



2010 Coastal & Estuarine Land Conservation Program

Harstine Island – Scott Property Acquisition Project Harstine Island, Mason County, Washington

SUBMITTED BY: Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
PO BOX 42650
Olympia, WA 98504-2650

CONTACT: Bill Koss
(360) 902-8629
Bill.Koss@parks.wa.gov

DATE: March 16, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK	3
1.1 Importance to CELCP Program Goals	4
1.1.1 Primary Purpose: Ecological	4
1.1.2 Secondary Purpose: Conservation	17
1.1.3 Secondary Purpose: Recreational	19
1.1.4 Secondary Purpose: Historical	20
1.1.5 Secondary Purpose: Aesthetic	21
1.2 Relevance to CELCP and Other State/Local Plans	21
1.3 Manageability of the Project Site	26
1.4 Long-term Use of the Site	26
1.5 Threat of Conversion	27
1.6 Project Readiness	28
1.7 Ability to Acquire Land	29
1.8 Ability to Manage Land	29
2.0 PROJECT TIMELINE	31
3.0 BUDGET NARRATIVE	32
4.0 OUTREACH AND EDUCATION	34
5.0 ATTACHMENTS	35
5.1 Maps	35
5.2 Photos	35
5.3 Project Application Checklist	35
5.4 Project Readiness Documentation	35

Harstine Island – Scott Acquisition 2010

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission’s Harstine Island acquisition project protects the fee simple interest of approximately 97 acres of tidelands, wetlands and associated uplands. The acquisition would offer habitat protection as well as increased public access to the Puget Sound shoreline. In Washington, many of our shorelines are privately owned – and only 10% of the shoreline is accessible from the upland – creating a barrier to residents and visitors when they seek shoreline and water recreation.¹ Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission (State Parks) and The Trust for Public Land (TPL) are working together to secure this property from future development, protect high-quality habitat, and establish a public access point. The property will be held in fee simple ownership by State Parks in perpetuity.

The Harstine Island—Scott Acquisition (the “Scott Property” or “the property”) is located on the shoreline in south Puget Sound, Mason County, Washington. The property lies on the east side of Harstine Island², an 18.6 square mile island on Case Inlet (see Maps 1 through 5 and Photo 6). The proposed project area in this application consists of two parcels: Parcel 22001-40-00000 is large and has significant shoreline and Parcel 22001-24-90110 is a much smaller parcel that will provide access from a paved county road to the larger parcel. Parcel 22001-40-00000 has a direct and vital relationship to Puget Sound because it is located directly on the shoreline with approximately 25 acres of tidelands and approximately 87 acres of associated uplands. Together, these parcels total roughly 112 acres. Of this acreage, 97 acres are included in this proposal. The remaining 15 acres will be purchased with other funds and used for park facilities. See the table below for size figures:

Harstine Island Acreage Estimates		
	Acreage (all fee simple)	Coastal Frontage (feet)
Entire Project (2 parcels)	112	Approx 2900
• 22001-40-00000	110.5	Approx 2900
• 22001-24-90110	1.5	--
Project Area in this application:	97	2900

Project Highlights:

Freshwater Input. There are four small streams that provide freshwater to the intertidal area and create a small estuary. Estuary habitat is vital to juvenile salmon for rearing.

¹ The Trust for Public Land, Puget Sound Shoreline Strategy: A Conservation Vision for Puget Sound, The Trust for Public Land, Updated November 2005.

² Between 1838 and 1841, the Wilkes Expedition first named the island ‘Harstene Island.’ Since that time, the island has had many different spelling variations of Harstene. While the island itself is often spelled Harstine, maps, roads, and even structures on the island bear spellings of Hartstene, Harstene, or Harstein. In 1997, the Washington State Legislature officially deemed the island “Harstine Island.”

Feeder Bluffs. Portions of the shoreline have feeder bluffs that provide sand and gravel inputs to the local drift cell and are of importance to maintaining the beach on the property and those surrounding the property.

Unique Geography. A tombolo, a sand bar that connects to offshore rock formations or islands, is located at the southern end of the property. At low tides, this tombolo serves as a land bridge to a small island, McMicken Island State Park, and separates the intertidal areas into two micro-habitats with estuary functions.

Essential Habitat. The property's shoreline provides high-quality edge habitat. Edges, or ecotones, are important habitat because they are the meeting of different habitat types and have forage, refuge, rearing, and migration functions for more species than a homogenous habitat. A shoreline ecotone serves species that live in the uplands, on the shorelines, or are specifically adapted to coastal features.

Goals of CELCP and Other Plans. The Harstine Island acquisition satisfies many goals and strategies set forth by national, state, regional, and watershed level conservation plans, including Washington CELCP. Conservation of the Harstine Island project area meets state CELCP criteria for protection of wetlands, shorelines, salmon protection, forage fish habitat, and biodiversity. This property meets Priority One criteria in Washington's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy since it provides high quality Marine Nearshore habitat and Westside Riparian-Wetlands. The Strategy calls for "acquisition of land from willing landowners as an important non-regulatory tool" for high quality habitat protection.³ Importance of conservation of nearshore salmon habitat is also a priority for the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan adopted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in January 2007.⁴

1.1 Importance to CELCP Program Goals

1.1.1 Primary Purpose: Ecological

This property exhibits some exceptional beach and intertidal habitat supported by freshwater wetlands, streams, and upland forest. Together, this assemblage of characteristics create habitat suitable to a variety of plants and animals that make up a healthy ecosystem. Acquisition at Harstine Island is a unique opportunity to protect habitat that is intact with little need for restoration, except beach clean up and limited invasive-plant removal that will be conducted by State Parks volunteers.

³ <http://www.wildlifeactionplans.org/washington.html>

⁴ <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/Salmon-Recovery-Planning/Recovery-Domains/Puget-Sound/PS-Recovery-Plan.cfm>

ESTUARINE AND NEARSHORE ENVIRONMENTS (APPROXIMATELY 25 ACRES)

- Intertidal and Subtidal⁵

Conservation of nearshore habitat (see Map 5, 8, and 9 and Photo 6) is of great concern to scientists and planners throughout Puget Sound. As the interface between terrestrial and aquatic habitats, and between freshwater and saltwater, a healthy nearshore is the base of the Puget Sound food web, water quality, survival and recovery of endangered aquatic species, and is essential to biological processes that sustain upland and intertidal functions. The intertidal and subtidal habitats are intact, naturally functioning with no degradation.

The water regime and varying substrate of the intertidal area is beneficial to a wide array of marine organisms including: sand shrimp, mussels, shore crabs, limpets, Pacific oysters, little neck clams, horse clams, sand dollars and many more. In the upper tidal area, barnacles and algae are prevalent. The lower intertidal elevations contain abundant and diverse speciation.

Estuarine and nearshore habitat types along the Property shoreline range from largely inorganic sands and gravels along much of the upper beach to a more organically enriched silty sand along the majority of the low tide line and down to at least 2 feet below mean lower low water (MLLW) line. Within the mid-tide range, roughly elevations between mean higher high water (MHHW) and MLLW, habitat types vary substantially, dependent mainly on proximity to stream mouths and historic sediment sources from bluff erosion. Some areas in this range have relatively clean coarse sand while others have a more varied substrate with considerable amounts of silt in a sediment matrix of granules, pebbles, and small cobbles, with small to medium cobbles on the surface.

In these areas where fist sized or larger cobble are present, the tubular green alga can be found along with the acorn barnacles. At lower tidal elevations, between about MHHW and mean sea level (+8 feet MLLW), biota is dependent on the substrate (sand or gravel/cobble) and drainage (seep area or well drained). Macrobiota is limited in well-drained sand but in moist sand areas, infauna is plentiful and dominated by the ghost or sand shrimp. On dry gravel/cobble areas, the larger cobbles support dense barnacles as well as mussels, littorine snails, and limpets. A tremendous abundance of tiny littorines was present on April 9, 2008. Moist areas under cobbles hide shore crabs, isopods, and gammarid amphipods. Widely scattered Pacific oysters can be found.

More moist areas of gravel and cobble over a silty sand and shell matrix (mixed-fine habitats) often support an abundance of clams including native littlenecks, Japanese littlenecks, and some macomas. The infauna also includes a number of polychaete species and even horse clams are common—a somewhat unusual situation for this species, which is usually found at lower elevations. Mussels are often more abundant than in drier areas, forming mats over the gravel surface. Algae found in the spring of 2008 surveys included rockweed, the red algae, laver, and at least two species of the green alga. A few small seep areas at this tidal elevation had a dense cover of the red alga, a species known to support herring spawn in some areas.

⁵ Pentec Biological Assessment May 2008

Still lower on the beach, on the northern third of the Property, are two large patches of large oyster shells, mostly dead but with some living animals. These appear to be remnants from a commercial planting of small oysters (spat or larval stage) some years ago that were not fully harvested; most shells were quite large (e.g., 150 mm in length) but gaping and dead, possibly from desiccation or thermal stress. Live oysters in or near these groups were often at a slightly lower and/or more moist elevation than the majority of the dead ones. Several moist sandy areas at this elevation on the southern portion of the Property are covered with very dense, even overlapping, sand dollars, both live and dead. These animals, which feed by cilia, appear to have largely eliminated other biota in the immediate vicinity.

The majority of the lower intertidal zone, down to MLLW and below is dominated by remarkably firm sand with patches of smaller gravel and cobbles. A large sandy area just south of the base of the low tombolo, or spit, connecting Harstine Island to McMicken Island State Park had scattered *Ulva* algae and a filamentous red algae but some nearby areas along the south side of the spit (off the Scott Property) had near 100 percent *Ulva* algae cover. This, and the cover of benthic diatoms on the sand surface of the sand patch (on the Property) provide an indication of the high productivity of these flats. The sand patch and areas with small gravel over sand supported a greater density of algae, filamentous reds, and a diversity of infaunal organisms including polychaetes and bivalves. A common clam in these habitats is the small white tellinid, a species not often seen in intertidal sediments in Puget Sound. The most obvious polychaete, in both sand and gravel/sand habitats, was of the Family Chaetopteridae, which form a parchment tube that projects from the sediment surface. A relatively low density of horse clams, butter clams, and geoduck is present here and on the more gravelly lower intertidal areas.

The more gravelly areas support more algae of previously mentioned species as well as Turkish towel and the red algae. Animals present in and among the cobbles and attached algae include juvenile Dungeness crab and the kelp crab.

The lower intertidal habitats and assemblages described above are continuous with the subtidal zone. There is a high degree of overlap in species and ecological functions that extend from the lower (seaward) portion of the Scott Property onto state owned tidelands below. No eelgrass is reported on or near the site but the productivity of the subtidal zone is nonetheless high, contributed by most of the algal species mentioned above, along with benthic diatoms and kelp.

The healthy intertidal and subtidal zones contribute to the high vitality of the Harstine Island coastline. Water quality at both the northern and southern tips of Harstine Island is suffering. In this central area, where the acquisition project is located, water quality is high and will be sustained by preventing development through this project.⁶

⁶ Blake, Brady, WDFW shellfish biologist. Personal communication with TPL Project Manager, Ann Welz, November, 2007.

- Beach and Marine riparian⁷

Nearly half of the project area, 43%, is riparian habitat and yields many benefits for the both shoreline and the uplands. The 48-acre riparian habitat is composed of approximately:

- 25 acres of marine intertidal along 2,850 feet of shoreline;
- 13 acres of upland, forming a 200 foot shoreline buffer for self-sustaining nearshore processes; and
- 10 acres of estuarine and freshwater wetlands associated with the four streams on the property (see Wetland section below for details).

The beach at the Harstine Island project area is sand, cobble, shells, and gravel with steep bluffs in the back beach and organically enriched silt along the low tide mark. Trees and overhanging vegetation shade portions of the beach creating suitable refuge for juvenile salmon and forage fish. The vegetation also contributes organic matter to the to the marine environment such as woody debris, leaves, and insects. The feeder bluffs deliver inorganic matter to the beach at Harstine Island and the surrounding drift cell that nourishes other local beaches.

The beach itself is intact and provides high quality habitat. While there is a small quantity of Himalayan blackberry present around drift logs and some debris washed up on the beach, State Parks volunteers will remove these and perform beach clean up on a regular basis to maintain the property's high ecological values.

In the southern portion of the property, there is a remnant of a wall. The landowners have stated this was once part of a small boathouse that had been removed some time ago. This wall does not impair the function of the beach or act as a bulkhead or other armoring; it is overgrown by young trees and understory plants.

Coastal bluffs ranging in height up to approximately 80 feet occupy much of the riparian zone on the site. The bluff faces are generally well vegetated with a variety of mature trees (big-leaf maple, redcedar, alder) and shrubs (ocean spray, sword fern, huckleberry, salal). The bluffs are cut by the valleys associated with each of the four streams draining the Property. Visible materials comprising the bluffs include layers of sandy gravel alluvium. Materials on the beach also suggest that layers of sand stone and even coal may be present in the bluffs. Because of the slope stability provided by the riparian vegetation and because of the generally low energy conditions on the site, erosion of the toe of the bluff was evident in only a few areas. Nonetheless, the upper beach was well supplied with sand and gravel.

There is an abundance of large woody debris (LWD) in the back beach. Some of this debris is washed up on to shore and but most is contributed by the forested uplands and bluff erosion. Because of the proximity of the toe of the bluff to the high tide line across most of the site's shorelines, there is no storm berm and no accumulation of drift logs in front of the bluffs. In these areas, however, there was a large amount of LWD on the shoreline, derived mostly from trees fallen from the banks or still rooted in the bank but leaning out and onto the beach. The

⁷ Pentec Biological Assessment May 2008

small storm berm spits formed at the mouths of two streams (See maps 8 and 9, stream #1 and #3) do have beached drift logs adding to the stability of the spits.

UPLAND ENVIRONMENT (APPROXIMATELY 72 ACRES)

- Second-growth forest⁸

The total upland environment is 87 acres. Of this, 15 acres are not included in this proposal and will be funded by other sources. This area will be used for development of park facilities and will be located where prior disturbance has taken place and habitat quality is lower. The uplands are generally forested with second growth trees, however there are some Big-leaf maple trees that appear to be old growth. The forested upland portions of the Property include the tops of the ravines, the old logging and access road, and areas within the northern and southern portions of the site. The areas between the ravines are dominated by second and third-growth forests comprised of big-leaf maple, red alder, Western redcedar, evergreen huckleberry, salal, red huckleberry, low Oregon-grape, salmonberry, Indian plum, and sword fern. Pacific waterleaf and bedstraw were also observed on the existing trails. Small amounts of Western honeysuckle were observed within localized areas of the uplands. Again, exceptionally large and mature big-leaf maple is present within the upland forested areas as well as within the ravines and riparian areas.

The forested habitat contains some English holly, a non-native shrub. Small pockets of English holly are also present throughout the uplands. In addition, small areas of Himalayan blackberry are also present in localized quantities. The logging road has areas of Scotch broom that are giving way to red alder communities. Understory consists mainly of native shrubs. Species specific to the property's understory are: salmonberry, sword fern, Indian plum, red elderberry and red huckleberry.

- Freshwater Streams⁹

There are four small freshwater streams on the property that form channels over the beach before they empty into Puget Sound (see Maps 8 and 9). These streams are overwintering areas for juvenile salmon, especially coho. Juvenile coho were found in the streams during a biological assessment in May 2008. Spawning has not been documented, but juvenile salmon presence indicates these are non-natal streams used for rearing habitat. (See Salmon Use below for more information.) The streams output vegetative and organic material to the marine environment, essential to feed marine organism and increase production. The streams control the surface and ground water and each stream has some associated wetland buffers.

The riparian areas associated with the on-site streams are forested with native vegetation. These areas contain a canopy of Western redcedar, red alder, and big-leaf maple, and an understory of salmonberry, Indian plum, red elderberry, red huckleberry, sword fern, and piggy-back plant. Many of the big-leaf maples in the riparian areas and along the ravine slopes are exceptionally large in size and would be considered mature and old growth trees. The trees contain a healthy assemblage of mosses and licorice fern.

⁸ Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

⁹ Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

Stream 1. Stream 1 is the southernmost stream on the Property. It is a largely seasonal stream that extends off site to the southwest and flows through a culvert located between the central portion of the Property and the western Property boundary. Portions of the lower stream and areas near springs may be perennial. The bulkhead associated with the old boathouse defines its southeastern edge where it enters onto the beach. Width of the stream ranges from two to five feet, and depth ranges from 2 inches in the shallows to 8 inches in small pools. Bed material in the lower reach of the stream consists of fine sand with small amounts of granules and pebbles. Woody debris was abundant within the channel and was generally small in size. A riverine wetland is associated with the stream and fed by overbank flooding from the stream as well as high groundwater levels. In addition, several seeps are present along the ravine slopes, particularly the southern slope. These seeps create slope wetlands that also feed into the larger wetland located at the base of the ravine.

Stream 1 was sampled using a long-handled dip net, but no fish were seen. It is possible that some juvenile salmon migrating along the shoreline may enter the lower reach of the stream to rear.

Stream 2. Stream 2 is a perennial stream just north of Stream 1. It is the largest stream on the Property. In its lower reaches, the channel is incised through a riverine wetland. The bed in the lower several hundred yards of the stream is sandy with a few areas of pebbles and granules. Excellent in-stream habitat is created by the sequence of pools and riffles formed by large quantities of wood and root masses. Shading, leaf litter, and insect fall from the dense riparian vegetation contribute to the quality and function of the in-stream habitat for fish and adjacent wetlands make excellent habitat for amphibians. The upper reaches of the stream consisted of similar vegetation communities, woody debris distribution, and in-stream habitat.

The lower several hundred feet of the creek were sampled with a long-handled dip net in April 2008. Three species of fish were captured with coastal cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki*) the most abundant and widely distributed species. All cutthroat captured were small (80 to 100 mm) and smaller fry (25 to 35 mm) were also seen but not captured. This population may include both resident and anadromous (sea-run) forms. The second fish species captured was coho salmon (*O. kisutch*). The individual captured was about 100 mm in length and the adipose fin was clipped. This fish, thus, was of hatchery origin and had swum into this small stream to rear. This behavior pattern is not well documented but it is believed that juvenile fish utilize smaller streams lacking sufficient flow or habitat for adult migration and spawning. This stream environment has the advantage of having few predators on these fish and a stable food supply with limited competition (by cutthroat). The third species taken in Stream 2 was a freshwater sculpin (*Cottus sp.*), a largely benthic feeder that also provides little competition with the coho.

Stream 3. Stream 3 is the second largest stream on the site and is also perennial. The lowest reach of the stream is similar in nature to Stream 2, but this reach is formed by the confluence of 3 to 5 much smaller streams or springs that each fall over approximately 1- to 1.5-foot drops into the mainstream channel. These tributaries all enter the channel within a few feet of one another, about 75 feet upstream of the high tide line. As a result, the stream reach accessible from Case Inlet is short. Sampling with the long-handled dip net, nonetheless, captured two species of fish,

cutthroat and coho salmon. Both species were similar in size to those captured in Stream 2 and the coho also was adipose clipped, indicating hatchery origin. This stream, despite its limited length, like Stream 2, thus provides habitat for both resident and anadromous salmonids.

Stream 4. Stream 4 is the northernmost stream on the Property is also the smallest, although because it is spring fed, the lower portions may be perennial. The ravine through which the stream passes is narrow and steep, thus the stream gradient as it enters the saltwater exceeds that of other site streams. The channel is incised into the adjacent topsoil and forms small pools formed by passage over roots. Because of its low flow volume, the stream flow quickly disappears into the beach sediments, rather than forming a channel over the beach, as do the other streams. It is unlikely that fish inhabit Stream 4.

- Freshwater Wetlands¹⁰

Four wetlands were identified on the Scott Property. These wetlands are associated with the four ravines and streams. Wetlands were labeled Wetland 1, 2, 3, and 4 to correspond with the four streams (see Map 9). Each stream flows from west to east through its associated wetland before entering Case Inlet. The wetlands are similar in composition: palustrine forested broad-leaf deciduous seasonally flooded, and some palustrine emergent wetlands areas. Cowardin classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats (1979) codes these wetlands as PFO1E and PEM2E at wetland 3. Two hydrogeomorphic classes dominate the wetlands: riverine and slope, and are fed by both surface water and seeps.

Western red cedar, big-leaf maple, salmonberry, devil's club, red elderberry, stinging nettle, skunk cabbage, piggy-back plant, lady fern, sword fern, and Pacific waterleaf. Big-leaf maple, red elderberry, and sword fern dominate the wetlands. Native vegetation is consistent throughout all wetlands except small patches of Himalayan blackberry near disturbed areas (around culverts). Big-leaf maple, red elderberry, false lily-of-the-valley, and sword fern are present in and adjacent to the wetlands on the ravine slopes, hummocks, and elevated areas throughout the wetlands. Numerous snags are found in the wetlands.

There is a healthy, high-functioning wetland buffer zone around the wetlands. Large and small woody debris is present within the wetland and buffer areas. Woody debris is comprised primarily of red alder and Western red cedar. Woody debris ranges from late decomposition to newly fell.

Wetland 1. Wetland 1 is approximately one half acre in size and located within a ravine and confined by the side slopes to the north and south. The wetland measures approximately 40 feet in width with 3 to 4 feet being the stream. A culvert and land barrier is located near the southern property boundary. This barrier divides the wetland into two sections. No blockages were observed in the culvert. Overall, Wetland 1 provides a moderate to high level of function.

Wetland 1 consists of two hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classes – riverine and slope and is fed by high groundwater levels at the base of the ravine and multiple natural seeps located midway up the ravine slopes. Soils within Wetland 1 consist of silts, sands, and mucks.

¹⁰ Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

Wetland 2. Wetland 2 is approximately 4 acres in size and contains a forested plant community class as well as small scrub/shrub and emergent plant communities. A small area of cattail is present near the mouth of Stream 2. Similar to Wetland 1, the wetland is located within a ravine and confined by the side slopes to the north and south. The base of the wetland measures approximately 60 feet in width including the width of Stream 2 measures approximately 2 to 5 feet. Overall, Wetland 2 provides a moderate to high level of function.

Wetland 2 consists of two HGM classes – riverine and slope fed by ground water and multiple natural seeps similar to Wetland 1. Several of the seeps have defined channels demonstrating the large amounts of surface flow emanating from the slopes. It is likely that these seeps are seasonal and flow for approximately 8 to 9 months of the year. Soils within Wetland 2 consisted of similar soils as Wetland 1: silts, sands, and mucks.

Wetland 3. Wetland 3 is approximately 5 acres in size and contains 4.4 acres of forested wetland and 0.6 acres of emergent wetland. Wetland 3 is a unique Y-shaped wetland that divides to the northwest and southwest midway through the Property. The base of the wetland measures approximately 80 feet in width including 2 to 5 feet in width for Stream 3. Similar to Wetlands 1 and 2, the wetland is located within a ravine and confined by the side slopes to the north and south. Overall, Wetland 3 provides a moderate to high level of function.

Wetland 3 consists of two HGM classes – riverine and slope originating from surface waters of Stream 3 as well as multiple seeps. Like Wetland 2, several of the seeps have defined channels demonstrating the large amounts of surface flow emanating from the slopes and flow for approximately 8 to 9 months of the year. The seeps provide a hydrologic connection between these larger and smaller slope wetlands and the wetland at the base of the ravine.

Soils within Wetland 3 consisted of similar soils as observed in Wetlands 1 and 2: silts, sands, and mucks. Soils were relatively consistent throughout the wetland. In past years, a barrier was placed in front of the culvert on the logging road. This temporary barrier resulted in sediment accumulation. In general, the culvert barrier resulted in approximately 1 to 3 inches of sand and silt deposition throughout the wetland.

Wetland 4. Wetland 4 is the smallest of the on-site wetlands and measures approximately 20 feet in width, including approximately 1 to 2 feet width of Stream 4. Wetland 4 is approximately one-fourth acre in size. It contains a forested plant community class. Similar to the other wetlands on the Property, Wetland 4 is located within a ravine and confined by the side slopes to the north and south. Overall, Wetland 4 provides a moderate level of function.

Wetland 4 consists of one HGM class – riverine characterized by overbank flooding of Stream 4 and high groundwater levels at the base of the ravine. Soils within Wetland 4 consisted of silt and sand, similar soils as observed in the other on-site wetlands. However, smaller quantities of muck were observed. The ravine becomes confined approximately 125 feet from the mouth of Stream 4 and wetland conditions are no longer present.

ECOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE¹¹

Acquisition of the Harstine Island Project is ecologically important to the south Puget Sound region for the natural shoreline and its contribution to the coastal resources, processes, species, and connectivity in the region. The nearly 112 acres are large enough to allow for multiple species use and sustain populations in the uplands and the extensive tideland areas. The most significant contributions to the coastal processes are outlined below:

- Salmon Use¹²






The east shore of Harstine Island is an important rearing area for juveniles of several species of anadromous fish that spawn in streams throughout the southwestern portion of Puget Sound. Of these, chum salmon are perhaps the most abundant, but pinks, Chinook, and coho salmon are also present, either from natural spawning or from hatchery propagation. The broad, low gradient, intertidal area and the fully vegetated riparian shoreline of the Property provide ideal rearing habitat for these species during their early marine life history. The natural shorelines of the Property provide especially excellent rearing opportunities and predator refuge considering the fact that a large proportion of Case Inlet shorelines are artificially hardened and lack natural riparian vegetation. A school of juvenile pink or chum salmon was seen along the Property shorelines during the April 9, 2008 survey.

Although salmon spawning has not been documented in streams on the Property, a unique function of at least two of the Property's streams is their use as non-natal rearing streams. During limited surveys in April 2008, both Streams 2 and 3 were found to contain rearing coho juveniles. Both coho and Chinook salmon, after leaving their natal (spawning) stream, have been documented to move from the marine environment into small coastal estuaries and subsequently into their tributary streams to rear. Thus, these two creeks are functioning as pocket estuaries, recently shown by work in the Skagit River system to be of high importance to the success of Chinook salmon populations.¹³

¹¹ Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

¹² Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

¹³ Beamer, E., A. McBride, R. Henderson, and K. Wolf, 2003. The Importance of Non-natal Pocket Estuaries in Skagit Bay to Wild Chinook Salmon: An Emerging Priority for Restoration. Skagit River System Cooperative, LaConner, Washington. Beamer, E., A. McBride, R. Henderson, J. Griffith, K. Fresh, T. Zackey, R. Barsh, T. Wyllie-Echeverria, and K. Wolf, 2006. Habitat and Fish Use of Pocket Estuaries in the Whidbey Basin and North Skagit County Bays, 2004 and 2005. Skagit River System Cooperative, LaConner, Washington.

<p>Table 1: Salmonids in Puget Sound¹⁴</p>	<p>Species name</p>	<p>Description and Relation to project site</p>
	<p>Chinook <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i></p>	<p>Puget Sound’s largest and most recognizable salmon, Chinook is a federally threatened species and utilizes shorelines with characteristics like those at Harstine Island.</p>
	<p>Coho <i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i></p>	<p>Popular for sport fishing, coho can be found in small neighborhood streams, and even urban environments, across Puget Sound. Coho were found in streams on the project site in April 2008.</p>
	<p>Chum <i>Oncorhynchus keta</i></p>	<p>Many genetically distinct runs of chum live in Puget Sound. A group of chum or pink salmon was observed along the shoreline in April 2008.</p>
	<p>Pink <i>Oncorhynchus gorbuscha</i></p>	<p>Pinks use estuaries and nearshore extensively as nursery areas during their out-migration. A group of chum or pink salmon was observed along the shoreline in April 2008.</p>
	<p>Cutthroat trout <i>Oncorhynchus clarki clarki</i></p>	<p>Cutthroat use the shallow waters close to shores and in estuaries. It is a native anadromous trout species and was seen in project area streams in April 2008.</p>

- Biodiversity¹⁵

The Harstine Island – Scott Property Acquisition is highly productive habitat. Conservation of the nearshore habitat will have a far-reaching impact for local wildlife. A survey of the Washington wildlife databases reveals many Priority Wildlife Heritage Points in the immediate area of the project site (these “points” are areas or attributes vital to preserving Washington’s natural heritage and exact locations are often concealed due to the sensitivity of these areas):

¹⁴ Images and information from Washington Department of Ecology webpage http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/pugetsound/species/salmon_est.html and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife webpage—except Bull trout image from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bull Trout Factsheet: <http://www.fws.gov/pacific/news/bulltrout/bultrt2.pdf> (illustration by K. Morris/USFWS).

¹⁵ Washington Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program 2008

Priority Seabird Colonies (Pigeon Guillemot); Priority Seal/Sea Lion Haulout where pupping occurs seasonally; Bald Eagle and Osprey Nests; Hardshell Intertidal Clam, Pacific Oyster, and Subtidal Geoduck habitat; Rock Sole and Sand Lance Spawning Area; Herring Holding Area; and a partially enclosed lagoon priority habitat. This wide array of heritage points for animals and habitats demonstrates the value of protecting the biodiversity of this shoreline.

Mammals known or expected to use the site shorelines and intertidal areas include coyote, raccoon, opossum, black bear, deer, Douglas squirrel, mice and voles, and sea otter.

Observed bird use of the shorelines included kingfishers, which sit on branches overhanging the water awaiting prey, and great blue herons, which stand in the water doing the same. Unidentified woodpeckers were heard feeding in trees along the riparian zone and it can be expected that later in the spring there would be considerable use by neotropical migrants including swallows, warblers, vireos, and flycatchers. A variety of year-round residents, such as chickadees, Steller's jay, juncos, nuthatches, and bushtits are also expected to use the site. In addition, a barred owl and rufus hummingbirds were observed in the ravines.

The Whale Museum has documented four unique sighting days from 1990 to 2005 for southern resident orca in the vicinity of McMicken Island State Park, a quarter-mile from the Scott property. In addition, sightings were documented in nearby Dutcher's Cove on the Key Peninsula in Case Inlet. NOAA recently listed the southern resident population as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Critical habitat for this population is currently being identified and designated.

- Tombolo¹⁶

The tombolo that connects the Scott property beach to McMicken Island State Park is a unique geographic feature. A tombolo is a sand spit that connects a beach to an island or a rock outcrop. This tombolo also creates two estuary habitats and lagoon bisecting the intertidal area, thus creating a quiet bay enjoyed by many diverse species. The intertidal features and its productivity are the basis for the food web of Puget Sound fish and marine mammals. Furthermore, the conditions at the Scott property are well suited for sand dollars. There are dense overlapping areas full of thriving sand dollar beds.

- Feeder Bluffs¹⁷

Puget Sound's sand and gravel beaches are largely derived from the erosion of coastal bluffs. This process builds beaches and, because longshore currents redistribute sediment along the shoreline, helps maintain and shape landforms such as the tombolo, or spit, between the Scott property and McMicken Island State Park. The term "feeder bluff" is widely used in the region to describe bluffs that are particularly important sources of coastal sediment. These bluffs are often high, rich in coarse sand and gravel, and subject to rapid erosion and landsliding. Besides their geologic importance to maintaining beaches and spits, shoreline bluffs are valuable ecosystems

¹⁶ Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

¹⁷ Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

in their own right. They form complex riparian and nearshore habitats that have been greatly diminished on Puget Sound during the past century.

Coastal bluffs on Puget Sound have been heavily impacted by development. Widespread construction of bulkheads and seawalls to control erosion has seriously impaired the natural supply of sediment to many beaches. Local governments and regulatory agencies have attempted to protect feeder bluffs, but pressure for prime view real estate and demands to stabilize eroding shorelines limits these efforts. Ultimately, protection of bluff habitats and the ecological functions of these bluffs depend on large buffers or complete protection of both the bluffs and adjacent upland areas. One major benefit of protecting these areas is that it keeps development out of potentially hazardous areas.

The resilience of Puget Sound's beaches and small estuaries to rising sea levels will depend on an abundant source of coastal sediment, and therefore on the preservation of these naturally eroding shorelines. At the same time, higher sea levels will increase pressure on landowners to armor bluffs from the effects of accelerated erosion. Acquisition and preservation of coastal feeder bluffs like those at the Harstine Island project will be an important step towards maintaining long-term viability of many of the Sound's coastal habitats.

- Forage Fish¹⁸

Sand lance in this part of Puget Sound can spawn throughout the year though sand lance spawning is largely restricted to the winter months. As noted above, the upper shorelines along the great majority of the Property appear to provide excellent surf smelt and/or sand lance spawning habitat. In 2008, WDFW documented sand lance and surf smelt spawning ½ mile south of the property near Fudge Point. This lack of similar data for the Scott Property is likely the result of the limited number of surveys and the timing of those surveys in relation to actual spawning times for local fish.

- Sea level rise¹⁹

Conservation of the Scott property and preventing development will assist in lessening the climate change impacts of sea level rise. Key issues affecting the resilience of nearshore habitat include the rate of sea level rise, the ability of habitats to migrate, and the availability of sediment. The Harstine Island project will allow the habitat areas to migrate inland and absorb changes in tidal dynamics, offsetting the potential impacts from sea level rise. The intact property will not require restoration activities that have the potential to be lost to a rising water level.

ENDANGERED AND PROTECTED SPECIES

This site will enhance and protect Federal or state listed, threatened or endangered species. As mentioned in the above paragraph, there is great diversity of species that live and utilize the property. Many of these species that rely on the intact and healthy habitat of the property are

¹⁸ Pentec Environmental Biological Assessment May 2008

¹⁹ Preparing for the Impacts of Climate Change in Washington, Draft Recommendations, December 2007.

Federal or state endangered and/or threatened species. See bottom of table for key to status abbreviations.

Table 2. Species of Concern	Status²⁰	Project benefits
Chinook <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	FT, SC	Conserve Chinook habitat at the property’s high functioning nearshore areas. It is hypothesized that Nisqually Chinook utilize all South Sound nearshore areas for refuge and rearing before migrations. Conservation of important nearshore rearing areas (critical habitat) is consistent with the Final Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan (Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, 2007) and will promote recovery of Puget Sound Chinook salmon.
Coho <i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	FSC	Conserve juvenile coho rearing and refuge habitat found in nearshore areas and at the small streams onsite. Conservation of important nearshore rearing areas is consistent with the Final Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan (Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, 2007) and will promote increased survival to adulthood and prevent population decline of Puget Sound Coho.
Steelhead <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	FT	Conserve smolt rearing habitat found in nearshore areas and small streams on the site. Conservation of important nearshore rearing areas is consistent with Salmonid Habitat Limiting Factors Water Resource Inventory Area 15 (West), Kitsap Basin, and Area 14 (North), Kennedy-Goldsborough Basin. (Washington Conservation Commission 2003)
Orca whale <i>Orcinus orca</i>	FE, ST	<p>Orcas are found in the waters of McMicken Island State Park, waters adjacent to the Scott property project site. Southern Resident killer whales have been sighted in the area on 4 “unique sighting days” (1990 to 2005, in quad 429), during late-fall. (Whale Museum, 2007).</p> <p>Conservation of this property will support goals of the Washington State Status Report for the Killer Whale (WDFW, 2004) and the Recovery Plan For Southern Resident Killer Whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2008) by protecting habitat essential to the Orca’s food source.</p>
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Recently delisted (federal and state)	The project site and project area provide year-round foraging habitat (waterfowl, gulls, fish) for several birds and there are two nests within ½ mile of the project site. On the June 5, 2008 site visit, a very large eagle was observed feeding on the shore of the Scott property during low tide. Conservation meets goals for feeding habitat protection in Pacific Bald Eagle Recovery Plan, Region 1, USFWS.

²⁰ From WDFW <http://wdfw.wa.gov/wlm/diversty/soc/soc.htm> updated June 2008; some corrections and adjustments were made pursuant to US Fish and Wildlife Service information on TESS http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/ update daily.

Peregrine Falcon <i>Falco peregrinus</i>	Recently delisted (federal and state)	The project site and project area provides winter and migratory foraging habitat for falcons and meets habitat conservation goals of Pacific Coast American Peregrine Falcon Recovery Plan .
Common loon <i>Gavia immer</i>	SS	Habitat conservation will help protect existing south Sound populations through habitat conservation.
Merlin <i>Falco columbarius</i>	SC	Project will conserve forest habitat. Merlin is a season resident in the region.
Pileated woodpecker <i>Dryocopus pileatus</i>	SC	Project provides conservation of foraging and potential breeding habitat will protect existing populations.
Purple martin <i>Progne subis</i>	SC	Conservation of existing snags on the beach and feeder bluffs will protect potential breeding and feeding habitat.
Vaux's swift <i>Chaetura vauxi</i>	SC	Conservation of forest habitat will protect potential nesting habitat and populations as this is a seasonal resident on the island.
Western grebe <i>Aechmophorus occidentalis</i>	SC	Conservation of nearshore and marine habitat will help protect declining populations.
Clark's grebe <i>Aechmophorus clarkii</i>	SM	Conservation of nearshore and marine habitat will help protect declining populations.
Great blue heron <i>Ardea herodias</i>	SM	Habitat conservation will help protect existing populations in the region.
Horned grebe <i>Podiceps auritus</i>	SM	Conservation of nearshore and marine habitat will help protect declining populations.
Red-necked grebe <i>Podiceps grisigena</i>	SM	Conservation of nearshore and marine habitat will help protect declining populations.

FE: Federally Endangered
FT: Federally Threatened Species

FSC: Federal Species of Concern
FP: Federally Protected

SC: State Species of Concern
SM: State Monitored
SS: State Sensitive

1.1.2 Secondary Purpose: Conservation

The Harstine Island acquisition is essential to build connections throughout Case Inlet and south Puget Sound. This property is situated in the landscape to provide high-quality habitat to juvenile salmon, and other species, as well as provide connections for recreation and aesthetic values.

There are three state parks on Harstine Island: Jarrell Cove, Harstine Island, and McMicken Island. State Park's opportunity to acquire the Scott property will enhance the current protected

areas on the island. The acquisition will provide an upland connection to McMicken Island State Park, at present only accessible by boat. Harstine Island State Park is located just to the north of the project site and if acquired, the project site and the shoreline accessible from Harstine Island State Park will provide 2 miles of publicly accessible tideland (see Map 4). The project area will serve as the third point in a triangle of protection on the eastern side of Harstine Island among the project area and Harstine and McMicken Island State Parks.

Protection as a state park not only enhances the recreation opportunities, it also creates links and intact areas for species use and migration. The larger parcel of the project area is currently subdivided for 15 lots. If developed, the density of those single-family units would fragment habitat, increase surface flow with impervious surfaces, and overall be detrimental to species that rely on this area for its natural shoreline and intact habitat.

A regional perspective of Case Inlet indicates that the eastern side of Harstine Island supports numerous conservation efforts in Mason and Pierce counties, and protection of additional pocket estuaries on the western side of Key Peninsula, the east side of Case Inlet, is enhancing connectivity.

- Mason County's Shoreline Master Plan²¹ calls for a reduction in detrimental construction and improvement in linkage of shoreline parks for both people and habitat.
- Capitol Land Trust²² has been active in this area for 20 years and focused on shoreline conservation. The Harstine Island project would add to the growing number of shoreline acres preserved in south Sound.
- The Squaxin Tribe is working diligently to secure vital fish habitat. Conservation at Harstine Island will supplement the tribe's work by conserving non-natal salmon habitat.²³
- South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group is working at Jarrell Cove State Park, on the north tip of Harstine Island, to improve salmon passage. As salmon from Jarrell Cove out-migrate, they follow the shoreline south toward the Scott property, where intact shoreline is used for refuge and food.²⁴
- Across Case Inlet, Key Peninsula Metropolitan Park District protected one pocket estuary in 2008 and is working to conserve a second. This trend in protecting rearing habitat in Case Inlet continues with the Harstine Island project's conservation of non-natal streams.²⁵

State Parks will manage the property to conserve habitat values while allowing public access. Through previously established park policies that balance ecological function and access as well as new protocols being developed by the State Parks commission, the agency will maintain property's critical habitat values while providing public access. (See Manageability Section for a more detailed description.)

²¹ Mason County, Mason County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter IX SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, April 1996 (Revised 2005)

²² <http://www.capitolandtrust.org/aboutus.htm>

²³ Personal communication with Squaxin Tribe

²⁴ <http://www.rco.wa.gov/maps/projects.htm>

²⁵ Key Peninsula Metropolitan Park District, personal communication with Scott Gallacher

There is little need for restoration at the Scott property. If acquired, State Parks would work with its staff and local volunteers to coordinate regular beach clean up events to remove debris that washes upon the shore. Due to the intact habitats, there is no area that requires a rigorous undertaking to restore. Because the area was logged previously, there are pockets of invasive plants that State Parks will have volunteers remove if forest succession does not halt their spread. Furthermore, upon acquisition of the property, volunteers will be engaged to remove small pockets of invasive plants on the shoreline, as part of beach clean up activities. If State Parks wishes to undertake more rigorous restoration in the future, they have staff and a volunteer base as well as ability to apply for state and federal grants to accomplish any future restoration needs.

1.1.3 Secondary Purpose: Recreational

Impending growth and increasing restrictions to the shoreline make projects this like that much more important for Puget Sound's future. The Puget Sound Region is growing fast and expects population to increase by 30 percent over the next 20 years.²⁶ Already, about 480,000 people reside within just a 20-mile radius of the Scott Property – a radius that includes the cities of Tacoma, Olympia, and Bremerton. Tacoma is the second largest city in Washington state and drives the economy of the South Sound region with the nation's sixth largest port. Growth around Tacoma is quickly spreading to areas like Mason County – with the majority of residents choosing to live in unincorporated rural areas, such as where this project is located. Likewise, Olympia is the state capital and draws a large number of commuters from outlying south sound counties. The Scott property, on Harstine Island in Mason County, is an opportunity to protect coastal habitat and provide public access to a shoreline park and natural area in preparation for the anticipated growth of the county and region.

In Washington, many of our shorelines are privately owned or the upland access to get to publicly owned shore is held privately. A recent inventory of the shoreline shows that only 19% of the shoreline is accessible to the public. Moreover, only half of those publicly available beaches are accessible from uplands.²⁷ This creates a barrier to residents and visitors when they seek shoreline and water access. State Parks and TPL are working together to secure this property from any future development or logging, protect high-quality habitat, and establish a public access point. Furthermore, State Parks has a vision to create a cluster of parks in the South Sound with various uses, directed at all types of recreation. This property would play a part in this vision.

State Parks is approaching this acquisition of the Scott Property with both conservation and recreation aspects in mind; any activities on site will be structured to preserve the ecological integrity of the high functioning habitat. Thus, only low impact public uses will be allowed. The site will be open per State Parks' regulations, generally all-year round with an assigned Park Manager, and supported by State Parks' knowledgeable staff.

This acquisition will provide the following recreation values:

²⁶ Puget Sound Shoreline Strategy: A Conservation Vision for Puget Sound, the Trust for Public Land, Updated November 2005, p. 4

²⁷ The Trust for Public Land, Puget Sound Shoreline Strategy: A Conservation Vision for Puget Sound, The Trust for Public Land, Updated November 2005.

- Provide public access to McMicken Island State Park by foot via a ¼ mile walk across the tombolo, or sand spit, during low tides. Today, McMicken Island State Park is only accessible by boat (see Photo 6).
- Supplement existing state parks in the area by connecting the tideland to Harstine Island State Park and opening a 2-mile stretch of publicly owned tideland to the public (see Map 4).
- Create potential for overnight facilities that are consistent with habitat conservation and complement the day use park activities on this site and on the island (see Map 7).
- Connect three state parks: the Scott property, and McMicken Island and Harstine Island State Parks (see Map 4).
- Provide another stop on the Cascadia Marine Trail and fill a void in this part of Puget Sound. McMicken Island State Park is already accessible by boat, however providing public access from the upland and a potential place to launch boats is a needed addition. (The nearby Harstine Island State Park does not offer a boat launch – the steepness of its topography and the distance to the shoreline does not lend itself to this use.)

The Cascadia Marine Trail, an inland sea trail that is a National Recreation Trail, is designated as one of only 16 National Millennium Trails by the White House. Suitable for day or multi-day trips, the Cascadia Marine Trail has over 50 campsites to visit. The primary goal of the Cascadia Marine Trail is to secure camping areas every 5 to 8 miles for the safety of non-motorized boaters traveling on Puget Sound waters – this property is approximately 8 miles by water from three other sites.²⁸ This property will provide a water access point, day-use facilities and potentially also overnight campsites. (The portion of the property planned for park development is excluded from this CELCP request.)

1.1.4 Secondary Purpose: Historical

Harstine Island and the project site are on the western side of Case Inlet. Case Inlet is an important fishing area of the Squaxin Tribe. The protection of this site is important for the tribe's salmon recovery efforts along Case Inlet and in the South Sound Region.²⁹ The Tribe believes it is imperative to preserve nearshore functions necessary for juvenile salmon survival. These vital functions create transition zones vital for food production, migration corridors, predator refuge, and physiological refuge. This site provides these functions and is important to the Tribe to protect for habitat and Puget Sound heritage.

²⁸ Washington Water Trails Association, Cascadia Marine Trail website: <http://www.wwta.org/trails/cmt/about.asp>

²⁹ Scott Steltzner, Fisheries Biologist for the Squaxin Island Tribe Natural Resources Department, is extremely supportive of this proposal. (Support letter available upon request.)

1.1.5 Secondary Purpose: Aesthetic

Harstine Island provides unique views of Puget Sound because of the unusual land formations at the site. In addition, preserving the intact upland forest and preventing dense residential development will preserve the views of Harstine Island when seen from the water. The tombolo and McMiken Island create a unique composition at the Project site. Looking east from the Scott property, especially at low tides, shows the land bridge connecting the small, forested island to the larger Harstine Island. On clear days, the view extends all the way to Mount Rainier: a classic landscape from the Sound to the mountains essential to the character of this region (see Photos 1, 4, and 5).

In addition, preserving this property will protect the view of users of the Cascadia Marine Trail, a National Recreation Trail designated by the White House as one of only 16 National Millennium Trails. Paddlers utilize McMicken Island State Park as a stop on this trail. Preserving the views and scenery at the Scott Property will continue to enhance the adventure experience for paddlers in south Sound.

1.2 Relevance to CELCP and Other State/Local Plans

Relevance to State CELCP Plan

The Harstine Island acquisition will further the implementation of Washington CELCP in multiple ways. Washington CELCP emphasizes protecting sustainable biodiversity of coastal and estuarine resources with a focus on preservation of watershed/shoreline processes, functions, and connectivity of natural systems, and identifying project areas based on the presence of target ecological features and other attributes—recreation/public access, historical/cultural, and aesthetic. This acquisition advances multiple Washington CELCP priorities in the following criteria:

Salmon Recovery³⁰

Protection and restoration of salmon habitat is essential to the recovery of this Pacific Northwest icon. The Harstine Island project area has important habitat benefiting endangered salmon, and preserves the ecological integrity of the landscape as stated in the Washington CELCP. A successful acquisition will protect nearshore and non-natal streams, important habitats for salmon.

Wetlands Protection³¹

The freshwater wetlands on the parcel are essential for coastal processes because they store and release freshwater into Puget Sound. The Harstine Island property has high- and good- quality wetlands available for protection.

³⁰ *Washington State's Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Plan*, Washington Department of Ecology, April 2007, p7-8.

³¹ *Ibid.* p 8.

Forage Fish and Shorelines Protection³²

Overall, this acquisition will permanently protect over ½ mile of natural shoreline, protecting critical habitat for forage fish, salmon, and other species in the food web. The sand and gravel beaches support abundant shellfish populations and feeder bluffs supply sediment to known spawning grounds for forage fish south of the project. Although no forage fish spawning has been documented at the property, the beach here has suitable composition for potential spawning. The intact, undisturbed natural shoreline here is an important healthy link for migrating salmon using the nearshore habitat of the south Sound.

Species and Habitat Biodiversity³³

The second-growth forested uplands contribute to the health of the water quality and water-dependent wildlife. The uplands, shoreline, and intertidal areas are an intact system of habitats that sustain many species (see Biodiversity section above).

Ecoregional Issues and Threats for Puget Sound³⁴

By keeping habitat intact, preventing development, and preserving connections in south Puget sound, the Scott acquisition helps offset ecoregional threats facing Puget Sound.

Broader Threat of Habitat Fragmentation³⁵

A steady loss of habitat, alarming declines in some fish and wildlife populations, and closures of shellfish beds are signs that the very best of the Puget Sound is threatened. Harstine Island acquisition will protect important habitat connectivity for salmon and other species, and decrease fragmentation in south Puget Sound, while preserving rich biodiversity, and ecological processes and functions that support healthy estuarine ecosystems (described in Ecological section above).

Relevance to Other State and Local Plans

Acquisition of the Scott Property at Harstine Island supports the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program, as well as many other state and local planning efforts. Priorities advanced by this acquisition are detailed below:

³² Ibid. p 8.

³³ *Washington State's Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Plan*, Washington Department of Ecology, April 2007, p 8.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 9-10.

Management plan or effort	How this project helps implement its goals
<p>Washington State Coastal Zone Management Program Washington Department of Ecology</p>	<p><i>Managing Washington’s Coast</i> recommends the protection and ecological management of habitat and ecosystems such as those that will be protected by this project. Washington state parks are considered ‘other specially designated areas’ as they conserve habitat, function as learning centers, and provide recreation opportunities.³⁶</p>
<p>Greater Mason County Nearshore Assessment Anchor Environmental, 2004</p>	<p>This assessment performed for Mason County identified areas in need of restoration. This property is not recommended for restoration. Preservation of its natural shoreline is recommended to conserve its high to moderate level of function. The Scott property was not identified as an area in need of restoration because: 1) The shoreline is unarmored, allowing for natural coastal processes to take place, 2) the shoreline has between 80 to 100 percent overhanging native riparian vegetation which provides food, shade, and structure, 3) the sediment supply ranking is unelevated and appears to be functioning at an appropriate level given the Property’s location on the landscape, and 4) no boats, docks or floats are present on the Property.</p>
<p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s Puget Sound Coastal Program USFWS, 2006</p>	<p>The goal of this program is to restore and protect priority habitats. The project area protects 39.3 acres of unique coastal habitat, including 20.3 acres of coastal wetlands, areas that provide habitat for a variety of plant and animal species that are uniquely adapted to living in these environments. This project also meets the primary goal of conserving habitat for threatened and endangered species like Orca whales and Puget Sound Chinook and coho salmon.</p>
<p>North American Waterfowl Management Plan Pacific Coast Joint Venture Strategic Plan, 1996</p>	<p>The project contributes to the goals of the North American Waterfowl Plan, which is an international strategy to restore waterfowl populations through habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement. The project contributes to the plan’s goals by protecting estuarine and forested wetland areas that provide important habitats for waterfowl.</p>
<p>Northern Pacific Coast Regional Shorebird Conservation Plan Drut and Buchanan, 2000</p>	<p>The goals of the Northern Pacific Coast Regional Shorebird Conservation Plan include protecting, restoring, and enhancing the quantity and quality of shorebird nesting, roosting, and foraging habitats to stabilize, maintain, or increase breeding, wintering, or migrating populations of shorebird species within the region. The project contributes to these goals by acquiring and protecting in perpetuity 39.3 acres, including 20.3 acres of highly functional marine nearshore and coastal wetland habitats. The entire protected area consists of high quality shorebird habitat and other habitat suitable for the endangered Brown Pelican and threatened Marbled Murrelet.</p>
<p>Conservation Strategy for Landbirds in Lowlands and Valleys of Western Oregon and Washington Oregon – Washington Partners in Flight, 2000</p>	<p>The property and nearby area contains a considerable amount of riparian – open water habitat, one of four priority habitats. The Property is adjacent to McMicken Island State Park and Harstine Island State Park. McMicken Island State Park provides habitat to seabird colonies, bald eagle, and a variety of shorebirds. The undisturbed shoreline contains native overhanging vegetation. The upland portion of the Property contains several ravines with freshwater streams and wetlands. These ravines</p>

³⁶ *Managing Washington’s Coast*: Washington State’s Coastal Zone Management Program, Washington Department of Ecology Publication 00-06-129, p. 56.

	provide habitat to a large number of landbirds including owl, hummingbird, and songbirds. Acquisition of the Property will preserve the existing landbird and shorebird habitat and provide a connection to the adjacent riparian – open water habitats of McMicken Island State Park.
Magnuson – Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 14, May 2000	Actions such as estuarine alteration, bank stabilization, agriculture, aquaculture, construction, urbanization, removal of woody debris, wetland alteration, and wastewater / pollutant discharge have been named as threats to Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) as outlined in the Magnuson – Stevens Fishery Conservation Act. Protection of the project area will ensure that these actions will not threaten Essential Fish Habitat found within the estuarine or marine intertidal habitats contained in the project area. Without protection and preservation, development is a likely use of the property. Puget Sound EFH for Chinook and coho is outlined in Amendment 14 to the Salmon FMP. http://www.pcouncil.org/salmon/salfmp/a14.html
Washington’s Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2005	This Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife action plan identifies Bays, Estuaries, and Marine Nearshore habitats as “Priority One” habitats for conservation in Washington. This project directly addresses the goals and priorities for conservation of marine and nearshore habitats.
Washington Biodiversity Conservation Strategy Washington Biodiversity Council, 2007	One of the goals outlined in this plan is to use acquisition as a means to protect biodiversity. Though acquisition, this project will protect unique marine intertidal, nearshore, and upland habitats and the biodiversity these support. Because the shoreline is the edge between the water and land, it is a unique habitat in the diverse species it supports.
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat and Species program WDFW, 1991	The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Priority Habitat and species program “identifies habitats and species determined to be priorities based on defensible criteria” for management and conservation recommendations. This proposal will protect: forage fish spawning habitat, bald eagle nesting habitat, as well as habitat for other shore birds, invertebrates, and sea mammals. http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phshabs.htm
Washington Shorelines Management Act, Chapter 90.58 RCW	Program goals include preserving the natural character and ecological function of significant shoreline long-term and increasing public access, interest and recreational activities along these designated areas. Acquisition of the Property will meet these goals. The preservation of the Scott Property will protect state-wide interests by not developing the Property and maintaining a significant amount of land for long-term protection. The natural character of the shoreline will also be preserved by maintaining its undeveloped nature. Protection of the Property will also protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline. Acquisition of the Property will increase publicly owned areas and allow for access and more recreational opportunities. It will also serve as a link to McMicken Island State Park.
Guidance for Protection and Restoration of the Nearshore Ecosystems of Puget Sound, Technical Report 2004-02 Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership, 2004	The Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership’s goals are to identify significant ecosystem problems, evaluate potential solutions, and restore and preserve critical nearshore habitat. This project protects marine and nearshore habitat that provides foraging and refuge for a variety of marine and estuarine species. Furthermore, the project will protect nearby surfsmelt spawning grounds by stabilizing the nearshore environment, beaches, and bluffs that provide sediment for spawning beaches and prevent disruption of coastal processes.

<p>Puget Sound Water Quality Protection RCW 90.71</p>	<p>Protection of the property is consistent with RCW 90.71, Puget Sound Water Quality Protection, in which the Washington State Legislature has recognized “that Puget Sound and related inland marine waterways of Washington State represent a unique and unparalleled resource. A rich and varied range of marine organisms, composing an interdependent, sensitive communal ecosystem reside in these sheltered waters.” The legislature has further recognized that residents of this region enjoy a way of life centered on the waters of Puget Sound, which depends upon a clean and healthy marine resource. This project will sustain the healthy waters in this area and maintain marine and intertidal processes.</p>
<p>Puget Sound Conservation and Recovery Plan 2007-2009 Puget Sound Partnership, 2007</p>	<p>Two of the eight priorities of the Puget Sound Partnership’s Puget Sound plan are protecting functioning marine and freshwater habitats and protecting species diversity. Acquisition of this property would contribute to achieving these priorities.</p>
<p>Recovery Plan for Southern Resident Killer Whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) National Marine Fisheries Service, 2008</p>	<p>The goal of the Recovery Plan For Southern Resident Killer Whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) is to achieve the recovery of the Southern Resident killer whale distinct population segment (DPS) and its ecosystem to a level sufficient to warrant its removal from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Conservation of the property at Harstine Island would help rebuild depleted populations of salmon and other killer whale prey to ensure an adequate food base for recovery of the Southern Residents and would help minimize pollution and chemical contamination in Southern Resident habitats.</p>
<p>Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan Shared Strategy, 2007</p>	<p>The Puget Sound Salmon Recovery plan identifies protection of marine and nearshore habitats as essential to salmon recovery. This project addresses habitat preservation for endangered salmon species. Acquisition here will protect the waters and streams used by over-wintering coho salmon. Protection will also ensure safe rearing, forage, and refuge habitat along the shoreline.</p>
<p>WRIA 14 Salmon Recovery Strategy Mason County Conservation District - Lead Entity, 2004</p>	<p>The project directly addresses and supports the geographic, water quality, and salmon species priorities of the WRIA 14 salmon strategy. The northern tip and southern end of Harstine Island have water quality issues, while the central portion - where this project is located - has relatively good water quality. Preservation of this habitat and water regime will support the basin plan to improve water quality in this watershed impacting salmon recovery.</p>
<p>Mason County Regional Trails Plan (Draft) Mason County Department of Parks and Trails and Mason County Regional Trails Committee, 2008</p>	<p>Mason County is considering creation of a county or regional water trail. The Trails Plan cites the need for more overnight campsites and launch sites, as the current sites are spaced relatively far apart for a multi-day sea trip. This property could play a part in serving the needs of the paddling community by providing additional water access points and potentially providing overnight campsites.</p>
<p>Cascadia Marine Trail Goals Washington Water Trails Association, 2008</p>	<p>The Washington Water Trails Association is dedicated to growing the Cascadia Marine Trail to its fullest extent to serve the many kayakers and paddlers who live in and visit Puget Sound. “The primary goal of the Cascadia Marine Trail is to secure camping areas every 5 to 8 miles for the safety of non-motorized boaters traveling on Puget Sound waters. The length of Puget Sound shoreline, according to various sources, is between 1,800 and 2,300 miles. The trail will be considered complete at a point in</p>

	time when there are between 225 and 460 campsites.” (Excerpted from http://www.wwta.org/trails/cmt/goals.asp) This property will provide a water access point and potentially also provide overnight campsites.
--	---

1.3 Manageability of the Project Site

Current status of the property is undeveloped land, with potential subdivision for 15 single-family homes on 5-acre lots. The lots surrounding the Scott property are generally developed and are zoned as Rural Residential, 5 acres per lot. The Scott family uses their property for occasional picnics and walks on the beach, but there is not heavy or persistent use by the landowners for recreation. Historically, a small area near the mouth of Stream 1 (see Map 8) was used by the family for a small boathouse and the area of the middle intertidal zone on the northern portion of the Property shows past use for rearing Pacific oysters.

The degree of non-native species varies. The property was logged at one time, and areas that were heavily disturbed during that process exhibit more invasive plants than areas not subject to logging trucks and machinery. However, the forested uplands are healthy and second growth is showing traditional forest succession. A few pockets of non-native plants exist on the beach and have accumulated behind LWD and drift logs. A formal restoration is not yet designed, but State Parks is planning to engage State Parks volunteers for clean up activities that will include invasive species removal along the beach and within upland areas where forest succession is not halting their spread. Any further restoration plans will be formalized after State Parks takes ownership at a later date.

An environmental site assessment was completed February 2009. There is no contamination on site and no need for environmental remediation.

1.4 Long-term Use of the Site

Planned use. State Parks plans to manage this site for habitat protection and low-impact, passive recreation. State Parks expects this site will become a public access point to the shoreline, an education destination for local school groups, a location to host nature activities for seniors, as well as a place for bird watching and wildlife viewing, beach walks, and nature hikes. (As mentioned earlier, 15 acres of the property’s total 112 acres is being purchased with non-CELCP funding. In this portion being excluded from the CELCP proposal, State Parks plans to house an onsite Park Manger and provide day-use and overnight camping facilities.)

Compatibility to Primary Purpose. Even though recreation is a key component of this project, it is compatible to the project’s ecological purpose. State Parks will balance recreation while preserving habitat values and protecting the most sensitive areas on the site. By encouraging interaction with the shoreline and the forest and reconnecting people to Puget Sound, this project will help foster a stewardship ethic among its users that can spread beyond this site and into larger conservation issues, such as the protection of the greater Puget Sound ecosystem.

State Parks' onsite Park Manager will monitor sensitive areas and ensure appropriate usage of the project site. The Park Manager will manage hours of operation and other duties related to the park as set out by State Parks.

As a land steward, State Parks has a Stewardship Program with scientific staff in each region with full-time professional biological support available from headquarters. State Parks is committed to protect natural areas and aquatic resources.

1.5 Threat of Conversion

Impending growth and increasing restrictions to the shoreline make projects this like that much more important for Puget Sound's future. The Puget Sound Region is growing fast and expects population to increase by 30 percent over the next 20 years.³⁷ Already, about 480,000 people reside within just a 20-mile radius of the Scott Property – a radius that includes the cities of Tacoma, Olympia, and Bremerton. Tacoma is the second largest city in Washington state and drives the economy of the South Sound region with the nation's sixth largest port. Growth around Tacoma is quickly spreading to areas like Mason County. Currently the county population is over 50,000 people and has grown by 10% in the last 5 years,³⁸ with the majority of residents choosing to live in unincorporated rural areas, such as where this project is located. Likewise, Olympia is the state capital and draws a large number of commuters from outlying south sound counties.

The Scott Property, on Harstine Island in Mason County, is an opportunity to protect coastal habitat and provide public access to a shoreline park in preparation of the anticipated growth of the county and region. State Parks has been preparing for this eventual growth by creating and managing parks for the use of all citizens and visitors of Washington.

This property has been under a high threat of conversion. The Scott family had already divided the property into fifteen home sites and was recently listing it for sale. Because the county approved the Scott's development plan in 1991, the Scott's plan was grandfathered into the environmental laws that existed at that time, laws that were less environmentally sensitive than they are now, 18 years later. Furthermore, with two of the Scott family brothers earning their living as real estate developers, the Scott family has the expertise in-house to develop and sell their 15 lots in addition to the skills and experience needed to effectuate any needed zoning changes or deal with the general challenges of property development. Development of the Scott property into fifteen home sites would have a direct effect on water and habitat quality in the vicinity, degrading the area and reducing diversity and species usage.

Because of the high ecological values of this property and its adjacency to McMicken Island State Park, State Parks has been trying to acquire this property for many years. Unfortunately, the property's ownership structure has made such efforts unsuccessful to date. The property, which has been owned by the Scott family for over 40 years, had been passed on from one generation to the next, with about twenty relatives owning the property most recently. While

³⁷ Puget Sound Shoreline Strategy: A Conservation Vision for Puget Sound, the Trust for Public Land, Updated November 2005, p. 4

³⁸ State of Washington OFM 2007 Data Book: <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/databook/county/pier.asp#02vital>

State Parks has been close to acquiring the property two times in the past ten years, each deal had to be cancelled at the last minute due to one of many involved parties changing their mind.

In the current effort, two of the property's landowners contacted TPL in mid-2007 to help them explore a potential conservation sale to State Parks. Since that time, the State Parks / TPL partnership has been successful in aggressively moving this deal forward – and all needed acquisition funds have been awarded or are pending award – except for the \$525,000 being requested in this CELCP application.

Unfortunately, due to the current economic crisis and the steep decline of the stock market, some members of the twenty landowner contingent had an urgent need for immediate cash and could no longer wait for a potential sale to State Parks a year from now – they demanded an immediate purchase of the entire property or else they would start selling off individual lots of their 15-lot subdivision to start generating income.

Because of the urgency of the situation and the danger of this conservation opportunity being lost permanently, State Parks and TPL signed a Memorandum of Understanding stating that if TPL stepped forward and temporarily bought and held the property, State Parks would commit to buy it within the next two years, pending the availability of funding. Thus, in late February 2009, TPL took on the risk and borrowed capital to successfully buy the Scott Property from the 20-member landowner group. While TPL can hold the property temporarily, TPL cannot hold the property indefinitely and would need to put it back on the market if State Parks were unable to secure the remaining \$525,000 needed to acquire this property.

1.6 Project Readiness

The Scott property acquisition is ready to close, pending funding. If this project is awarded \$525,000 in CELCP funds, it is anticipated that this project have all the funding needed for acquisition (since the other funding is awarded or is expected to be awarded).

- TPL has stepped in to buy and temporarily hold the property from the prior twenty landowners, making a very clean and simple transaction for State Parks. State Parks and TPL have a signed Purchase and Sale Agreement (see letter and deed attesting to this in the Attachments).
- The appraisal was completed November 2008 and will be updated as needed (see Executive Summary in the Attachments).
- The Environmental Site Assessment was completed February 2009. No contaminants or environmental hazards were found on the site (see Summary in the Attachments)
- Map 6 shows a survey plat of the proposed 15-lot development on the larger of the two parcels.
- The title is clear and not subject to any litigation, liens, judgments or other situations (see Title Report in the Attachments).

While State Parks has not yet expended funds for this land acquisition and does not plan to do so prior to the ranking of CELCP proposals, State Parks would like to reserve the right to receive a

Waiver of Retroactivity in the event this project is recommended for CELCP funding and the project's success is furthered by purchasing the property before June 2010.

1.7 Ability to Acquire Land

Washington State law (RCW 79A.05.030(7)) authorizes the State Parks and Recreation Commission to acquire land. State Parks, the applicant, has a strong record in land acquisitions. The agency completed over 50 transactions to purchase more than 8,150 acres of property with a value of nearly \$27 million since January 2000. State Parks has real estate experts on staff and is prepared and authorized to acquire the fee simple interest of the entire Scott property as well as manage state and federal grant contracts.

TPL is a national, nonprofit, land conservation organization that conserves land for people to enjoy as parks, community gardens, historic sites, rural lands, and other natural places, ensuring livable communities for generations to come. Since its founding 36 years ago, TPL has acquired more than 2.5 million acres nationwide valued at nearly \$5.6 billion dollars. TPL has been preserving Puget Sound shorelines since 1993, having added 24 new parks and natural areas totaling more than 10,300 acres.

Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission Mission Statement

“The Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission acquires, operates, enhances, and protects a diverse system of recreational, cultural, historical and natural sites. The Commission fosters outdoor recreation and education statewide to provide enjoyment and enrichment for all, and a valued legacy for future generations.

In 2013, Washington's state parks will be premier destinations of uncommon quality, including state and regionally significant natural, cultural, historical and recreational resources that are outstanding for public experience, health, enjoyment and learning.”

TPL is working in conjunction with State Parks' Planning and Program Manager, Bill Koss, to complete this acquisition by assisting in negotiations and fundraising. The TPL project staff, Nelson Mathews and Ann Welz, brings with them years of experience in conservation real estate and project management. In his role as Northwest Program Director, Nelson helps manage the Trust for Public Land's conservation efforts in Oregon, Idaho, Washington and Alaska. During his 17 years at TPL, Nelson has successfully negotiated, acquired, and conveyed into protective public and non-profit ownership well over 100,000 acres of lands with recreational, historic and environmental significance. Ann has twenty years of project management and transaction experience, including senior leadership roles in the non-profit, for profit, and public sectors.

1.8 Ability to Manage Land

State Parks operates a statewide system of 121 parks. In total, the park system contains more than 120,000 acres of land in 37 counties across the state. Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, a seven-member board, administers the state agency. The Commission provides policy guidance to the agency, including the recently adopted Natural Resource Policy,

which will guide management of this property. The policy places great weight on retaining natural attributes of park sites.

State Parks employs more than 500 staff, with most staff located in the parks and regional offices. There is an established Stewardship Program with scientific staff in each region and full-time professional biological support available from headquarters in Olympia, Washington. Park Rangers are the on site staff and have law enforcement capability.

The Scott Property acquisition will provide an excellent opportunity to apply State Parks “green strategies” solutions, reducing the impact of the built environment on the natural environment, while ensuring State Parks’ guiding principles.

2.0 PROJECT TIMELINE

The Harstine Island - Scott Property acquisition will be completed within the CECLP award time frame. The project is already close to completion and would be fully complete between June 1, 2010 -December 31, 2011 if awarded funds in the fiscal year 2010. (If this project is recommended for CELCP funding and State Parks secures a Waiver of Retroactivity, State Parks may purchase the Scott Property in late 2009 if this would further the project’s success.)

<i>Table 3.</i> <i>Project Timeline</i>	<i>Benchmarks/Actions</i>
November 2007 - April 2008	Negotiations with landowners. State and federal grant applications prepared and submitted.
July - December 2008	Continue negotiations and complete appraisal.
January - March 2009	Coastal Wetlands awards announced, this project to receive \$1,000,000. WA state #2 WWRP Riparian ranking confirmed, project slated for \$1,500,000, pending state legislative appropriations in May 2009. (See details in the ‘Budget’ section.) Environmental Site Assessment completed. Purchase and Sale Agreement signed. TPL successfully buys-and-holds the property to prevent the landowners from selling for development and to buy time for State Parks to raise the remaining funds.
November – December 2009	If State Parks can secure a CELCP Waiver of Retroactivity, State Parks may submit the required documentation and pursue a purchase of the property in late 2009.
January - October 2010	State Parks to submit remaining NOAA documentation required. If a CELCP Waiver of Retroactivity is not secured, State Parks will purchase the property as soon as funds are available.

3.0 BUDGET NARRATIVE

It is anticipated that this project will be ready to close upon award of \$525,000 in CELCP funding. This is the last piece of funding needed for both this specific CELCP project and the total project. (The other funding has been awarded or is expected to be awarded, pending state legislative appropriation and is discussed further below.)

Federal share

This proposal is a request for a CELCP grant in the amount of \$525,000 for the Harstine Island – Scott Acquisition. Match for this acquisition is \$525,000 composed of state funds. The CELCP budget for this project is \$1,050,000. This request for federal funding represents 50% of that budget. (See tables for total budget and CELCP budget details.)

This project seeks to acquire in fee simple 97 acres of the two Scott property parcels on Harstine Island. The land acquisition cost is based on a reviewed appraisal, completed November 2008 in accordance with “yellow book” standards, and will be updated as needed prior to closing. There are no other costs in this CELCP budget other than land acquisition and administration expenses. All due diligence costs are being covered by the TPL.

Non-Federal Matching Funds

The match for this grant proposal is in the form of cash and will be available within the performance period. The Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) – Riparian Grant Account is the expected source of the remaining funds and the award is pending. The project’s proposal for WWRP-Riparian grant tied for #2 and funding is anticipated, pending legislative appropriation, which is expected May 2009, with funds available as early as October 2009. Should match from this state source not be successful, however, TPL has committed to the match amount, potentially from an additional grant or another funding source.

Other

The property will not be leased or rented. This acquisition would become a new State Park. All of the Washington state parks have a nominal user fee structure to help offset park management. Currently, fees for overnight camping (if offered at this park) range from \$12 to \$24, depending on the level of service, and watercraft launching of canoes or kayaks is \$7 for a daily permit. Permits are generally not required for day use activities such as picnicking, hiking, or beach combing.

This project is not being considered for other funding besides the programs noted on the budget table. This CELCP funding request does not duplicate another request.

Budget Overview Table – Suggested Format

Category	Amount (Cash unless noted)	Funding Sources	Funds Already Expended?
Admin	\$ 25,000	Federal Share from CELCP	No
	\$ 25,000	Non-Federal Matching Share from State WWRP-Riparian Grant (award pending)	No
Acquisition	\$ 500,000	Federal Share from CELCP	No
	\$ 500,000	Non-Federal Matching Share from State WWRP-Riparian Grant (award pending)	No
	\$1,000,000	Federal – NCWCG (awarded) ³⁹	No
	\$1,000,000	State Match for NCWCG – WWRP-Riparian Grant (award pending)	No
	\$ 150,000	State Parks – area for park facilities ⁴⁰	No
Due Diligence ⁴¹	\$ 60,000 in-kind	The Trust for Public Land	Some expended starting 2007
Biological Assessment ⁴²	\$ 5,000 in-kind	Pentec Environmental	Yes, March 2008
TOTAL Cost:	\$3,265,000		

CELCP Budget Table – Suggested Format

Category	Federal Share from CELCP	State/Local Matching Share	Total	Funding Source (for Non-Federal share)	Funds Already Expended?
Admin	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 50,000	Cash – WWRP	No
Acquisition	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	Cash – WWRP	No
TOTAL:	\$525,000	\$525,000	\$1,050,000		

While State Parks has not yet expended funds for land acquisition, if CELCP funds this proposal, State Parks would like to reserve the right to receive a Waiver of Retroactivity in the event project success is furthered by purchasing the property before June 2010, after proposals are ranked and before CELCP funds are available.

³⁹ NCWCG – National Coastal Wetland Conservation Grant

⁴⁰ A portion of the Scott property, 15 acres, will be used for park facilities, and will be purchased with non-CELCP funds.

⁴¹ Due Diligence – TPL is donating the funds it has expended / will expend – including the appraisal, Environmental Site Assessment, and staff and legal resources. (This in-kind donation is being used as match for other grants.)

⁴² Biological Assessment – Pentec Environmental is a division of Hart Crowser. Senior staff of Pentec conducted the biological assessment of the property and donated a part of their work for this project. (This in-kind donation is being used as match for the NCWCG.)

4.0 OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

This project has high support from the community. In addition to the in-kind donation being made by TPL and Pentec Environmental (mentioned earlier in the ‘Budget’ section and being used as match for other grants), many other organizations also strongly support this project:

- The Squaxin Tribe states this project is imperative for the tribe’s salmon recovery efforts along Case Inlet.
- The Tahoma Audubon Society supports this project because “there are few opportunities to acquire and protect highly threatened, highly functioning habitats and processes.”
- The Washington Water Trails Association wants to add a needed link to their Cascadia Marine Trail.
- The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife owns the public recreational shellfish tidelands in the area and would like this property’s high-quality habitat also preserved.

In summary, there is a broad range of support for State Parks to acquire this property. Letters from these organizations are available upon request.

Once the property is acquired, State Parks will provide outreach and education activities for visitors. The following is an example of the types of programs State Parks intends to provide.

Site-specific programs or products	Audience/participants	Estimated size of audience/participants
<p>State Parks will hire and house a Park Manager who will reside on the property. He/she will lead educational programs and answer visitor questions about the site’s natural resources and recreation opportunities. Furthermore, the Park Manager will arrange for the services of additional speakers and tour guides as needed, to help deliver the parks educational and recreational programs.</p>	<p>Elementary school children from Mason County.</p> <p>Park visitors, young and old alike</p>	<p>3 groups of 30 students for age-appropriate environmental education</p> <p>6 Saturday morning beach walks/birding tours during summer months with groups composed of 15 – 20 participants. Tours will likely vary between strolling the beach of the Scott property, hiking the three-mile round-trip trail to Harstine Island State Park to the north, or during a low tide, walking over the tombolo and exploring McMicken Island State Park.</p>

5.0 ATTACHMENTS

5.1 Maps

- Map 1. Location of Harstine Island in context of Washington state
- Map 2. Map of the Puget Sound region and location of project site
- Map 3. Vicinity map of Case Inlet and Harstine Island showing the project area
- Map 4. Map showing relationship to other nearby State Parks properties
- Map 5. Parcel boundary map
- Map 6. Survey map showing approved subdivision
- Map 7. State Parks' conceptual development plan for the property
- Map 8. Location of streams, wetlands, and intertidal areas
- Map 9. Map of wetland boundaries referred

5.2 Photos

- Photo 1. Tombolo
- Photo 2. Digging for horse clams
- Photo 3. Sand dollars at low tide
- Photo 4. View of shoreline, sand beach, and bluff
- Photo 5. Scenic view of iconic Mt. Rainier from the property
- Photo 6. Aerial view of property with red lines marking project boundaries

5.3 Project Application Checklist

5.4 Project Readiness Documentation

- Letter attesting to Purchase and Sale Agreement
- Letter attesting to appraisal (and summary pages)
- Title Report
- Summary pages from the Environmental Site Assessment