team could not change the CLAMP options. The Managed Lake submitted by CLIPA is not accurately reflected leaving a quandary in terms of offering input to correct the errors. CLIPA has recently submitted some corrections based on best assumptions. However, baseline criteria in terms of various study dates are lacking. CLAMP's Managed Lake option includes a proposal to dredge to -13 feet to the freeway. That depth of dredge wouldn't require a post-dredge every 10 years, but rather every 30 to 40 years because a -13 foot dredge is deep. The Managed Lake option by CLIPA is completely different than depicted within the graphic. Although, the information is a first touch, insufficient information was lacking to provide the baseline. CLIPA's Managed Lake Sub-Option is 25% of the Restored Estuary. In terms of Ms. Massingale's comments, she indicated that Floyd|Snider must accept the options as submitted. He would be interested in how the team considers the feedback and revises the chart with better criteria on baseline information to enable clarity in the discussion of the managed lake community option.

Ms. Gardner-Brown apologized if there was lack of clarity in terms of the source of the cost information for the different components. The costs were from CLAMP 2009 documents. The information was applied to all options because the new options were comparable to existing options.

Mr. Holman said it appears that the team used CLAMP studies as the gold standard as the basis for the cost estimates. He views that as a serious flaw. An analysis by a civil engineer was completed five months ago on the dredge portion offsite. There were gross errors ranging from conversion errors in the tables to assumptions that were off-base. To use the studies as a standard for something that is occurring 10 years or more years later with more knowledge discredits where the process has been in the last 10 years and the amount of effort that has been contributed to the process by CLIPA, DERT and others. For example, the CLAMP study for the lake option called for dredging to -13 feet or 877,500 cubic yards of sediment. Three

reasons were cited in the study. The first was to remove a sufficient amount of material to provide flood control as originally envisioned by CLAMP. It's possible to attain the same amount of flood control by dropping the level of the lake by two feet before a storm event, which is practiced by DES today. DES regularly drops the level by several feet during a storm event to enable the volume to build up, which is equivalent to removal of 875,000 cubic yards of sediment at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. That is one reason why the information is invalid. The second reason was to have proper depth to enable water skiing in the lake. DERT doesn't envision water skiing in the lake and doesn't view it as a reason to dredge 875,000 cubic yards of sediment. The reasons proposed for the massive dredge are not really valid. The DERT plan calls for lower dredging volumes. A smaller-volume dredge under any of the options could be easily placed on shore and those costs would be substantially less and equal between all five options. Additionally, the CLAMP process took seven years at a cost of $7 million to complete the studies. The final report includes a table that examines the cost of dredging for the lake option. The table includes unit costs for various pieces of equipment and the volumes, and extends those costs. Within the table, there is a $1 million error. After seven years, the report has errors and to establish the report as the gold standard is building a house of cards. Within the same area, the CLAMP analysis compared dredging sediment under the Estuary option and the Managed Lake option. The lake analysis was completed earlier prior to considering the Estuary option using a different year for unit costs. When the estuary was completed, a different methodology was factored. Different techniques were used between the two options. Consequently, there is a whole series of problems. The process would be much advised to use at least some of the basic information that has been presented and not fall back on flawed information and assumptions from the CLAMP study.

Ms. Gardner-Brown apologized if it appeared that the documents reflected CLAMP as the gold standard. The consultant team has not contended that the documentation is the gold standard, but it is a comprehensive report and the most recent design analysis. DES provided analyses on three options that could be considered. The information conveyed during the process encouraged sponsors of options to offer feedback on any information that they believed was misrepresented or that might change, such as less dredging in the middle basin as part of the Managed Lake Sub-Option. It is important that stakeholder perspectives pertaining to the design of the options are appropriately represented. However, the information must be fairly represented for all options, with a baseline source to anchor the approach.

Sue Patnude commented that she was under the impression the information as presented would move forward into an EIS process. The information, as presented, is what's available and would be included in the Proviso Report to the Legislature. The Legislature would then determine a source of funding for the EIS process. During the EIS process, all the details and independent studies would move to the next step.

Ms. Gardner-Brown agreed they have always maintained that design was not part of this process. It has always been conveyed that the environmental impact statement process is the point where technical analyses will examine sediment transport deposition, hydrodynamic modeling, water quality, biological resources, and aesthetic impacts. That work is part of Phase II.

Ms. Patnude asked whether the next phase includes the CLAMP options because the CLAMP process was an estuary feasibility study as part of the overall adaptive management plan with 10 different goals. Included in the plan was to consider the feasibility of an estuary. The plan wasn't an EIS or anything else that could result in a specific conclusion. However, at the end of the process, the CLAMP policy advisory body recommended restoration of the estuary. That recommendation was rendered in 2009. The recommendation was never pursued. The reason for that was because at that time, there was no cost effective or environmentally sound option. Today, new information is available with more details. Even if the estuary recommendation had been followed before, a full-grown EIS environmental review process

would have been followed. To the credit of DES and Floyd|Snider, other options are under consideration. Continually regurgitating what could have happened, what didn't happen, and what was flawed or good are no longer valid moving forward.

Mr. Stewart said he appreciates the skepticism of any study because any scientist would want to be as objective as possible and it's important to have all the facts straight. The Capitol Lake Alternatives Analysis in 2009 was during the time Capitol Lake was on the list of impaired surface waters for phosphorous, fecal coliform, and dissolved oxygen. On the CLIPA website, the report completed by CLIPA describes Capitol Lake as healthy, immediately invalidating any kind of non-biased response. The White Paper report claims that Capitol Lake is probably the healthiest lake in Thurston County. It's important to consider the source of details when considering scientific responsibility of data.

Mr. Peeler thanked the team for development of the graphic. For the Managed Lake and the Managed Lake Sub-Option, one of the components of the 5th Avenue Dam Removal/Bridge Construction or Dam Maintenance should likely be segregated and moved to the maintenance/operation grouping. Additionally, since the timeline is 50 years, dam maintenance might require more examination during the EIS process because he's unaware of any 100-year old bridge still standing without some level of rebuilding regardless of the type of bridge, i.e., concrete/steel, concrete, steel, or other type of construction. The issue was briefly reviewed in terms of ongoing maintenance by DES in the past; however, looking ahead another 50 years might entail a bigger question about whether there would need to be some significant reconstruction. He asked whether the bar chart for the Managed Lake Sub-Option includes the cost for creation of the Percival Creek channel as envisioned in the proposal.

Ms. Gardner-Brown affirmed the bar chart includes those costs. The proponent of the option included approximately $7.5 million, which includes an accounting for the cost to create the channel. She offered to revise the bar chart to clarify the information. Initially, the chart included a note that spoke to the issue. Part of the cost is absorbed through initial channel dredging, as there would be a hydraulic connection between the systems allowing saltwater into Capitol Lake. She agreed with the recommendation to reflect dam maintenance and repairs as a maintenance cost.

Mr. Peeler spoke to previous comments surrounding the costs of dredging and different dredging techniques that might be employed. He suggested more review during the EIS of whether different techniques have been utilized for estuary systems versus a lake system because of the mechanics of the operation that might affect the cost.

Ms. Gardner-Brown agreed that the location of the dredging operation could impact cost. Within the Managed Lake or Managed Lake Sub-Option, dredging would occur in the lake basin whereas open system options have dredging occurring in marine waters (Budd Inlet) entailing different access, and less impacts. These factors result in reduced cost over the options implementing dredging within a lake system and requiring upland access from adjacent parks or parcels.

Mr. Schundler spoke in support of previous comments about the value of sediment. Some comparison of the alternatives is warranted. He would like to see a visualization summary of the work already completed. The value of sediment in terms of data for estuaries and food webs reflect how estuaries serve as a food web, which is why estuaries rank with tropical rain forests as some of the most productive ecosystems in the world. This area is a subsystem of the entire Pacific Ocean ecosystem and sediment is very valuable to Budd Inlet. Although shellfish cannot be harvested in Budd Inlet because of the LOTT Wastewater Treatment Plant, it doesn't preclude the basin's ecosystem benefitting from a Puget Sound-wide restoration for the entire food web of Budd Inlet, aquaculture, and fisheries in lower Puget Sound and beyond. As far

as terrestrial use of the nutrient matter, it's potentially problematic for freshwater ecosystems because of the New Zealand mudsnail and invasive plant species. However, sediment could be used to help fertilize existing shellfish beds and shellfish ecosystems in the South Sound to avoid upland disposal.

Mr. Holman said he doesn't intend to debate the previous conversation; however, the 50-year timeline seems excessively long, which creates concern because of the importance of recognizing changes occurring during a 50-year period. To essentially discount the ability to adaptively manage and to accept that the dredging scenarios would occur in 50 years is unrealistic. If the city, county, and the area are tasked for the money to dredge every five or 10 years, the area would find a way to avoid spending hundreds of millions of dollars in any case regardless of whether the system is a lake or an estuary. The unfair burden of all the options by using a straight-line assumption model assumes costs today would continue over the course of the next 50 years. Additionally, the charts convey dollars spent 50 years in the future are equivalent to today's dollars because the figures do not discount any of the costs that are 30, 40, or 50 years in the future. Even if the estimates factored 3.5% percent, the costs would be discounted at least five times. Essentially, a million dollars spent 50 years from now is really only several hundred thousand dollars. The chart distorts costs. Rather, displaying one option with costs loaded on the front-end and another option with costs projected at the back-end unfairly burden the option with costs incurred later. The time value and the 50-year life cycle are automatic when completing a true analysis.

Mr. Lengenfelder remarked that his comments speak to the issue of dollars and confusion associated with the bar chart. It also relates to information buried in the DES announcement for the public hearings regarding the reference to a survey. He assumed that a previous reference of 80% of people having responded and supporting an EIS is in reference to that survey. The survey tool is Monkey Survey. He attempted to complete the survey and realized mid-way that the questions were unclear. When he attempted to return to the beginning of the survey, the survey limited that option and automatically exited him from the program. He attempted a second time to complete the survey, when the same scenario occurred. The survey is not representative of a broad-base of the area's population. Specifically, participants attending the meetings who have paid attention throughout the process. The survey is problematic.

Ms. Gardner-Brown said the reference pertaining to 80% support was in reference to support of the Purpose and Need Statement, which is a tool used in Phase II. There were no specific questions regarding Phase II, but rather an assumption based on the attendance of interested stakeholders and interest in identifying and selecting a long-term management after technical analyses.

Mr. Lengenfelder suggested that the assumption is not accurate because of the frustration of the unknowns at this point, in terms of how all the options are flushing out because many assumptions were not included in the notes that might help to clarify the information. For those who pay attention or are analytical, they really can't sort the information and make a value judgment.

Discuss Next Steps and Phase 1 Transition into Phase 2

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed a two-page document on next steps and transitioning from Phase I to Phase II. The intent of the document is a description of the Phase I process moving to Phase II. The vast majority of stakeholders want to move to Phase II. DES is pursuing funding to move to Phase II. Phase II includes technical analyses and updating option designs.

Ms. Gardner-Brown provided an overview of the document.

Open House for Written Input and Material Review

Participants were invited to submit written comments and review materials. Ms. Gardner-Brown thanked everyone for attending.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned to an open house at 7:29 p.m.

Prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net