




Wed 9/15/2021 5:41 PM

Robert Wubbena <rwubbena@gmail.com>

Capitol Lake---Who is responsible for it--DEIS

To Laurie Dolan; Jessica Bateman; Sam Hunt; Andrew Barkis; jt.wilcox@leg.wa.gov

Cc Jack Havens; Bob Holman; Doug Mah; Dave Schaffert; Meg Van Schoorl; Todd Cutts

 We removed extra line breaks from this message.



The State (DES) is the lead agency on the DEIS for Capitol Lake. Most think that someone qualified is overseeing the study. The problem, the responsible party does not appear to be paying close attention to the quality (or lack thereof) in the DEIS preparation and findings that will be used to guide the next steps.

Our group of retired professionals (CLIPA) have spent the last 10 years attempting to get the State, the County, the City or whoever is responsible for the future of Capitol Lake, to pay attention to what is not being said. Now the State is spending over \$6 million to guide "someone" to make an informed decision. Since the Legislature is paying the bill---you must be that "someone".

We have updated our technical review and have produced the attached [120 page](#) detailed review of the new document, even though many of the same issues were shared with the DES staff and consultants over the last few years. The first ten pages of the document are "layperson friendly" and we would encourage you to review these ten pages. You will have many questions you might want to ask DES about.

Some key points----

- 1) COMMON FIRST STEP All three active alternatives start with the dredging of the North Basin. A good first step that will allow an informed next step and development of a long term funding and maintenance program sometime over the next 30 years.
- 2) CONSULTANT CONFIRMED LAKE HAS GOOD WATER QUALITY. The Consultant found that the existing Capital Lake has good water quality now and it is improving---not the problem many have claimed---and it improves Budd Inlet water quality
- 3) UNBELIEVABLE CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES. The Capital Cost estimates are wildly and widely confused and not well done not allowing a reasonable budget analysis of the alternatives.
- 4) UNCONFIRMED DATA FOR A \$200 MILLION CONCLUSION. The NZMS issue is a \$200 million question for all three alternatives and yet the Consultant did not even complete an update on the field sampling for the NZMS to determine if it is really a problem or what options to manage it exist.
- 5) 25 FOOT WALL IN MIDDLE OF CAPITAL LAKE REQUIRED The Hybrid Alternative would require a "two story high wall" in the middle of the lake to provide the reflection pond, hiding the reflection pond from many locations.

With the State (DES) as the Lead Agency for the DEIS, most local governments believe the Lake is the responsibility of the State--and no one knows who will pay how much for what benefit. Much is left to you, the local elected officials that are the "Lead Agency Decision Makers." for the local community.

Our advice. Select and appoint an "Independent Panel" to review the work of the DEIS Consulting Team, DES and the public comments.

Clearly an independent and qualified review is needed to sort out the answers to the questions raised in our [120 page](#) review and critical questions submitted by others.

--

Bob Wubbena
2201 Bayside PL NE
Olympia WA 98506
360-280-9100
[rwubbena@gmail](mailto:rwubbena@gmail.com)