

Supplemental Environmental Assessment  
for the  
Strawberry Plant Park  
Shoreline Restoration Project

Supplements EA for the  
Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor Site  
Bainbridge Island, Washington  
Restoration Plan

**Prepared by the  
Elliott Bay  
Trustee Council**

June 6, 2009

Public Review Draft

<i>Project Location:</i>	Eagle Harbor, Bainbridge Island, Kitsap County, Washington
<i>Lead federal agencies for the Restoration Plan:</i>	The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (DOI,FWS)
<i>Lead Administrative Trustee:</i>	NOAA Damage Assessment and Restoration Center NW Attn: John Kern 206-526-6029 <a href="mailto:john.kern@noaa.gov">john.kern@noaa.gov</a>
<i>Cooperating agencies and tribes:</i>	Washington Department of Ecology (WDEC, as lead state Trustee) and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Suquamish Tribe, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, and the City of Bainbridge Island
<i>Comments/Contact Person:</i>	John Kern, NOAA NOAA Damage Assessment and Restoration Center NW 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Building 1 Seattle, WA 98115 Email: <a href="mailto:john.kern@noaa.gov">john.kern@noaa.gov</a>
<i>Administrative Record:</i>	Supporting documentation for this Supplemental Environmental Assessment may be reviewed by contacting the case records manager John Kern at 206-526-6029 or <a href="mailto:john.kern@noaa.gov">john.kern@noaa.gov</a> .

1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	4
1.1	SUMMARY OF THE RESTORATION PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE WYCKOFF/EAGLE HARBOR SITE .....	4
1.2	CHANGES MADE IN THIS SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT .....	6
2.0	PURPOSE AND NEED FOR RESTORATION .....	6
2.1	OVERVIEW .....	6
2.2	PURPOSE AND NEED .....	7
2.3	NEPA COMPLIANCE.....	7
2.4	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....	8
2.5	ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD .....	8
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING/AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT.....	9
3.1	EAGLE HARBOR SITE FEATURES .....	9
3.2	STRAWBERRY PLANT PARK SITE DESCRIPTION .....	10
4.0	STRAWBERRY PLANT PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION.....	11
4.1	PROJECT BACKGROUND .....	11
4.2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	12
4.3	PROJECT MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP .....	14
5.0	ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS.....	14
	Restoration alternatives must be analyzed for Direct, Indirect, or Cumulative impacts under NEPA. ....	14
5.1	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED .....	14
5.2	DIRECT, INDIRECT, OR CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF THE NO-ACTION AND PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES .....	15
5.3	EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON THE SPP RESTORATION AND NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVES .....	22
5.4	COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION .....	23
6.0	REFERENCES:.....	26
7.0	LIST OF PREPARERS:.....	27

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

As a result of a settlement with Pacific Sound Resources (*United States et al. v. Pacific Sound Resources et al.*, Civ. No. C94-687 (W.D. Wash., Aug. 29, 1994)), and the Memorandum of Agreement for Elliott Bay, the Duwamish River, and Eagle Harbor (effective date 1/19/06), the Elliott Bay Trustee Council (Trustees) received funds to restore natural resources injured by hazardous substances from the Wyckoff facility in Eagle Harbor, Bainbridge Island, Washington. The Trustees previously developed a Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (RP/EA) that identified restoration of some key habitat types as the preferred alternative to restore injured resources (Elliott Bay Trustee Council, 2009). That EA was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 U.S.C 4321 et seq.) and NEPA implementing regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508). That RP/EA identified the Strawberry Plant Park Shoreline Restoration Project (SPP) as one of the projects that contained one or more of these key habitat types and which ranked highly enough among potential projects, based on then-currently known information, to be tentatively proposed to be implemented under the RP/EA. The plan indicated that if the Trustees made the decision to pursue implementation of any of these projects, further evaluation of potential impacts of the projects on the human environment would be conducted.

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) briefly summarizes the purpose and need for restoration as previously described in the RP/EA, and discusses the screening and selection of the SPP as a preferred project under the RP/EA. The SEA evaluates the potential impact of proposed restoration actions at SPP on the quality of the physical, biological, human, and cultural environment. The SEA also discusses the ongoing process of restoration of injured resources using Wyckoff settlement funds and describes the process for submission of further project proposals for screening and possible selection for implementation.

The Trustees involved in this restoration planning process consist of the following agencies and Indian tribes: the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the U.S. Department of Commerce; the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), represented by the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS); the Washington State Departments of Ecology (WDEC, as lead state Trustee) and Fish and Wildlife (WDFW, as state co-Trustee); the Suquamish Tribe and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe.

### 1.1 SUMMARY OF THE RESTORATION PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE WYCKOFF/EAGLE HARBOR SITE

The RP/EA explained the purpose and need for the restoration actions to address injury to natural resources resulting from the release of hazardous substances into Eagle Harbor pursuant to Section 107(f) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq., (also known as the Clean Water Act or CWA) and other applicable Federal or State law, including Subpart G of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 C.F.R. Sections 300.600 - 300.615, and regulations at 43 C.F.R. Part 11 which are applicable to natural resource damage assessments (NRDA) under CERCLA. It described the affected environment and the role of the public in the restoration process. It evaluated three general restoration alternatives for appropriateness under CERCLA as well as for potential impacts to the human environment:

**No-Action:** No restoration actions would be taken under this alternative to compensate the public for injuries to natural resources. The only restoration that would occur would be that accomplished under other authorities and programs. This alternative would have no impact on the environment, including beneficial impacts to species such as the threatened Puget Sound Chinook salmon. However, it would also be inconsistent with the Trustees' mandate under CERCLA to make the public and environment whole for injuries to natural resources and losses of ecological services

resulting from the release of hazardous substances. Because the Trustees have funds that are required to be used to restore injured natural resources on Bainbridge Island, and such use is consistent with CERCLA, this alternative was not selected as Preferred.

**Species-Specific Restoration:** Under this alternative, the Trustees would develop specific projects to benefit individual species. A number of different types of projects could be implemented under this alternative, including restoring critical habitat for a given species; constructing net pens, hatcheries, or artificial incubators; seeding flats with clams; creating artificial reefs; erecting nest boxes or perches, and creating or enhancing nesting, loafing, feeding and rearing habitats for birds. The Trustees would need to identify the target species and develop projects to compensate for injuries to these species. There is a wide-range of potential impacts to the environment from this alternative because of the wide variety of the types of projects that could be included under it. From a NRDA perspective, a species-specific restoration approach would be most appropriate if one or a few species were predominantly injured by the hazardous substance releases, because projects could be designed to precisely address injuries to the most affected species. However, when there is a broad range of species affected with a number of different life-histories, trophic levels, etc., as is the case for Eagle Harbor, a species-specific restoration approach is problematic primarily because targeting restoration for one or a few species runs the risk of having non-targeted species getting little or no restoration benefits to address their injuries. This alternative was also not selected as Preferred.

**Integrated Habitat Restoration:** Under this alternative, the Trustees would restore key nearshore and shoreline habitats that would benefit, directly or indirectly, a large suite of species that were injured by releases of hazardous substances into Eagle Harbor. These projects would create habitats that provide food, foraging and resting areas for juvenile salmonids and other fish, shore birds and other wildlife. Since loss of nearshore habitats has been identified as a contributing factor in the population declines of a number of species (Gelfenbaum et al., 2006), the restoration of these habitats would directly benefit those species and assist in recovery of their populations. The key habitats targeted in this alternative include: marsh, eelgrass, intertidal flats, and forage fish spawning beaches. In general, there would be some short-term, minor adverse impacts from implementing this alternative, primarily from the construction activities. However there would be some slight longer-term beneficial impacts following the end of construction activities, including to threatened species such as Puget Sound Chinook salmon, bull trout, and Puget Sound Steelhead. This alternative was identified as preferred in the RP/EA and NMFS found that implementation of this alternative would not have significant impacts on the human environment in a “Finding of No Significant Impact” (FONSI), dated January 12, 2009. The integrated habitat restoration alternative was subsequently selected as the approach for restoring injuries to natural resources resulting from the release of hazardous substances into Eagle Harbor from the Wyckoff Facility

The RP/EA described the process that the Trustees used to screen potential projects consistent with the Integrated Habitat Restoration Approach. This process used NRDA restoration alternative selection criteria to evaluate the appropriateness of each potential project. Project ideas that had been received up to that time were evaluated based on the currently known information. It also described the process for submission of further project proposals for screening and possible selection for implementation. It identified five projects which, based on the information then available, were consistent with the Integrated Habitat Restoration alternative and these five projects were identified as the top restoration project candidates for construction. Detailed impact analysis was included for the Milwaukee Dock Eelgrass project, but was not possible for the other projects based on the information then known. This SEA analyzes the impacts on the human environment from the proposed SPP project and a No-Action Alternative.

## **1.2 FOCUS OF THIS SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

As described in the RP/EA, supplemental analysis of site-specific projects would be conducted where warranted. Information and analyses provided in the RP/EA are not repeated here, as this SEA augments that analysis by providing a more in-depth discussion of the proposed plans and a detailed impacts analysis for the SPP project. There are two alternatives discussed in this SEA: implementing the SPP project as apart of the RP integrated habitat restoration effort and not implementing the SPP project as part of the restoration effort presented in the RP (the No-Action Alternative). If the SPP project is not implemented, there would be substitute restoration proposed in the future using the funds that would have been spent on the SPP project; those other projects are not yet proposed and are not a subject of this SEA. Under either alternative, other restoration actions would occur to address some of the injuries to natural resources resulting from releases from the Wyckoff facility.

There are also two clarifications to the RP/EA provided in this SEA:

- The last sentence of the last paragraph in section 1.2 (page 7) is updated here to read, “For each of the restoration projects the Trustees will develop a monitoring plan designed to gauge the response/performance of the project implementation and to help assess the need for adaptive management.”
- The second to last sentence in the first paragraph in section 3.2.8 (page 20) is updated here to read, “The Trustees will only fund projects that do not incur significantly negative impacts to historic trust resources.” This change is considered a clarification of the intent of the RP/EA, and is not a significant change that in itself warrants supplemental analysis, therefore no additional discussion of this clarification is necessary in the remainder of this SEA.

## **2.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR RESTORATION**

This chapter provides an overview of the history of Eagle Harbor including information about the Wyckoff facility and the release history of the site, and describes the legal authority under which Trustees act on behalf of the public. More detailed information is available in the RP/EA (Elliott Bay Trustee Council, 2009), including the project selection process that resulted in identifying the SPP as a potential restoration project. The RP/EA also provides information concerning public involvement in the restoration planning and NEPA process.

### **2.1 OVERVIEW**

Eagle Harbor is a small embayment located on the eastern side of Bainbridge Island, Kitsap County, Washington, in central Puget Sound (Figure 1). The bay is about two square kilometers in area. Small marinas occupy the inner bay. The central and outer portions of the harbor are surrounded by residences, the Washington State Department of Transportation (DOT) ferry terminal and ferry maintenance facility, a marina, and the former Wyckoff Company wood treatment facility. The area known as Winslow is located immediately north of the harbor, has a population of 2,822, and is the principal center of population and commerce on the island. Since March 1991, the whole island of Bainbridge has been incorporated and is now the “City of Bainbridge Island” (COBI). Winslow is now considered as the downtown area within Bainbridge Island.

The Suquamish Tribe occupied villages and camps along the shoreline of Eagle Harbor site over the last 5,000 years. Euro-Americans first settled Eagle Harbor area in the 1870’s, when there were still two large Suquamish Indian encampments on the north shore of the harbor. Boat building

began at that time, and in the early 1900's a large shipyard was started by the Hall brothers in the area now occupied by the Eagle Harbor Condominiums and the ferry maintenance facility. One of the largest industries on Bainbridge Island was the Wyckoff Company wood-treating plant on the south shore at the entrance to Eagle Harbor, which began operations in 1903. Wood treatment operations ceased at Wyckoff in 1988. The Wyckoff facility and approximately 500 acres in Eagle Harbor was proposed as a Superfund site in 1985 and was listed on the National Priority List (NPL) in 1987. The only activities that have occurred in the recent past are related to site cleanup. A summary of information related to the contamination in Eagle Harbor is given in:

[http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HAC/pha/wyckoff/wyc\\_p1.html](http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HAC/pha/wyckoff/wyc_p1.html)

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Trustees entered into a Memorandum of Agreement, in which the Trustees were to develop restoration goals (NOAA, 2001) for the site. If the goals were not met by remedial actions, the Trustees would receive funds in order to undertake restoration for injured natural resources and services. The goals developed by the Trustees were not met, so funds were provided to the Trustees to conduct restoration actions on Bainbridge Island, including the nearshore areas.

## **2.2 PURPOSE AND NEED**

The purpose of this proposed action is to restore critical habitats in Eagle Harbor by building restoration projects that will, in combination with other restoration projects implemented under the RP/EA, compensate the public and environment for injuries resulting from the release of hazardous substances into Eagle Harbor, Bainbridge Island, WA. This is needed because under the CERCLA NRDA process, natural resource Trustees are required to implement restoration actions intended to make the public and environment whole for injuries resulting from the release of hazardous substances. Restoration under CERCLA is explained in detail in the final RP/EA (Elliott Bay Trustee Council, 2009).

The basic goal of NRDA restoration under CERCLA is to make the public and environment whole for injuries caused by releases of hazardous substances. Numerous different natural resources and resource services were impacted by the releases of hazardous substances from the Wyckoff facility. This includes resources that were directly exposed to the contaminants in Eagle Harbor and injured as a result of that exposure, but also resources that were indirectly impacted because of things like the reduction in the amount of prey biomass. To the maximum extent practicable, given the funds available, the Trustees' goal is to undertake restoration actions that will benefit the suite of resources affected by the Wyckoff releases both directly and indirectly. It is highly likely, however, that the total amount of restoration that can be achieved with the funds provided by the bankruptcy settlement will not fully address the injuries to natural resources resulting from the Wyckoff releases, despite the best efforts of the Trustees to maximize the amount of restoration that can be achieved with these funds.

## **2.3 NEPA COMPLIANCE**

The decision-making process for conducting restoration of natural resources under CERCLA must comply with the NEPA (40 CFR Section 1500, et seq.) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA. In compliance with NEPA and the CEQ regulations this SEA summarizes the current environmental setting, describes the purpose and need for action, identifies alternative actions, assesses their applicability and environmental consequences, and summarizes opportunities for public participation in the decision process.

## **2.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Trustees received public input in the development of the RP/EA, through discussions with local public officials, a public meeting, and a public review and comment on the draft RP/EA. The Trustees welcome additional restoration project suggestions from the public that are consistent with the restoration goals and restoration criteria presented in the RP/EA. New project ideas will be evaluated for potential implementation until all the settlement funds are spent. Public opportunities to comment on the scope and design of each of the projects ultimately proposed for implementation will also be available through Supplemental Environmental Assessments and the federal, state, and local permitting processes.

This draft SEA for the SPP project is being made available for public review as part of the process laid out in the RP/EA. Following a public notice, it will be available to the public for a 15-day comment period. Comments received during the 15-day period will be considered by the Trustees before finalizing the SEA. A summary of comments received and the Trustees' responses thereto will be included in the final SEA. The deadline for submitting written comments on the Draft RP/EA will be specified in one or more public notices issued by the Trustees to announce the document's availability for public review and comment. Additional opportunities for public review will be provided in the event that significant changes to the plan are required. Comments on this draft should be submitted in writing to:

John Kern  
NOAA Restoration Center NW, Bld. 1  
7600 Sand Point Way, NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

or via email to:

[john.kern@noaa.gov](mailto:john.kern@noaa.gov)

## **2.5 ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

This SEA references a number of resource documents prepared by and for the Trustees and through the restoration planning process. These documents, incorporated by reference into this SEA, are part of the administrative record on file for these projects with the lead Administrative Trustee and may be viewed by contacting John Kern at 206-526-6029 or via email at [john.kern@noaa.gov](mailto:john.kern@noaa.gov).

### **3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING/AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

In this section, there is a brief description of the physical and biological features of Eagle Harbor, and a more detailed description of the Strawberry Plant Park site, including information on the site's history.

#### **3.1 EAGLE HARBOR SITE FEATURES**

The physical and biological features of Eagle Harbor are briefly described below. The material is summarized from the RP/EA where additional details are available, including information on the history of Eagle Harbor.

##### **3.1.1 Physical Features**

Eagle Harbor is a bay of approximately 0.8 square miles on the eastern side of Bainbridge Island, Kitsap County, Washington, in Central Puget Sound. Eagle Harbor is a narrow east-west oriented bay, approximately 2.2 miles long and 0.4 miles wide near its mouth. The maximum depth of -50 ft Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) occurs in the eastern portion of the harbor. Salinity in Eagle Harbor is similar to levels in Puget Sound, at approximately 27.5-28.5 parts per thousand. However, fresh water inflow is minimal and as such does not substantially affect salinity in the harbor.

The existing shoreline is almost entirely armored and there is evidence of past fill events along much of the shoreline. Filling, dredging and armoring have diminished the historical extent as well as the function of intertidal habitats around the area. The most impacted reaches on Bainbridge Island, as defined in the Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment (Williams et al., 2004), are in Eagle Harbor, and these reaches were "characterized by exceptional amounts of fill and armoring, most of which encroached into the intertidal zone..." The same is true of Bainbridge Island shorelines in general, since over 50% of the shoreline has some form of armoring or other modifications (Williams et al., 2003). The areas of habitat remaining throughout the bay are isolated by development between the habitat patches. WDFW has mapped surf-smelt spawning beaches along the northern and southern Eagle Harbor shorelines and south of Bill Point on the Puget Sound shoreline as well as sand lance spawning on the southern Eagle Harbor shoreline and on the Pritchard Park West Beach area.

The Bainbridge Island nearshore environment as a whole was characterized in the Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment (Williams et al., 2004) and more detailed information is available in this document as well as other documents available at:

[http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/nearshore\\_assessment.aspx](http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/nearshore_assessment.aspx)

##### **3.1.2 Biological Features**

Eagle Harbor provides nursery and adult habitat for a variety of marine fish and invertebrate species. Important fish and invertebrates include several flatfish species, scorpaenids (rockfish), surf perch (pile perch), gaddids (cod), hexagrammids (lingcod and greenlings), cancrid crabs, sea cucumbers, squid, and pandalid shrimp. Several shellfish species are present in the intertidal and subtidal areas. Several shoreline areas are also used by forage fish (e.g., surf smelt, sand lance, and herring) for spawning. Listed species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) potentially present in Eagle Harbor and the nearshore waters surrounding Bainbridge Island include Puget Sound Chinook salmon, Puget Sound steelhead, bull trout, Steller sea lion, humpback whale, leatherback sea turtle, marbled murrelet, and Southern Resident killer whale. Of the species most likely to be present in the area, the nearshore and estuarine waters of Bainbridge Island are critical habitat for Puget Sound Chinook salmon, the nearshore waters (as shallow as 20 ft relative to

extreme high water) are critical habitat for Southern Resident killer whale, but no critical habitat has been designated for Puget Sound Steelhead.

Waterfowl species that are likely to be found in Eagle Harbor include greater scaups, lesser scaups, ring-necked ducks, surf scoters, white-winged scoters, American widgeons, great blue heron, Canada geese, mallards, common goldeneye, mergansers and bufflehead. Other species that may occur include western grebe, double-crested cormorants, Pacific loons, American coots, and pigeon guillemots. Although several species of gulls occur in and around the bays of Bainbridge Island and the Kitsap peninsula, glaucous-winged gulls are the most commonly observed during the Kitsap Audubon Bird count and are abundant along the water front areas. Shorebirds include sandpipers, dunlins, and snipe. The wading birds are generally present along the sandy shorelines. Migratory birds that are known to be present in the action area include red-breasted nuthatches, song sparrows, downy woodpeckers, dark-eyed juncos and chickadees, among others.

## **3.2 STRAWBERRY PLANT PARK SITE DESCRIPTION**

This section describes the physical and biological features of the SPP site and provides some information on the history of the site itself.

### **3.2.1 Physical Features**

The entire Strawberry Plant Park property is approximately 4 acres in size and is located in the back reaches of Eagle Harbor (Figure 1). The north side of the site is bounded by Shepard Way NW. A residential property borders the property on the west side, while the east side is bordered by Weaver Creek. The southern boundary of the property is Eagle Harbor itself. The property has a general, gentle slope downward from the road toward the Eagle Harbor shoreline. A driveway leads down from Shepard Way through a forested area to a large concrete pad, located in the lower portion of the property.

The lower portion of the property includes a small modern building, two earthen piers, some bulkheading, a smaller concrete pad, bare areas, and areas of vegetation (Figure 2). The bank of Weaver Creek has large slabs of concrete on some portions. The shoreline is highly modified, and the present shoreline is largely comprised of fill material placed on formerly intertidal habitat. Fill depth varies by location and there is at least 8' of fill on top of native soil in one location according to borings taken at the site (Aspect Consulting, 2008). There is also a significant amount of shoreline armoring. In areas without shoreline armoring the grade is relatively steep compared to what would normally be expected in an unaltered shoreline with similar hydrology.

Until recently there had been a large number of creosote pilings in the intertidal zone, but these were removed by Washington Department of Natural Resources in February 2009; a few concrete pilings remain. The intertidal area is covered with scattered debris such as bricks and concrete chunks. The mouth of Weaver Creek forms a small sub-estuary, but it is restricted by fill and concrete debris.

More information about the physical features of the site is available from documents available at: [http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/strawberry\\_plant.aspx](http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/strawberry_plant.aspx).

### **3.2.2 Biological Features**

The upland forested area contains Douglas Fir, hemlock, cedar, madrone, maple, and willow trees, providing good habitat for a number of bird species. It also contains some invasive plant species including scotch broom, Himalayan blackberry, ivy, and morning glory. The shoreline contains some marsh vegetation, but due to the configuration of the shoreline including the steep slope, the

marsh is in a relatively thin band and appears to be functioning at a relatively low level as habitat. Many of the animal species discussed in Section 2.1.2 would be expected to be present in and around the SPP site.

### **3.2.3 Site History**

The SPP site has an extensive history which will only be discussed briefly here. The information presented below is largely from a preliminary background archaeological report prepared as part of the site assessment effort (Northwest Archaeological Associates, Inc., 2009). This report is available at: <http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/documents/pln/strawberryplant/sp-rpt-archaeology.pdf>

The SPP site is within the traditional territory of the Suquamish Tribe, and reports from early settlers indicate that there were Suquamish camps and villages in the area. By the late 1800's a small farm with a house and boat landing was located in the vicinity of the SPP property. Strawberry farming became important on Bainbridge Island and in 1930 a strawberry cannery was built on the site by the Winslow Berry Grower's Association, a cooperative of Japanese-American farmers. The cannery was a double-gable roofed building located partially on land and mostly on pilings overwater. The cannery operated until all Japanese-Americans on Bainbridge Island were sent to internment camps during World War II. Following the end of the war, canning operations were moved to a new location. The building and property had a variety of other uses since then, including gravel and sand processing, boat building, and as offices. The cannery building was destroyed by fire in 1997. The property was obtained by the COBI in 2005, as detailed below in Section 4.1.

## **4.0 STRAWBERRY PLANT PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION**

This section provides details on the background of the Strawberry Plant property and the process under which the project was developed, as well as specific details about the project design, construction actions, and post-construction monitoring and stewardship.

### **4.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

The information summarized immediately below is largely taken from a background Memorandum to the COBI City Council on the SPP and the restoration project (Best, 2007a) and from the COBI webpage for the SPP project ([http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/strawberry\\_plant.aspx](http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/strawberry_plant.aspx)).

The COBI approved the acquisition of the SPP property through a property exchange on November 10, 2004, and acquired the property on January 28, 2005. The property was valued at \$1.5 million at the time of the exchange. Prior to the acquisition, the COBI and Park District entered into an agreement whereby there would be a joint planning process for the SPP property with the ownership to be transferred to the Park District in the future. The agreement also identified habitat restoration as a mutual interest for the property by the COBI and Park District, in addition to recreation. Although there had been a desire for establishing a sailing, rowing, and kayaking center on the property, COBI and Park District staff in consultation with Rowing Club representatives determined that this was impractical because of regulations (buffers and setbacks) that restricted the development of the site for that purpose as well as the fact that a very long dock (approximately 300' long) would be required simply to reach the zero tide line (and it was deemed unlikely that all necessary permits could be obtained to construct such a dock). Through a property conversion, the location of the boating center was changed to Waterfront Park.

In March 2007, the SPP was one of several potential sites for restoration projects that were shown to Trustee representatives for consideration in restoring natural resources injured by releases from the Wyckoff facility. After evaluation of the initial SPP project concept, along with other potential restoration project suggestions, the SPP project was identified as one of those potential COBI restoration projects having high potential as a candidate NRDA restoration project. During the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor public meeting held by the Trustees on May 1, 2008, the SPP was identified as a project that was likely to be included in the restoration effort and it was also identified as such in the draft RP/EA and, following consideration of public comments, in the final RP/EA. Because the planning process for SPP was then at a stage where detailed impact analysis could not be performed because of the then-uncertainty about specific project details, the RP/EA indicated that after additional information was available the project would be re-evaluated and a SEA developed if the Trustees decided to propose funding the project as part of the overall NRDA restoration effort. At the request of the COBI, the Trustees provided some funding (\$33,960.00) to do preliminary investigations necessary for further development of the SPP project concept by the COBI because the further development of the project concept was needed for the further evaluation of the project by the Trustees. This funding was provided under the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Trustees and COBI, finalized in June 2008.

On September 27, 2008, the COBI and Park District held a design charrette in which members of the public identified their desires for the SPP design. City and Park District staff then developed design concepts that incorporated key elements identified by the charrette participants and which balanced both habitat and public use. These concepts were made available for public review and comment by COBI and Park District. On December 8, 2008, the Trustees met with a COBI representative to provide comments on the design concepts developed by the COBI and Park District. The resulting revised design concept for the habitat restoration portion of the SPP (the design for the park portion outside of the habitat area will be developed in the future) was presented to the COBI City Council and Park District Board on February 24, 2009 at a public meeting. A Trustee representative spoke at the meeting and indicated that, although the Trustees would prefer there to be more habitat restoration than in the revised design concept, they understood the need for the SPP to have multiple uses and that the design concept was a good compromise between the different uses. He said that the concept for the habitat area was consistent with the requirements in the RP/EA and that the Trustees would support providing further funding for the project as shown in the concept presented at the meeting, contingent upon the need for the Trustees to meet regulatory requirements such as consultation under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and those of the NEPA. Both the City Council and Park District Board voted to approve the area designated for habitat and the restoration concept at that meeting.

## **4.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The SPP restoration project will restore a much more natural shoreline than exists currently at the site by removing large amounts of fill and the existing shoreline armoring (Figure 3). The shoreline reach in which the SPP is located is currently rated as "moderate/high impact" and ranks as the 186<sup>th</sup> worst reach out of 201 reaches on Bainbridge Island according to the Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment and would likely rank as the 21<sup>st</sup> best reach after the restoration is completed (Best, 2007b). With respect to the value of the SPP restoration project as NRDA restoration, the RP/EA describes the screening process used to evaluate potential projects for implementation under it and gave scores based on the information available at the time of the screening (see Table 1 in the RP/EA). The SPP project then received a total score of 24 points, which is the maximum possible. Based on newer information about the estimated project cost and the availability of other funds to pay some of the construction costs, the Trustees conclude that the project is definitely very cost-effective from a NRDA funds perspective and the tentative score given earlier was not changed.

The project will remove fill from approximately 0.65 acres to create new intertidal habitat (marsh and mudflat), and in addition will remove debris from some existing intertidal habitat. (Creosote pilings in the intertidal were removed under a Washington Department of Natural Resources program). The amount of intertidal marsh will double from the 0.2 acres of poorly functioning existing marsh to 0.4 acres of marsh that should all function at a very high level of ecological services provision. In total, there will be 1.36 acres of intertidal restoration of the key habitat types that were identified in the RP/EA as being appropriate to address the injuries to natural resources with the settlement funds. There will also be 0.61 acres of new riparian buffer built adjacent to the restored marsh habitat. The integrated complex of riparian, marsh, and mudflat habitats at this site would maximize ecological service provision to salmon, other fish, and bird species directly. Debris in the mouth of the stream would also be removed to enhance its value as a sub-estuary.

In the portion of the SPP that is designated for habitat, the design concept calls for a “non-motorized hand powered boat launch”, which will be created by placing a “fish-friendly” gravel mix down after the fill that currently exists is removed. This boat launch was a feature identified by the public as highly desirable for the park and the use of gravel will allow it to provide some degree of habitat function. The concept also calls for an overwater viewing structure to be built over the footprint of the existing eastern earthen pier. The overwater viewing structure was suggested by the Trustees in comments on the draft designs that had been developed following the charrette held by the COBI and Park District, in order to increase the amount of intertidal restoration. Additionally, the design concept calls for a pedestrian bridge to connect the existing waterfront trail to the SPP. No NRDA funds will go toward the construction of the elevated viewing platform or the pedestrian bridge.

The plans for the portion of the SPP property upland from the habitat restoration area (which will be developed as a park for human use) have not yet been developed, and future development of this upland portion is not part of the NRDA restoration and will not receive funding from the NRDA settlement. However, it is possible that the fill that will be removed as part of the restoration would be disposed of on SPP property upland from the riparian area- if it is not disposed of off-site at an approved disposal area. (Off-site disposal is likely to be more expensive). The tentative location for the fill placement on-site would be in the location of the large existing asphalt area, which would be removed before the fill is placed. If the fill is placed on-site, the plan calls for the fill to create a raised area behind the riparian buffer which would then be planted to create a meadow. The removal of some of the asphalt and replacing it with a meadow would be beneficial in reducing the amount of impervious surface at the site and would provide benefits such as increased primary production. Although there would be some ecological services provided by a meadow, it would not be considered part of the habitat restoration because it would be intended for human use. The disposal of the fill is a necessary part of the habitat restoration, so restoration funds would be used for fill disposal whether it is done on-site or off-site.

The total cost of the restoration project, excluding property costs, is estimated by COBI at approximately \$931,000, including costs for monitoring and stewardship. To date, a total of \$33,960 in NRDA settlement funds have been provided for preliminary site investigations and the Trustees have conditionally approved an additional \$315,443 as a match for SRFB funds for construction. The amount of restoration of key habitats at this site that will be leveraged with NRDA funds is much more than can typically be obtained, based on similar NRDA restoration projects built in Puget Sound. In accordance with the MOA between the COBI and Trustees, a restrictive covenant will be placed on the habitat restoration portion of the SPP property, to protect the created habitat from future development.

### **4.3 PROJECT MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP**

A monitoring plan will be developed by the Trustees to gauge the response/performance of the project implementation and to help assess the need for adaptive management. The monitoring will be conducted by the COBI with funding provided by the Trustees. Restoration projects also require active stewardship to accomplish actions such as removing invasive plant species, collecting and disposing of trash and debris, and adding mulch. A plan for stewardship of this project will also be developed. Stewardship will be conducted by the COBI under its Shoreline Stewardship Program, with funds provided by the Trustees. These stewardship and monitoring activities are intended to accomplish the project objectives as described here, and are considered a part of the proposed action alternative.

## **5.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

Restoration alternatives must be analyzed for Direct, Indirect, or Cumulative impacts under NEPA.

### **5.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

Two restoration alternatives were evaluated in this SEA, an action alternative of building the SPP habitat restoration project as part of the NRDA restoration and a No-Action alternative in which the SPP project would not be included in the NRDA restoration effort. Under the No-Action alternative, however, the funds that would have been spent on the SPP project would be still be used, but would be spent on another restoration project.

#### **5.1.1 Alternative 1: No-Action**

The No-Action Alternative would result in the Trustees not implementing the SPP project as part of the overall effort to restore natural resources and services that were lost as a result of the release of hazardous substances from the Wyckoff facility into Eagle Harbor. Instead, because the Trustees are obligated to conduct restoration with the NRDA settlement funds, other restoration actions would occur under the RP/EA utilizing these funds to replace the SPP restoration project. The substitute restoration action would likely be to construct a single restoration project (because the amount of NRDA funding that would be available for substitute restoration would be the same amount that the SPP project would cost), either a lower-ranked project than those tentatively selected under the RP/EA or a new restoration project that has yet to be identified. Although a full assessment of other projects not yet proposed cannot be conducted, it is assumed that the total amount of ecological benefits gained from restoration to address injuries in Eagle Harbor would likely be less under this alternative than the action alternative because the SPP project would provide a relatively high pay-off of ecological service gains at a relatively low cost compared to other currently-known potential projects that could replace the SPP project. Some of the other potential restoration projects that could be funded out of the settlement might require acquisition of property, which is not required for the SPP project, and/or involve higher construction costs. This is especially true for the SPP project where NRDA settlement funds can be used to leverage Salmon Recovery Board Funds (SRFB) to pay some of the construction costs (the SRFB grant has already been approved, contingent upon the use of NRDA funds as a match).

Implementation of Alternative 1 would have generally similar impacts to those that would occur under Alternative 2 because under both alternatives there would be restoration, and the types of construction activities would basically be similar. There might be slightly less overall impact under Alternative 1 because it is likely that the restoration that would occur with the NRDA settlement funds that would otherwise be spent on the SPP project would be physically smaller because of higher costs and the lack of funds from other sources, such as the SRFB grant. The smaller restoration that would likely occur under the No-Action Alternative would also result in a reduction in the degree to which the overall restoration effort compensates for the injuries to natural

resources from the Wyckoff facility. Additionally, because there are no potential replacement projects (outside of the other four projects that are likely to be included in the Wyckoff restoration effort and which are identified in the RP/EA) that could be implemented within the anticipated timeframe for the SPP project, the “replacement” restoration that would occur under Alternative 1 would take longer to be built, and the delay in this restoration would result in a further reduction in the degree to which the Wyckoff-related injuries would be fully addressed. This is because under NRDA regulations, less restoration is needed to address a given injury if that restoration occurs sooner rather than later. Under the circumstances of this case, the Trustees are limited by the amount of the settlement, so delayed restoration will compensate for less injury than if restoration occurs sooner.

### **5.1.2 Alternative 2: Strawberry Plant Park Restoration (Preferred)**

Alternative 2 would consist of implementing the SPP project as NRDA restoration under the RP/EA for the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor site. Additional restoration of other proposed projects using the remaining settlement funds would still occur under this alternative; these other actions were presented in the RP/EA are not further analyzed here. The total amount of restoration that would occur under this alternative would likely be greater than under the No-Action Alternative because it is unlikely that such a cost-effective project, in terms of ecological benefits to the injured resources gained from the restoration compared to the NRDA settlement dollars expended, could be found and because of the delay that would result because an alternate project could not be built within the same timeframe that the SPP restoration project could be constructed.

As discussed in the previous section, there might be a slight difference in impact under this alternative compared to Alternative 1, but any difference would likely be negligible. This alternative would provide more restoration of the injured natural resources, so it would be more consistent with the Trustees’ mandate under CERCLA to obtain compensation for these injuries. Because there would not be a significant difference in impact expected under the two alternatives and a specific replacement project for SPP has not been identified, the Trustees’ goal of restoring injured natural resources would be better accomplished by funding restoration at SPP, and Alternative 2 is therefore preferred.

## **5.2 DIRECT, INDIRECT, OR CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF THE NO-ACTION AND PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES**

The No-Action Alternative and SPP Restoration Alternative were evaluated based on specific NEPA factors identified below to determine the significance of the impacts. Because NEPA requires consideration of context and intensity (40 CFR 1508.27), the impacts of the proposed alternatives must be analyzed in several contexts, e.g., the society as a whole, the affected region and interests, and the locality and by consideration of the intensity (severity) of impacts by assessing the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that could potentially arise from implementation of the proposed project. The significance of impacts under 40 CFR 1508.27(b) is to be considered in evaluating the intensity of both the beneficial and adverse impacts under short- and long-term conditions. Therefore, this section analyzes the affected environment against those specific factors [40 CFR 1508.27(b)] in order to determine whether or not the alternatives would have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. In addition, the potential impacts of the alternatives were examined in light of NOAA Administrative Order (NAO) Series 216-6, *Environmental Review Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act* (NAO 216-6).

The Trustees concluded overall that any potential adverse environmental impacts from the SPP Restoration Alternative would be short-term and construction-related, while beneficial environmental impacts would result in long-term benefits to the area’s natural resources and the

aesthetic pleasures for humans. The same is largely true for the No-Action Alternative, because restoration would still occur under this alternative, although a specific project is not yet identified. However, there would likely be less restoration achieved under the No-Action Alternative than under the SPP Restoration Alternative, because the SPP project is extremely cost-effective from a NRDA-perspective. It is unlikely that any project substituting for the SPP project would be cost-effective enough to result in as much restoration being achieved, than if the SPP project is included in the restoration actions to address the Wyckoff releases. So, while the impacts under NEPA would largely be the same for both alternatives, the SPP alternative better meets the Trustees responsibilities to restore injured natural resources.

### **5.2.1 Likely impacts of the alternatives [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(1)]**

Adverse environmental impacts expected from restoration projects under both alternatives would all be short-term and construction-related impacts. The magnitude of environmental impacts would generally be a function of the extent and duration of construction. Mitigation measures (i.e., use of Best Management Practices- “BMPs”) will be included to minimize these short-term impacts under either alternative. The long-term impacts will be beneficial to the area’s natural resources by, for example, providing additional fish habitat, protecting and improving water quality, and increasing aesthetics in the area. Projects implemented under either alternative would be developed to comply with all applicable local, state, tribal, and federal permits and approvals.

There are a number of potentially applicable laws and regulations that govern the Trustees’ restoration projects. Many federal, state, tribal, and local laws and regulations need to be considered during the development of projects as well as several regulatory requirements that are typically evaluated during the federal and state permitting process. A brief review of potentially applicable laws and regulations that may pertain to these projects is presented below in Section 5.4. Under either alternative, the Trustees would ensure that there is coordination among these programs where possible and that project implementation and monitoring is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

#### **5.2.1.1 Aesthetics, light, and glare**

Under either alternative, project sites would have poor aesthetics from disturbed soils, piles of debris, and other construction-related untidiness during the construction phase of a project. It is possible that lights would be used if some of the construction work is done during nighttime (for example, to work when there are good tides). There would be some glare off of machinery used in the construction. However the duration of the construction phase would be relatively short- a few weeks to a few months- for the SPP project or replacement project(s) under the No-Action Alternative. Following construction, project sites are likely to have much better aesthetics than were present prior to the restoration action, if for example rip-rap or other shoreline armoring is replaced with marsh and riparian vegetation.

#### **5.2.1.2 Economic impacts**

No significant economic impacts on neighborhoods would be expected to occur under either the No-Action or SPP project restoration alternatives. Under the SPP Alternative, there would be no conversion of commercial property to habitat that could lead to job losses or decreases in income, while it is possible that a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative might involve such a conversion- although it is unlikely that there would be a significant conversion of commercial property, if any at all, for the restoration that would substitute for the SPP project. There will be short-term economic benefits to local businesses in the general area in which habitat projects will be located from spending by construction workers under either alternative. Property values in the vicinity of the SPP project could benefit because of the development of the SPP park (some of which might be attributable to the increased aesthetics of the restoration component), and it is

possible that there would be a similar effect for substitute restoration under the No-Action Alternative. Over the long-term there should be no significant economic impacts from either alternative.

### **5.2.1.3 Energy and natural resources**

There are no sources of energy or exploitable natural resources on the SPP site and unlikely to be on substitute sites; therefore, no impacts will result under either alternative.

### **5.2.1.4 Geological and soil resources**

There are no known mineral or oil deposits in the areas where the SPP project will be located and since the SPP habitat area is a disturbed/filled-in area, construction of habitat will therefore provide a slight increase in the quality of soils and sediments. It is likely that the same would be true of substitute restoration under the No-Action Alternative. So under either alternative there would be impacts expected.

### **5.2.1.5 Recreation and education**

Any shoreline restoration projects implemented under either the SPP or No-Action Alternatives would increase the aesthetics of the shoreline, replacing hard armoring or fill with vegetated shorelines. This will create a more aesthetic appearance for recreational boaters and kayakers. The SPP project will have passive recreational use and possibly displays that could provide environmental education to visitors- largely in the upland park area that is not part of the habitat restoration effort under the RP/EA. For projects located on COBI or Park District property, there will be active efforts to engage citizens in stewardship and environmental educational activities. Based on the discussions at the February 24, 2009 public meeting about the SPP project concept, the Park District is likely to include some form of educational displays about the history of the SPP site. For a substitute project it is possible that there might be recreational and educational opportunities, but that would depend on the location and ownership of the property on which it would be built.

### **5.2.1.6 Land and shoreline use**

The SPP Alternative will not result in negative impacts on land or shoreline use since no existing approved uses are anticipated to be decreased or eliminated. The same is likely to be true for the No-Action Alternative. The SPP project would result in a shoreline that would be both more aesthetically pleasing to visitors to the park and would provide more ecological services to trust resources- so both the public and natural resources would benefit from implementing this project. The shoreline of a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative would necessarily provide additional ecological services than what currently exists (in order to meet NRDA restoration selection criteria), but might not provide as much benefit with respect to human use depending on where the substitute project was located.

### **5.2.1.7 Transportation, utilities, and public services**

There might be temporary impacts to transportation or utilities during construction of an individual project under the No-Action Alternative, depending on the location of the substitute project, although they should be limited to small areas for short time periods. It is less likely that there would be even temporary impacts to transportation or utilities from implementing the SPP project because of its location and the existing utility connections on the site. Overall, implementation of either alternative would not be expected to increase demand for public services and utilities.

### **5.2.1.8 Water resources**

During construction of the SPP project or a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative there could be minor short-term impacts to water quality resulting from increased turbidity. This could

potentially affect aquatic vegetation and fauna. Overall, however, impacts would be expected to be temporary and localized. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be used to minimize the amount of sediment suspension in the water. Construction would only occur during periods when it would not be detrimental to fish and fisheries in compliance with applicable permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and ESA consultation terms and conditions. Over the long term, the SPP project would benefit water quality by re-establishing marsh which will serve to trap sediments and filter water. There would also be an increase in the amount of vegetated aquatic habitat, which should support greater biomass of fauna. The same is likely true for a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative.

#### **5.2.1.9 Wetlands**

The shoreline along much of Eagle Harbor and Bainbridge Island is armored, and many former wetlands have been filled, so relatively little wetland habitat remains. Implementation of the SPP Restoration Alternative will increase the amount of wetlands in Eagle Harbor to the benefit of the environment in general and the organisms that depend, directly or indirectly on wetland habitat. The implementation of a substitute project would likely also increase the amount of wetlands, although because of the cost issues discussed above, it is likely that the amount of new wetlands would be less under the No-Action Alternative.

### **5.2.2 Likely effects of the alternatives on public health and safety [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)]**

Neither the No-Action nor the SPP Restoration Alternatives would be expected to have any significant effects on public health or safety. The adverse effects from the implementation of the SPP Restoration Alternative or a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative, such as loud noise and exhaust from machinery, would all short-term and construction-related impacts and thereafter the overall effects can be considered beneficial to the areas' humans and natural resources.

#### **5.2.2.1 Environmental Health and Noise**

No long-term risks to environmental health are expected to result from the SPP project or a substitute project since no hazardous materials will be stored or created on-site. The habitat portion of the SPP site has been sampled in the past and recently in 2008 and the results do not indicate that there are any hazardous substances present at levels of concern (Anchor, 2008). A substitute project location considered under the No-Action Alternative would undergo similar investigation, and it is not likely that a site with significant contamination would be selected, although it is possible if the resulting increase in ecological benefits to injured resources would be great and contaminated material could be handled safely. A separate analysis of any such proposed project would be conducted as warranted if the No-Action Alternative was selected and the SPP project was not implemented. A health and safety plan will be in place to address any potential hazards during construction for either alternative.

Project implementation under both alternatives would result in short-term noise impacts in a small area around the project location from the use of heavy equipment during the construction phase of the projects. Outside of the immediate project area the increase in noise should be minimal.

#### **5.2.2.2 Air Quality**

During the construction phase for the SPP project or a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative there would be minimal short-term increases in exhaust and dust from use of construction equipment. No significant or long-term impacts to air quality would be expected to result from the implementation of the SPP or substitute project alternative. The SPP project would replace bulkheads, debris, and non-pervious surface with vegetated habitat, and a slight

improvement in air quality should result. A substitute project under the No-Action Alternative would be similar, in that an increase in vegetated habitat would likely result.

### **5.2.2.3 Floodplain and Flood Control**

The SPP Restoration Alternative or a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative would not be expected to have any significant impacts on flood control or affect the floodplain to any significant degree.

### **5.2.3 Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area in which the Alternatives would be Implemented [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)]**

There is no specific location on Bainbridge Island identified for a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative, because no project has been identified as a replacement, so it is not possible to characterize its location. In general, Bainbridge Island is similar in many respects to other islands and coastal areas in Puget Sound. It includes some habitats, such as eelgrass, marsh, stream mouths, and mudflats that are critical habitat for a number of different species. However, a large portion of the shoreline on the island has been modified, eliminating or diminishing the ecological services provided by these nearshore and shoreline habitats.

The specific SPP project area is generally similar to many other areas within Eagle Harbor and elsewhere in Bainbridge Island in that it is highly modified by placement of fill and shoreline armoring. The presence of Weaver Creek along the eastern portion of the site will increase the ecological benefits of the restoration actions that will occur there under Alternative 2. There is some existing marsh, but it is restricted to a fairly narrow band, because of the steep slope of the fill material and does not appear to be functioning at a high level. Large areas of concrete line the stream and debris is scattered throughout the intertidal area.

Either the SPP or a substitute restoration project would recreate natural habitat in areas that have been highly modified or degraded, and in which little natural shoreline habitats remain. Both would yield positive environmental impacts for the humans and the natural resources that use the Bainbridge Island environment, by increasing the amount of natural habitat for use by fish and wildlife and increase the enjoyment of passive recreational activities such as wildlife viewing.

### **5.2.4 Controversial Aspects of the Alternatives or their Likely Effects on the Human Environment [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)]**

Restoring lost habitat in Eagle Harbor or elsewhere on Bainbridge Island is generally non-controversial. A large number of different planning efforts and non-governmental organizations have supported doing such habitat restoration in the Bainbridge Island and Puget Sound environment. However there are a few individuals who have not supported conducting restoration on the SPP shoreline and two basic issues have been raised. The first is that the existing shoreline provides a good location for views- especially at the ends of the two earthen piers- and is readily accessible to the public as currently configured. As discussed earlier, the COBI City Council and Park District Board approved the restoration concept that was developed by city and park staff based on input from the public as well as the Trustees. The design calls for an elevated walkway to a viewing platform that will be located at the end of the existing eastern earthen pier, so the use of the SPP site as a popular viewing location will be retained.

The second issue relates to the past importance of the site historically, especially related to the cannery operations and the former cannery building. After the 1997 fire, only the earthen piers that ran alongside the building, the footprint on the fill where the land-based portion of the building was located, and the remnants of the pilings that supported the overwater portion of the building remain from the former cannery. The intertidal area with the pilings was determined not to be historic

property (WDAHP, 2009) and the pilings were removed as part of a program by the Washington Department of Natural Resources as mentioned above. In 2008, an archaeological consulting company monitored direct exploratory probes conducted within the SPP site and completed a preliminary background research of the project area in February 2009, and concluded that despite the association of the site with important historical events the Strawberry Cannery site no longer retains integrity of condition in its present state and does not meet the criteria of significance for an historic property (NWAA, 2009). Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act has been initiated for the SPP project, and NOAA will continue consultations with the Suquamish Tribe, Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and other entities to determine potential effects to any identified historic properties. The final determination about whether historic properties are present is not likely to be made prior to finalization of this SEA.

At the February 24, 2009 meeting in which the COBI City Council and Park District Board both voted to approve the restoration concept, a number of individuals supported both the restoration concept and the presentation by some means of the site's history when the upland portion of the park is developed.

Although there is some controversy related to the restoration of the SPP shoreline as habitat due to the past historical associations, the decision to pursue shoreline restoration was made by local public officials after considering comments from the public. The decision of the Trustees to provide some of the funding necessary to restore the SPP shoreline itself is not controversial and is consistent with the RP/EA.

#### **5.2.5 Degree to Which Possible Effects of Implementing the Alternatives are Highly Uncertain or Involve Unknown Risks [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5)]**

The type of habitat restoration that would occur under the SPP Restoration Alternative is likely to be successful because it would be largely recreating the former shoreline and habitats at the site. Similar restoration projects in Puget Sound have a very good record of success. Previous sampling at the habitat portion of the site has not found any contamination at levels of concern (Anchor, 2008), so the construction is not expected to cause any harmful effects beyond the temporary construction-related effects discussed above. The project will be removing fill material and will not impact native sediments, reducing the risk of exposing any buried archaeological artifacts that might be present.

A substitute project under the No-Action Alternative would likely have little risk from implementation because the type of project would likely be similar and site investigations would be conducted to evaluate potential risks prior to any Trustee decision. Construction of a substitute project would occur only if the investigations indicated that the level of risk was low.

#### **5.2.6 Precedential Effect of the Alternatives on Future Actions that may Significantly Affect the Human Environment [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6)]**

The Trustees believe that the SPP restoration project or a substitute project under the Integrated Habitat Restoration Alternative together with other habitat enhancements being planned by other groups would exert strong positive influences on natural resources utilizing the Bainbridge Island intertidal and nearshore environments. Enhancing and creating fish and wildlife habitat benefits the area's natural resources, helps to protect and improve water quality, bolsters native plant communities, enhances the visual quality of the area, and provides educational opportunities for the public. Because there is already a strong restoration program being undertaken as part of the Puget Sound Initiative, no significant precedential effects are anticipated from the Eagle Harbor/Bainbridge Island restoration effort overall and from either of the two alternatives considered in this SEA.

### **5.2.7 Possible Significance of Cumulative Impacts from Restoration under these Alternatives and Similar Projects from other Mechanisms; Potential Impacts on Connected Actions [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)]**

The cumulative effects analysis for the SPP Restoration Alternative and the No-Action Restoration Alternative in which a substitute restoration project would be built is consistent with that contained in the RP/EA. The following updates the analysis presented in the RP/EA.

The cumulative effects analysis in this SEA is commensurate with the degree of direct and indirect effects posed by the alternatives considered. Restoration projects considered in accordance with an overall CERCLA action are intended to mitigate or compensate for prior injury to natural resources under NOAA's jurisdiction, and therefore typically have predominantly beneficial impacts toward redressing impacts to those resources. In the case of the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor restoration effort, the SPP project is one component of the overall CERCLA remediation and restoration for the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor site, therefore the potential for cumulative impacts is considered in the context of that overall project site. Although impacts to natural resources under NOAA's jurisdiction, and in general, may occur in the larger regional vicinity of Puget Sound, the potential for the SPP Restoration Alternative or a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative to incrementally contribute to those effects does not warrant consideration here, as the goal of the effort is to increase available habitat for those resources. Therefore, the cumulative impacts analysis for this restoration action appropriately focuses on the incremental effects of the action in the context of other Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor ongoing actions under CERCLA.

The resources that may be temporarily impacted during construction actions of either the SPP restoration project or a substitute project are air quality (by increased dust, noise, and exhaust fumes from construction equipment), disturbance of soils and sediments (largely currently degraded and disturbed), and water (from increased turbidity). Some slight and temporary impacts to marine fauna and flora could occur, but impacts to these and other resources would be minimized by use of BMPs. Other restoration projects that may occur in the vicinity would similarly incorporate required BMPs, such as dust control and soil and erosion best management practices. Additionally, the overall footprint of projects that would be built under the SPP Restoration Alternative or a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative would be relatively small. Consequently, the minor and temporary impacts of the action on air quality, soils and sediments, and water quality has a low potential to result in cumulatively significant impacts to these resources.

An important consideration for Trustees conduct of restoration actions is the timing and location of restoration projects relative to the overall CERCLA action. Specifically, it is important that habitat restoration occurs on sites where contamination either did not occur or has been successfully remediated to appropriate standards, and that habitats or living marine resources not be restored in an area where they may be impacted by other impacts associated with the larger remediation or restoration action. Completion of the SPP project would result in additional and/or improved marsh, mudflat, and riparian habitat which would be more ecologically productive and support the types of natural resources, such as English sole, salmonids, crabs, etc., that were injured by releases from the Wyckoff facility. A substitute project under the RP/EA would also restore one or more of the key habitat types identified in the RP/AS. With respect to natural resources, over the mid and long-term (i.e., after completion of the restoration actions) restoration under the SPP Restoration Alternative will be wholly beneficial with no potential for incremental contribution to significant impacts related to contaminant exposure in the marine environment. The same would be true for a substitute project if the SPP Restoration Alternative is not selected.

### **5.2.8 Effects of the Alternatives on National Historic Places, or Likely Impacts to Significant Cultural, Scientific or Historic Resources [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)]**

Prior to conducting restoration at any restoration site with Wyckoff NRDA settlement funds the Trustees would consult with the Suquamish Tribe and the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and would conduct investigations to identify significant cultural and historical properties as part of the 106 consultation process. Projects would be designed to avoid impacts to these properties if they are in the project area. That process is currently underway for the SPP project and would occur for any substitute project should the SPP Restoration Alternative not be selected. It is important that it be clear that the initial decision about how to address historic features for the SPP site was initially done through the public planning process conducted by the COBI and Park District, in which a portion of the SPP site was designated for habitat. However, should the 106 consultation process for the site result in a determination that it is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places the Trustees would continue consultation about how to avoid or mitigate potential impacts to significant historic properties. The Trustees would not fund the SPP restoration project if it would result in significant negative impacts to historic properties, as determined through the Section 106 consultation process (which is not expected to be completed prior to finalization of this SEA).

### **5.2.9 Degree to which the Alternatives may Adversely Affect Endangered or Threatened Species or their Critical Habitat [40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)]**

The SPP Restoration Alternative or a substitute project under the No-Action Alternative would provide additional critical habitat for threatened Puget Sound Chinook salmon and additional habitat for Puget Sound steelhead, and may benefit other listed species in the surrounding area (such as bull trout and Southern Resident killer whale) indirectly through increases in prey biomass resulting from increased habitat. Through selective scheduling of the construction period to minimize impacts to salmonids and implementation of methods to minimize in-water turbidity, short-term impacts to listed species would be relatively minor. Federal laws and regulations pertaining to fish and wildlife as well as applicable ESA consultation processes and terms and conditions would be followed, and no long-term adverse impacts would be expected to result from this alternative. Since the proposed project may affect listed species and their critical habitat, an ESA Section 7 consultation was initiated at a meeting on December 2, 2008 and will be completed prior to seeking a FONSI determination on this SEA. Following construction, the SPP project or a substitute restoration project would improve fish habitat structure and function. Juvenile anadromous salmonids will benefit from increased habitat quantity and quality. As indicated earlier, benefits to listed species would likely be greater from the SPP project than from a substitute project because of its cost-effectiveness.

### **5.2.10 Introduction of Non-Indigenous Species [NAO 216-6 6.01(b)(11)]**

No non-indigenous species would be introduced as part of the implementation of either the SPP Restoration or No-Action Alternatives. However, existing invasive and non-native plant species would be replaced with native species in accordance with the monitoring program and a site specific vegetation plan.

## **5.3 EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON THE SPP RESTORATION AND NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVES**

The effect of climate change that is most relevant to nearshore and shoreline restoration projects on Bainbridge Island is sea level rise (SLR). Other anticipated effects of climate change, such as increased rainfall and reduced snowpack leading to higher peak flows in streams and rivers, will have more impact on freshwater stream habitats than estuarine habitats. There is a wide range in the predictions of how much SLR will occur in Puget Sound, one of the higher estimates is that it could be 40 inches or more by year 2100 (Bauman et al., 2006). The SPP site would allow some

migration of marsh inland to offset SLR to some degree, but this would be at the expense of some riparian habitat, unless a future Park District Board would allow some of the upland currently outside of the habitat portion of the site to become habitat. An alternate restoration project under the No-Action Alternative would presumably have a similar ability for some migration inland as SLRs.

## **5.4 COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION**

This section presents a review of the potentially applicable laws and regulations that govern the Trustees' restoration projects. Many federal, state, tribal, and local laws and regulations need to be considered during the development of the SPP restoration project as well as several regulatory requirements that are typically evaluated during the federal and state permitting process. A brief review of potentially applicable laws and regulations that may pertain to this project is presented below. The project manager will ensure that there is coordination among these programs where possible and that project implementation and monitoring is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

**Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 42 USC §§ 9601 et seq., and National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, 40 CFR 300.** CERCLA, also known as Superfund, provides the basic legal framework for cleanup and restoration of the nation's hazardous substances sites. CERCLA establishes a hazard ranking system for assessing the nation's contaminated sites with the most contaminated sites being placed on the National Priorities List (NPL). The Wyckoff Property was an NPL site, and the various settlements were intended to fund restoration of the injured natural resources.

**Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), Ch. 70.105D RCW (1989) and Ch. 173-340 WAC (1992).** MTCA, Washington's toxic cleanup law, is the state equivalent of the federal Superfund program and is managed by WDEC. The statewide regulations set forth cleanup standards and requirements for managing contaminated sites. WDEC is a participant in this project so MTCA compliance will be inherent in the Trustees' decision-making process.

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq.; 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508.** NEPA was enacted in 1969 to establish a national policy for the protection of the environment. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established to advise the President and to carry out certain other responsibilities relating to implementation of NEPA by federal agencies. CEQ's NEPA regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) outline the responsibilities of federal agencies under NEPA and provide specific procedures for preparing environmental documentation to comply with NEPA. Where appropriate, NEPA requires that an EA be prepared in order to determine whether the proposed action will have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. An EA was completed for the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor proposed restoration, and supported a finding that the proposed action would not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. The SEA for this project will undergo a public review and comment period and then the lead federal agency will make a final recommendation. The SEA, the appropriate regulatory documents, and the public comments will become a part of the administrative record for this project.

**State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW and Chapter 197-11 WAC.** SEPA sets forth Washington State's policy for protection and preservation of the natural environment. Local jurisdictions must also implement the policies and procedures of SEPA. The SEPA process for the SPP restoration project is being conducted by the COBI.

**Clean Water Act (CWA) (Federal Water Pollution Control Act), 33 USC §§ 1251 et seq.** The CWA is the principal law governing pollution control and water quality of the Nation's waterways. It requires the establishment of guidelines and standards to control the direct or indirect discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States. Discharges of material into navigable waters are regulated under Sections 401 and 404 of the CWA. The USACE has the primary responsibility for administering the Section 404 permit program. Under Section 401 of the CWA, projects that involve discharge or fill to wetlands or navigable waters must obtain certification of compliance with state water quality standards.

**Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA), 33 USC §§ 2701 et seq.** OPA, provides for the prevention of, liability for, removal of and compensation for the discharge, of the substantial threat of discharge, of oil into or upon the navigable waters of the United States, adjoining shorelines, or the Exclusive Economic Zone. Section 1006(e) requires the President, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, to develop regulations establishing procedures for natural resource trustees in the assessment of damages for injury to, destruction of, loss of, or loss of use of natural resources covered by OPA. Section 1006(b) provides for the designation of Federal, State, Indian tribal and foreign natural resource trustees to determine resource injuries, assess natural resource damages (including the reasonable costs of assessing damages), present a claim, recover damages and develop and implement a plan for the restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, or acquisition of the equivalent of the natural resources under their trusteeship.

**Rivers and Harbors Act, 33 USC §§ 401 et seq.** This Act regulates development and use of the nation's navigable waterways. Section 10 of the Act prohibits unauthorized obstruction or alteration of navigable waters and vests USACE with authority to regulate discharges of fill and other materials into such waters. Actions that require Section 404 CWA permits are also likely to require permits under Section 10 of this Act. A single permit usually serves for both purposes so this project can potentially ensure compliance through this mechanism.

**Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), 16 USC 1531 §§ et seq., 50 CFR Parts 17, 222, 224.** The ESA directs all federal agencies to conserve endangered and threatened species and their habitats and encourages such agencies to utilize their authorities to further these purposes. Under the Act, NMFS and USFWS publish lists of endangered and threatened species. Section 7 of the Act requires that federal agencies consult with these agencies if their action may affect endangered and threatened species or adversely modify or destroy designated critical habitat. The Trustees have begun informal consultation under the ESA for this project and the consultation terms and conditions are expected to set forth a number of measures that would be followed if this action is selected for implementation.

**Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) (formerly Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, MSFCMA), 16 USC §§ 1801 et seq., 50 CFR Part 600.** In 1996, the Act was reauthorized and changed by amendments to require that fisheries be managed at maximum sustainable levels and that new approaches be taken in habitat conservation. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) is defined broadly to include "those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding or growth to maturity" (62 Fed. Reg. 66551, § 600.10 Definitions). The Act requires consultation for all federal agency actions that may adversely affect EFH. Under Section 305(b)(4) of the Act, NMFS is required to provide advisory EFH conservation and enhancement recommendations to federal and state agencies for actions that adversely affect EFH. Where federal agency actions are subject to ESA Section 7 consultations, such consultations may be combined to accommodate the substantive requirements of both ESA and MSFCMA. NMFS has been consulted regarding any MSFCMA-managed species residing or

migrating through Bainbridge Island nearshore waters and Eagle Harbor, and required conditions resulting from this consultation would be followed if the SPP project is implemented.

**Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA), 16 USC §§ 661 *et seq.*, Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, 16 USC §§ 703 *et seq.***. The FWCA requires that federal agencies consult with the USFWS, NMFS, and state wildlife agencies for activities that affect, control or modify waters of any stream or bodies of water, in order to minimize the adverse impacts of such actions on fish and wildlife resources and habitat. These consultations are generally incorporated into Section 404 of the CWA, NEPA, or other federal permit, license or review requirements. Similarly, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act requires the protection of ecosystems of special importance to migratory birds against detrimental alteration, pollution, and other environmental degradation.

**Executive Order 11988: Floodplain Management.** On May 24, 1977, President Carter issued Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management. This Executive Order requires each federal agency to provide opportunity for early public review of any plans or proposals for actions in floodplains, in accordance with Section 2(b) of Executive Order 11514, as amended, including the development of procedures to accomplish this objective.

**Executive Order 11990: Protection of Wetlands.** On May 24, 1977, President Carter issued Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands. This Executive Order requires each agency to provide opportunity for early public review of any plans or proposals for new construction in wetlands, in accordance with Section 2(b) of Executive Order 11514, as amended, including the development of procedures to accomplish this objective.

**Executive Order 12898: Environmental Justice, as amended.** On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. This Executive Order requires each federal agency to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies and activities on minority and low-income populations. EPA and CEQ have emphasized the importance of incorporating environmental justice review in the analyses conducted by federal agencies under NEPA and of developing mitigation measures that avoid disproportionate environmental effects on minority and low-income populations.

The Suquamish Tribe constitutes distinct, separate communities of Native Americans who rely on Treaty-reserved fish and shellfish resources for subsistence, economic and spiritual purposes. Other members of low-income communities may rely on fishery resources for subsistence purposes. The Trustees have not identified any disproportionate, adverse impacts on human health or environmental effects on implementation of the preferred alternative on Native Americans or other minority or low-income populations, and believe that this project will be beneficial to these communities. The Tribe is a participant in the project planning and their representation will be inherent in the Trustee Counsel's decision-making process.

**Information Quality Guidelines issued Pursuant to Public Law 106-554.** Information disseminated by Federal agencies to the public after October 1, 2002, is subject to information quality guidelines developed by each agency pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554 that are intended to ensure and maximize the quality of such information (i.e., the objectivity, utility and integrity of such information). This SEA is an information product covered by the information quality guidelines established by NOAA and the DOI for this purpose. The information collected herein has undergone Section 515 pre-dissemination review and complies with applicable guidelines.

### **1855 Treaty of Point Elliott**

The 1855 Treaty of Point Elliott sets forth articles of agreement between the United States and the Suquamish Tribe, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, and other federally-recognized tribes within the Puget Sound area. Under the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, treaties are superior to any conflicting state laws or constitutional provisions.

**Other potentially applicable federal, state, tribal, and local laws** that are integrated into the regulatory process include:

- Archaeological Resources Protection Act, 16 USC §§ 469, *et seq.*
- Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 USC §§ 7401, *et seq.*
- Coastal Zone Management Act of 1982, as amended, 16 USC 1451 *et seq.*
- Marine Mammal Protection Act, 16 USC §§ 1361 *et seq.*
- National Historic Preservation Act, 16 USC §§ 470 *et seq.*
- Shoreline Management Act, Ch. 90.58 RCW and Ch. 173-14 WAC
- Hydraulic Code, Ch. 77.55 RCW and Ch. 220-110 WAC
- Historic Preservation Act, Ch. 27.34 RCW, Ch. 27.44 RCW, and Ch. 27.53 RCW

### **6.0 REFERENCES:**

Anchor Environmental (2008). Strawberry Plant Existing Environmental Document Review. Memorandum to Peter Namtvedt-Best, dated October 23, 2008.

Aspect Consulting (2008). Sampling Activities- Strawberry Plant Restoration Project, Bainbridge Island, Washington. Letter to John Small, dated September 18, 2008.

Bauman, Y., B. Doppelt, S. Mazze, and E. Wolf (2006). Effect of Climate Change on Washington's Economy: A Preliminary Assessment of Risks and Opportunities. Washington Department of Ecology Publication Number 07-01-010. (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0701010.html>)

Best, P. (2007a). Strawberry Plant Park & Shoreline Restoration Project. Memorandum to Bainbridge Island City Council, dated October 5, 2007.

Best, P. (2007b). West Sound Watersheds Council Pre-Application 2007 Round SRFB.

Elliott Bay Trustee Council (2009). Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor Site, Bainbridge Island, Washington. Final version January 2009.

Gelfenbaum, G., T. Mumford, J. Brennan, H. Case, M. Dethier, K. Fresh, F. Goetz, M. Heeswijk, T. Leschine, D. Myers, J. Newton, H. Shipman, C. Simenstad, C. Tanner, and C. Woodson (2006). Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound: A Research Plan in Support of the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership. PSNRP Technical Report 2006-01, Seattle, WA.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2001). Eagle Harbor Natural Resource Trustees Restoration Goals for the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor Superfund Site. Letter from David Powell (NOAA) to Sally Thomas (EPA), dated November 5, 2001.

Northwest Archaeological Associates, Inc. (2009). Summary of preliminary background research on the Strawberry Plant Project. Letter to John Small, dated February 19, 2009.

Washington Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation (2009). Concurrence letter to Washington Department of Natural Resources that no historic properties would be affected

by piling removal, dated January 13, 2009.

Williams, G.D., R.M. Thom, M.C. Miller, D.L. Woodruff, N.R. Evans, and P.N. Best. (2003). Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment: Summary of Best Available Science. PNWD-3233. Prepared for the City of Bainbridge Island: Bainbridge Island, WA; by Battelle Marine Sciences Laboratory: Sequim, WA.

Williams, G.D., R.M. Thom, and N.R. Evans. (2004). Bainbridge Island Nearshore Habitat Characterization & Assessment, and Monitoring Recommendations. PNWD-3391. Prepared for the City of Bainbridge Island: Bainbridge Island, WA; by Battelle Marine Sciences Laboratory: Sequim, WA.

## **7.0 LIST OF PREPARERS:**

The following Trustees participated in the development of this RP/EA:


Rich Brooks, Suquamish Tribe  
Randy Carman, WDFW  
John Kern, NOAA  
Jeff Krausmann, USFWS  
Jason Lehto, NOAA  
Glen St. Amant, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe



Figure 1. Project location.



Figure 2: Aerial photograph of the Strawberry Plant Park Site prior to the removal of creosote pilings (photo by Washington Department of Ecology).



# Strawberry Plant Park

## Preferred Shoreline Restoration Design Concept

Figure 3. Restoration Design Concept

