Decision Durability is the ability of an alternative to achieve long-term support from local tribes, stakeholders, and communities. Please use the scoring below to provide your entity's feedback on Decision Durability for each alternative.

Please submit your feedback via email to carrie.martin@des.wa.gov no later than Dec. 17, 2021. Please include a score and narrative response for each alternative; complete responses for each alternative are needed to include your feedback in Enterprise Services evaluation of the alternatives.

Please identify the level of support by you/the constituents that you represent for each alternative.

Alternative	Fully support or mostly support			Mostly support or partially support				Low support or cannot support		
Estuary	(10)	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Hybrid	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	(1)
Managed Lake	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	(1)
No Action	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	(1)

Please include with your rating a brief narrative describing your reasons for this score and answers to the following questions.

What about each alternative **INCREASES** your/your constituencies support of this alternative?

What about each alternative **DECREASES** your/your constituencies support of this alternative?

Estuary Alternative

What **increases** the City of Olympia's support for the Estuary Alternative?

- Through an accord between the Squaxin Island Tribe and the City of Olympia, the City has expressed a commitment to support the restoration of the Deschutes Estuary, restore treaty-protected salmon populations, and coordinate and cooperate to protect natural resources and respond to climate change.
- The Estuary Alternative would beneficially affect tribal populations through the cultural, heritage, spiritual, and educational value that an estuarine environment provides. (page 4-118)
- The draft EIS Water Quality Discipline Report (page 5-14) estimates that with the Estuary Alternative there will be an improvement in dissolved oxygen in Budd Inlet over the Managed Lake and Hybrid Alternatives.

- The Estuary Alternative would pose the least risk of potential increased utility and ratepayer costs associated with water quality regulation would occur if new TMDL allocations shift additional responsibilities for nutrient reduction to wastewater and stormwater dischargers.
- Reintroducing tidal hydrology to the Capitol Lake Basin would benefit many of the species of importance to local area tribes, including salmon and shellfish, and potentially other fish and wildlife, as well as plants. (Executive Summary page 35)
- Estuarine habitat in the South Sound has experienced severe reductions in both the quantity and quality of such key habitats for fish. Because of this, the transition in habitat type from freshwater lake to estuary would be highly valuable. (Executive Summary pages 4 and 5)
- The mixing of freshwater and saltwater in estuarine environments creates some of the most productive and valuable habitat on earth. The reestablishment of estuarine conditions by reintroducing saltwater and tidal influences to the Capitol Lake Basin would substantially improve ecological functions in the Project Area. In addition to supporting key ecological processes, estuarine conditions would provide productive habitat for shellfish, salmon, other anadromous species, and marine fish in the area, potentially including Endangered Species Act-listed Chinook.salmon (non-hatchery) and steelhead trout. Shallow water habitats with salt marsh vegetation along the shoreline would provide preferred forage and rearing habitat for juvenile salmon. (Executive Summary page 17)
- Under the Estuary Alternative, the conversion of freshwater lake habitat to a tidally influenced brackish estuary would substantially benefit anadromous fish and marine fish, potentially including ESA-listed Chinook salmon and steelhead trout, as well as shellfish. (page 4-63)
- Under the Estuary Alternative, aquatic invasive species that are intolerant to saltwater (e.g., New Zealand mudsnail, Eurasian watermilfoil, curly pondweed) would be largely eradicated from the area with the transition from freshwater to saltwater. (page 4-69)
- Maximum water levels for the Estuary Alternative would be slightly (≤1 foot [≤0.3 meters]) lower than those of the No Action and Managed Lake Alternatives. (Page 4-106)
- During extreme river floods (with 2 feet [0.61 meters] of RSLR), the Estuary Alternative would reduce the extent and intensity of flooding compared to the No Action and Managed Lake Alternatives. (Page 4-106)
- The total cost of Estuary Alternative over 30 years would be $70 to $271 million dollars less than the Managed Lake and Hybrid Alternatives. (page 4-184)
- The Estuary and Hybrid Alternatives would provide more opportunity for carbon sequestration and less methane emissions than the Managed Lake Alternative, with the Estuary providing slightly more storage capacity than the Hybrid Alternative. (Economics Discipline Report page ES-7).
- The Estuary alternative promotes the greatest levels of consistency with Guiding Principles in the 2017 Thurston Climate Adaptation Plan.
- With the Estuary Alternative, enhancements to trails, habitat areas, and restored water-based recreation would increase the value of recreation in the Capitol Lake Basin.
- Construction of a temporary 5th Avenue bridge could mitigate construction impacts and provide redundancy and provide improved traffic flow in this vital part of the City's transportation and utility network.

What **decreases** the City of Olympia's support for the Estuary Alternative?

- Not applicable.

Hybrid Alternative

What **increases** the City of Olympia's support for the Hybrid Alternative?

- Not applicable.

What **decreases** the City of Olympia's support for the Hybrid Alternative?

- Improvements in ecological functions with the Hybrid Alternative would be less substantial than for the Estuary Alternative.
- Over 30 years, the Hybrid Alternative would cost $70 to $127 million more than the Estuary Alternative.
- Of the three action alternatives, the Hybrid Alternative would generate the highest levels of GHG emissions during construction (Attachment 11, page 5-14)
- The Hybrid Alternative would have slightly less net carbon sequestration when compared to the Estuary Alternative because of the decreased area of saline marsh in the North Basin (Attachment 11, page 5-16).
- The Budd Inlet sediment deposition for the Hybrid Alternative would be approximately 23% greater than the predicted deposition for the Estuary Alternative. (page 4-8).
- The Department of Enterprise Services indicates that the final Environmental Impact Statement may include a freshwater (groundwater fed) rather than saltwater reflecting pool for the Hybrid Alternative. The City is concerned with the feasibility of a groundwater fed freshwater reflecting pool. Flow rates from existing artesian wells in downtown Olympia would not support sufficient water exchange to maintain water quality in a reflecting pool. Water rights for groundwater to feed the reflecting pool would also be highly speculative.

Managed Lake Alternative

What **increases** the City of Olympia's support for the Managed Lake Alternative?

- Not applicable.

What **decreases** the City of Olympia's support for the Managed Lake Alternative?

- The Managed Lake Alternative would have no change in impact on water quality in Lower Budd Inlet compared to existing conditions based on there being no changes in DO or general condition of habitat for cold water fish and no change in the extent or frequency of algae blooms. Budd Inlet would continue experience low DO concentrations that do not meet DO standards each summer especially in the lower water column. (Water Quality Discipline Report Page 5-9)
- The Managed Lake Alternative would perpetuate historic inequities, particularly for tribal populations that have experienced ongoing adverse effects from changes to the ecosystem since non-Indigenous settlement of the region and continued loss of connection to the natural environment. (page 7-11)
- Improvements in ecological functions with the Managed Lake Alternative would be substantially less than for the Estuary Alternative.
- Potential utility and ratepayer costs associated with water quality regulation would occur if new TMDL allocations shift additional responsibilities for nutrient reduction to wastewater and stormwater dischargers.

- Over 30 years, the Managed Lake Alternative would cost $158 to $271 million more than the Estuary Alternative.
- With the Managed Lake alternative, Tribal values would continue to be adversely impacted by the loss of connection to the natural environment and anthropogenic harm to natural ecosystems.
- The water quality improvements from a yet to be developed adaptive lake management plan are uncertain.
- The Managed Lake Alternative would not promote consistency with the Guiding Principles in the 2017 Thurston Climate Adaptation Plan, capturing and storing GHG emissions (page 4-86)
- Under the No Action and Managed Lake Alternatives, impacts would be significant if Ecology requires LOTT and other dischargers to implement more stringent actions for stormwater and wastewater discharges to improve water quality and meet regulatory standards in the basin.
- Among all alternatives, the highest maximum water levels and greatest extent of flooding would occur for the Managed Lake Alternative during extreme river floods. (page 4-2)

No Action Alternative

What **increases** the City of Olympia's support for the No Action Alternative?

- Not applicable.

What **decreases** the City of Olympia's support for the No Action Alternative?

- The No Action Alternative is not sustainable.
- The No Action Alternative would not improve water quality.
- The No Action Alternative would not manage sediment or future deposition.
- The No Action Alternative would not improve ecological functions.
- The No Action Alternative would not enhance community use of the resource.
- The No Action Alternative would not provide net environmental benefits.
- Under the No Action and Managed Lake Alternatives, impacts would be significant if Ecology requires LOTT and other dischargers to implement more stringent actions for stormwater and wastewater discharges to improve water quality and meet regulatory standards in the basin.
- Among all alternatives, the highest maximum water levels and greatest extent of flooding would occur for the Managed Lake Alternative during extreme river floods. The No Action Alternative would experience similar, although slightly lower, water levels during extreme river floods. (page 4-2)