



CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, MAY 18, 2017
3:00 PM – 5:00 PM
CITY HALL
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVENUE NORTH
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / ACCEPT OR MODIFY AGENDA / CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE

3:00 PM

Chair: Frank Gremse

Members: Charlie Kratzer
Jason Flowers
Karl Shearer
Dylan Frazer

2. ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING NOTES – April 20, 2017

3. GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM – Cami Apfelbeck

4. REVIEW – Critical Areas Ordinance: Geohazards – All

5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – All

6. LIAISON REPORT OUT – Councilmember Roth

7. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS – All

8. ADJOURNMENT

5:00 PM



ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 2017
3:00 PM – 5:00 PM
CITY HALL
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVENUE NORTH
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

MINUTES

1. **CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / ACCEPT OR MODIFY AGENDA / CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE**
3:03 PM

Chair: Frank Gremse

Members: Charlie Kratzer
Jason Flowers
Karl Shearer
Dylan Frazer

2. **LIAISON REPORT OUT** – Councilmember Roth indicated that the city council is interested in having ETAC review the Groundwater Management Plan

3. **REVIEW Critical Areas Ordinance** – Comments were provided to COBI on the Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas and Frequently Flooded Areas sections

4. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC** – All

5. **ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING NOTES – FEBRUARY 16, 2017 and March 16, 2017**– ETAC Members

6. **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS** – All

7. **ADJOURNMENT**
5:00 PM

Frank Gremse, Chair

05/18/17

Summation of Recommendations <i><u>not yet Implemented</u></i> from Recent Groundwater Assessments and Comprehensive Plan Update					
MONITORING					
Number	Recommendation	Resources Needed to Implement	Comments/Staff Recommendation for Implementation	Competing 2017 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)	Competing 2018 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)
1	Conduct confirmation sampling of historic, single-time elevated chloride measurements ¹	\$130 analytical costs plus 8 hours staff and equipment time to conduct confirmation sampling at 3 remaining wells	Out of 5 wells with one-time historic chloride concentrations that exceeded EWL (>100 mg/L) ⁵ , 2 were determined to be anomalies as post sampling results were all <7 mg/L. The remaining 3 only had one measurement with no prior or post samples for comparison. However, routine programmatic chloride sampling in wells ~0.5 miles away or less in the same aquifer do not exhibit elevated chloride concentrations. Should future results become available for the 3 remaining wells or nearby wells and these results exceed EWL, conduct confirmation sampling.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	Routine work, possible continued work in Seabold area depending upon outcome of current study, and groundwater management plan development
2	Identify any significant tidal influence on water levels in nearshore wells. Where necessary, characterize the tidal effect and adjust water level data accordingly ¹	Purchase (\$1000 - \$3000 each) and installation of pressure transducers to log continuous water levels OR conduct hourly water level measurements over a 24-hour period in ~13 wells; additional time to adjust historic water levels depending upon number of wells determined significantly influenced by tides	In general practice, tidal influence is only of interest for a specific well or localized study. Not as much a concern for long-term monitoring as regular monitoring over a long period of time will eventually capture that influence. Not the best use of resources as this time.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	Routine work, possible continued work in Seabold area depending upon outcome of current study, and groundwater management plan development
3	Add nitrate to annual water quality sampling, if nitrate levels are of concern ²	80 hours staff time to establish EWL and network of monitoring wells; then \$1000 analytical costs (~30 wells) and 24 hours staff and equipment time/year to conduct sampling	Nitrate not a concern at this time. Continue current approach to periodically review and reassess KPHD/DOH/COBI/KPUD data.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	Routine work, possible continued work in Seabold area depending upon outcome of current study, and groundwater management plan development
4	Encourage exempt well owners to periodically test their water quality and self-report to KPHD ²	None	Already coordinate with KPHD to do this; can increase education and outreach (Ecology provides a free private well owner class via email/podcast/video, workshops, seminars, and a library of information - includes a "Pledge to Test" campaign); can also include local policy/incentive in groundwater management plan	None	None
GROUNDWATER MODEL ENHANCEMENT					
Number	Recommendation	Resources Needed to Implement	Comments/Staff Recommendation for Implementation	Competing 2017 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)	Competing 2018 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)
5	Focus model extent and grid to provide greater resolution ³	\$10,000 consultant fees; 40 hours staff time to administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	Should be done in conjunction with any future model use.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	NA
6	Refine model layering ³	\$10,000 consultant fees; 40 hours staff time to administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	Should be done in conjunction with any future model use.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	NA
7	Adjust aquifer parameters ³	\$10,000 consultant fees; 40 hours staff time to administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	Should be done in conjunction with any future model use.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	NA
FUTURE ASSESSMENT					
Number	Recommendation	Resources Needed to Implement	Comments/Staff Recommendation for Implementation	Competing 2017 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)	Competing 2018 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)
8	Evaluate the groundwater model's capability to characterize the effects of decreasing groundwater levels on shallow wells and recommend refinements, if necessary (e.g. domestic/exempt) ⁴	After completion of #5-7, \$6,000 consultant fees; 40 hours of staff time to administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	After completion of #14, only pursue this if it is stakeholder's/council's desire to explore and implement policy to either prevent/mitigate significant impacts to shallow wells OR use results to implement #9.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	Routine work, possible continued work in Seabold area depending upon outcome of current study, and groundwater management plan development

9	Refine the groundwater database as recommended in #8, and simulate a range of projected future groundwater withdrawal rates from the various aquifers to account for the possible decommissioning of shallow private wells on parcels to be served by expanded public water systems ⁴	\$? consultant fees to refine model as stipulated in #8; then, \$6,000 (per scenario/model run) consultant fees; 80 hours of staff time to provide data for scenarios, administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	Only pursue this if implemented #8 and results indicate significant impacts to shallow wells (e.g. wells go dry) and it is stakeholder's/council's desire to implement policy to encourage the decommission of shallow wells and movement of water usage to the deeper aquifers by expanding nearby public water systems (providing "hook ups" to impacted well owners).	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	Routine work, possible continued work in Seabold area depending upon outcome of current study, and groundwater management plan development
10	Evaluate the groundwater model's capability to quantify groundwater discharge to streams and recommend refinements, if necessary ⁴	After completion of #5-7, \$9,000 consultant fees; 40 hours of staff time to administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	Implement this study either before or after #14 to help establish water allocation to stream baseflow to support water budget balancing.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	NA
11	Refine the groundwater database as recommended in #10 and simulate a range of projected future groundwater withdrawal rates to quantify impacts to groundwater discharge to streams ⁴	\$? consultant fees to refine model as stipulated in #10; then, \$6,000 (per scenario/model run) consultant fees; 80 hours of staff time to provide data for scenarios, administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	Implement this study either before or after #14 to help establish water allocation to stream baseflow to support water budget balancing. Springbrook Creek basin would be suitable pilot test based upon its size, 10-year flow record (on-going), and coverage under WAC 173-515 <i>Instream Resources Protection Program - Kitsap Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 15</i> which requires protection of the total natural flow in Springbrook Creek.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	NA
12	Provide periodic model review, updating the model as needed with new wells, withdrawal schedules, and monitoring data. Previous predictive scenarios should be re-assessed using refined assumptions about projected groundwater withdrawal rates, recharge rates, and sea level rise ⁴	\$100,000 consultant fees; 80 hours of staff time to administer contract, manage and direct consultant, and relay information to the public.	Routinely implement as run-up to comprehensive plan and critical areas ordinance updates every 8 years.	NA	NA
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN HIGH PRIORITY ACTIONS					
Number	Action	Resources Needed to Implement	Comments/Staff Recommendation for Implementation	Competing 2017 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)	Competing 2018 Workplan Items (at 0.53 FTE)
13	Adopt aquifer conservation zoning regulations and innovative permit review processes designed to protect the Island's surface and ground waters.	Unknown	Aquifer conservation zones are not considered Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas and, so, will not be addressed as part of the CAO update. However, once Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas have been designated and protective measures have been established, any perceived additional need for aquifer protections such as conservation area zoning could be addressed as part of the groundwater management plan development.	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	Routine work, possible continued work in Seabold area depending upon outcome of current study, and groundwater management plan development
14	Adopt an Island-wide Groundwater Management Plan.	\$150,000 - \$200,000 consultant costs plus 0.5 staff FTE over at least two years for groundwater management plan development.	Following the guidance laid out in <i>WAC 173-100 Groundwater Management Areas and Programs</i> , developing an area groundwater management plan is a resources-intensive effort. It is usually governed/coordinated by the Department of Ecology who designates an advisory committee of stakeholders and a lead agency to facilitate the process (could be the City, could be Department of Health or local health district). If the City designated as lead agency, would need a consultant to facilitate such as was done for the Comprehensive Plan Update. Could attempt to obtain grant-funding, but not a dependable source of funding under the current political climate. EXAMPLES: Vashon - Maury Island Ground Water Management Plan; East King County Ground Water Management Plan; Snohomish County Ground Water Management Plan; Kitsap County Ground Water Management Plan	Routine work, CARA designation - CAO update, Fletcher Bay/Sea Level Aquifer Production Test, focused study in Seabold area, support to ETAC for Appendix B review	NA
15	ETAC review of Appendix B - Existing Conditions	Unknown - depends upon ETAC's need	Complete in 2017	NA	NA

¹ *Groundwater Monitoring Program Update (Dec 2008, revised Mar 2009)*

² *Hydrogeological Assessment of Groundwater Quantity, Quality, and Production (Dec 2015)*

³ *Review Findings and Recommendations and Critical Aquifer Recharge Area Assessment (Dec 2015)*

⁴ *Bainbridge Island Groundwater Model: Aquifer System Carrying Capacity Assessment (Mar 2016)*

⁵ *Baseline Groundwater Technical Information Summary (Oct 2006)*

Overall Staff Recommendation for Future Groundwater Work/Study	
2017 - onward	Continue to implement/fund Groundwater Management Program at current level (covers routine monitoring activities and some special focused studies as needed); any significantly-sized groundwater study and/or model use would require additional dedicated funding
2017	Complete 2017 workplan items before taking on new work
2018 - 2019?	Develop Islandwide Groundwater Management Plan (recommendation 14) - Include model enhancements and utilization to quantify groundwater discharge to streams to assist water budget balance to protect instream flows either before or after (recommendations 10 and 11)
2020	Council adoption of Groundwater Management Plan - May include additional policy development/model use recommendations to answer new questions identified during plan development (such as recommendations 8 and 9) - Council schedules and budgets desired additional policy development and model use
2021-2022	Implement Council-directed additional work in conjunction with periodic model review and data assessment as run-up to comprehensive plan and critical areas ordinance updates in 2022-2024 (recommendation 12)

WATER RESOURCES

EXISTING CONDITIONS & FUTURE NEEDS

The following outlines the present conditions and understanding of the water resources of the Island and the future needs for restoration, enhancement, and protection of these resources.

Groundwater

Groundwater is the sole source of drinking water for Island residents, *farms* and industry on Bainbridge Island. It is found in underground reservoirs called *aquifers*. An *aquifer* is defined as a *permeable* sand and/or gravel formation that is capable of yielding a significant amount of water to a well. Wells on Bainbridge Island penetrate several distinct *aquifers* to allow withdrawal of drinking water by individual homeowners and municipal water purveyors. Most individual *household* wells penetrate to depths of less than 300 feet.

Some residents are still using hand-dug wells less than 40 feet deep, completed in the *permeable* sediments known as the Vashon Recessional Outwash. *Groundwater* found at this level also feeds the base flow (summer flow) for Island *streams*. High capacity wells have been drilled as deep as 1,200 feet to find adequate marketable quantities of water for public and private water purveyors. While few in number, these wells produce a large portion of the Island's potable water. The Blakely Formation, a sedimentary bedrock formation, dominates the geology on the southern end of the Island and limits *groundwater* production in this area.

Our understanding of the Island's water resources has been enhanced through historical studies such as the *City of Bainbridge Island Level II Assessment*⁴ prepared by Kato & Warren and Robinson Noble in 2000 and monitoring and assessments completed in the last ten years by the City's *Groundwater* Management Program. This work includes the development, improvement, and utilization of a *groundwater* model; the development of a well monitoring network; and the implementation of long-term monitoring.

Bainbridge Island has six principal *aquifers* (Kato & Warren and Robinson & Noble, 2000), the extents of which were refined in the *Conceptual Model and Numerical Simulation of the Groundwater-Flow System of Bainbridge Island, Washington* (USGS, 2011). The six *aquifers* delineated below reflect updated understanding based on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) model. Additional details about the *aquifers*, including detailed maps and discussion regarding the extent, thickness, and other characteristics, can be found in the USGS report.

Perched Aquifer (PA)—This *aquifer* is comprised predominantly of Vashon Advance glacial outwash (Qva). The top of the *aquifer* ranges from sea level to more than 300 feet above mean sea level [ft MSL], with a thickness of 20 to 200 feet, and is utilized predominantly by domestic wells. About 4 percent of wells are reported to be completed in this unit.

Semi-Perched Aquifer (SPA)—This semi-perched *aquifer* exists within *permeable* interbeds (QCipi) of the upper confining unit (QC1). The top of the *aquifer* ranges from sea level to more than 200 ft MSL, with a thickness of 10 to 50 feet. About 25 percent of wells are reported to be completed in this unit.

Sea Level Aquifer (SLA)—The Sea Level *aquifer* (QA1) is extensive, widely used, and mostly confined by QC1. The top of the *aquifer* ranges from -200 to 200 ft MSL, with a typical thickness of 25 to 200 feet. Fifty-three percent (53%) of wells are completed in the SLA.

Glaciomarine Aquifer (GMA)—This *aquifer* consists of water-bearing units within a thick sequence of fine-grained glaciomarine drift (QA2). The top of the *aquifer* ranges between more than -500 to -300 ft MSL, with a typical thickness of 20 to 300 feet. Several of the Bainbridge Island's production wells and at least 4 domestic wells are completed in this *aquifer*, representing about 2 percent of wells.

Fletcher Bay Aquifer (FBA)—The FBA (QA3) is the deepest identified *aquifer* on Bainbridge Island. Several large production wells are completed in this *aquifer* including the Fletcher Bay Well. The top of the *aquifer* ranges between more than -900 to slightly less than 600 ft MSL, with a typical thickness of 50 to 300 feet. While representing only about 1 percent of wells on Bainbridge Island, the metered KPUD and COBI FBA wells provide approximately 30 percent of the estimated total Island *groundwater* production.

Bedrock Aquifer—Less than 1 percent of the wells are completed in the sedimentary Blakely Harbor and Blakeley formations on the south end of Bainbridge Island.

Other wells on Bainbridge Island are either completed in water bearing zones within confining units or have an indeterminate *aquifer* completion zone.

COBI's monitoring well network is distributed across the six Bainbridge Island *aquifers* as follows: 16 in the Perched *Aquifer*, 7 in the Semi-Perched *Aquifer*, 32 in the Sea Level *Aquifer*, 5 in the Glaciomarine *Aquifer*, 9 in the Fletcher Bay *Aquifer*, and 1 in the Bedrock *Aquifer*. Aspect has updated the USGS *groundwater* model to include one new public supply well (KPUD North Bainbridge Well #10), for a total of 1,470 Group A and B public wells and exempt wells estimated to be active on Bainbridge Island.

Aquifer Concerns and Observed Conditions

There are two primary concerns in protecting an *aquifer* system. These are quality and quantity.

Water Quality

Seawater Intrusion

One of the most common *groundwater* quality concerns for Islands or other saltwater shorelines is saltwater intrusion, which is the movement of saltwater into a freshwater

aquifer. Where the source of saltwater is marine water such as Puget Sound, this process is known as seawater intrusion. Seawater intrusion occurs when the saltwater/freshwater interface moves inland from offshore. Freshwater is less dense than saltwater and so freshwater will float above saltwater. It is the pressure of the overlying freshwater that keeps the interface offshore. Excessive pumping or overuse of the overlying freshwater will pull the interface toward the shoreline and possibly inland.

Some of our *aquifers* such as the *shallow* Perched and Semi-Perched *aquifers* are, generally, not in contact with saltwater and, therefore, generally not susceptible to seawater intrusion (an exception being where these *aquifers* are present near the shoreline).

The Sea Level *Aquifer* and our deeper *aquifers* can be susceptible. How susceptible can vary from *aquifer* to *aquifer* and, even within the same *aquifer*, depending upon local conditions. In order to monitor for potential seawater intrusion, the most common practice is to measure chloride concentration and specific conductivity in *groundwater*. The City's *Groundwater* Management Program conducts annual chloride sampling in *aquifers* or wells susceptible to seawater intrusion. The established Early Warning Level, or EWL, is a chloride concentration >100 mg/L or any 4 consecutive samples showing an increasing trend. To date, no wells in the City's monitoring network (including Kitsap Public Utility District and the City's Water Utility wells) exceeded the EWL, and no trends in chloride results were noted.

Chloride concentrations typically varied between 2 mg/L and 15 mg/L. Results in 2013 and 2014 in the Fletcher Bay *Aquifer* indicate slightly elevated chloride above historic baseline concentration, but not upward trending results. However, these *should* be monitored for continued changes.

Additionally, the City's *groundwater* model was run by USGS in 2010 and updated, recalibrated and run again by Aspect Consulting in 2016 to examine the potential for seawater intrusion under different water production (e.g., growth) scenarios. Model projections indicated no seawater intrusion. It *should* be noted that the model is designed to observe regional scale conditions, but the scale is not fine enough to assess very localized conditions such as one or two wells along the shoreline. Therefore, it is important to continue to monitor in vulnerable areas to catch potentially developing local conditions.

One example is an elevated chloride level measured in one well in the Seabold area in 2006 prior to the development of the City's *Groundwater* Management Program. As there was no established program in place at the time, there was no immediate follow up sampling/study to confirm seawater intrusion rather than a source other than seawater intrusion. Other common sources of chloride in *groundwater* include connate, or very-old, *groundwater*, septic system effluent, very hard *groundwater*, windblown sea spray, and *recharge* from irrigation, agricultural practices, and well disinfection.

Chloride from any of these sources can result in elevated levels of chloride in an *aquifer*

or well. Erroneously interpreting chloride concentration data without more detailed study may result in what is called a “false positive,” where a test identifies a problem that does not, in fact, exist. That is why follow up investigation using site-specific assessments, is necessary before seawater intrusion can be confirmed. The City, the Kitsap Public Health District, and the Kitsap Public Utility District have teamed up to scope a localized, focused study in the Seabold area for potential funding in 2017.

Nitrates

According to USGS research, nitrate is the most commonly found pollutant in *groundwater* nationwide, particularly in rural areas. Nitrate levels in drinking water above EPA’s Maximum Contaminant Level (or MCL) of 10 mg/L can have serious health effects primarily for infants, but also pregnant women and individuals undergoing treatment with antioxidant medications. Nitrate converts to nitrite in the digestive tract which causes a condition called methemoglobinemia which lowers the oxygen in the blood stream. In infants this is called “Blue Baby Syndrome.” Brain damage, even death, can occur.

High nitrate levels in *groundwater* can also indicate the possibility that other contaminants may be present in the water such as bacteria or pesticides.

The typical sources of nitrate in *groundwater* include the application of fertilizers and pesticides, mostly from agricultural row crop farming, but commercial and *residential use* can be significant sources as well (such as lawns, parks, golf courses, ballfields, nurseries, and extensive gardens). Other sources include industrial processes and wastewaters, the land application of wastewater treatment plant sludge or biosolids, and on-site septic system returns.

Although the *Groundwater* Management Program does not, at present, routinely monitor nitrate in *groundwater*, the City’s consultant examined nitrate data from the Kitsap Public Health District (KPHD) as part of the 2015-2016 assessment. Nitrate data were not found to exceed EPA’s MCL of 10 mg/L. Nitrate data for Group A and B public wells and exempt wells did not indicate any trends. Data submitted to KPHD for exempt wells are typically single results and are insufficient to calculate any trends. However, the maximum result during the last 15 years (2000–2014) was 5.17 mg/L in 2007. There are no apparent trends over time or geographically across the island.

Other Water Quality Concerns

Generally, *groundwater* quality on the Island is very good. However, moderate levels of iron and manganese are naturally-occurring and common. Although neither of these minerals normally exceed EPA’s standards for drinking water, they can influence odor and taste and stain fixtures. Many *public water systems* and some private systems use filtration devices to remove or reduce these minerals.

Sole Source Aquifer Designation

In 2013, the Bainbridge Island *Aquifer* System was designated a Sole Source *Aquifer*. Sole Source *Aquifer* Designation can apply to one *aquifer* or a system of multiple *aquifers* as is the case with Bainbridge Island.

The Sole Source *Aquifer* Designation Program is an EPA program authorized under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974. Section 1424(e) defines a sole source *aquifer* as “the sole or principal drinking water source for the area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health.”

The EPA more specifically defines a sole or principal source *aquifer* as one which supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the *aquifer*, and that these areas have no alternative drinking water source(s) which could physically, legally, and economically supply all those who depend upon the *aquifer* for drinking water.

The program and designation are specifically designed to protect the quality of drinking water by helping to prevent contamination of the *aquifer* system. It provides this protection by raising the level of awareness of the vulnerability of the *aquifer* system to contamination and our dependence on the system for drinking water supply.

Further, it requires additional EPA scrutiny of federally-funded projects. EPA inspects proposed projects for potential to contaminate the underlying *aquifer*, and, where appropriate, requires modifications and mitigations to prevent contamination.

However, this additional scrutiny applies to federally-funded projects only, and some projects such as highways and agriculture may be exempt if they meet criteria laid out in pre-established memorandums of understanding between the EPA, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Agriculture, or other agencies.

Water Quantity **Water Levels**

The City's *Groundwater* Management Program currently monitors water levels in public and domestic wells Island-wide and in all six *aquifers*. Water level is an indicator for water quantity, and water level data are assessed against the program's early warning level, or EWL, for safe yield. The EWL for safe yield is a declining water level equal to or greater than ½ foot or more per year over a 10-year period that cannot be attributed to below average rainfall.

Individual well levels were reviewed for trends and compared against the EWL for safe yield. All wells were found to be below the EWL. Water levels in the *aquifers* did not indicate any *aquifer*-wide trends, and only two individual wells were noted for further review.

An exempt well (25N/02E-21P03) in the Sea Level *Aquifer* showed an apparent average decline of approximately 0.56 feet/year over the 8-year period of record.

However, further review of the water level measurement method history showed that it changed twice over the period of record from a steel tape to a sonic water level meter and, then, back to steel tape. The results collected via sonic water level meter appeared

to be inconsistent compared to the results before and after using the steel tape, a more rudimentary, but more reliable, measurement method. Therefore, the sonic level readings were removed from the analysis. Once removed, the remaining data were below the EWL. Water-use data were not available for the well. However, the well owner indicated to COBI that no known change in water use occurred over the period of record. Continued long-term monitoring of this well using the steel tape method, as planned by COBI, will determine if there is a significant trend in water level decline over time.

Group A system well 'Island Utility Well #1' (25N/02E-34F07) in the Fletcher Bay *Aquifer* has shown an average decline of approximately 0.49 feet/year from 2004-2014. Although this does not yet exceed the EWL, it is very close to approaching it. Therefore, further monitoring and assessment are warranted. The well is situated next to two other Fletcher Bay *Aquifer* production wells (Island Utility Well #2, Island Utility Well #4) within the same water system. Production data have not been available for these wells, which makes it unclear if declines are related to changes in water use over the period. This system has just transitioned to operation by KPUD in mid-2015, which is now reviewing available information to understand the current conditions within that water system.

Additional data review will continue as the system *infrastructure* is updated to see if additional water use, system loss, or some other factor contributed to the historical decline. No other Fletcher Bay *Aquifer* wells monitored exhibited a similar declining trend, so it appears that this issue is specific to this well and not an *aquifer*-wide concern.

Aquifer System Carrying Capacity

The City, as a community, has yet to fully-define or characterize a sustainable *aquifer* system. Some initial characteristics are keeping the saltwater/freshwater interface offshore and saltwater out of the freshwater supply, and maintaining a balanced water budget for the *aquifer* system in order to prevent depletion.

To help provide some baseline information about these initial characteristics and expected impacts to the system due to *climate change*, Aspect Consulting conducted a system *carrying capacity* model assessment. The *aquifer* system *carrying capacity* assessment was based on those safe-yield indicators with EWLs described above using *aquifer* water levels and chloride concentration. The on-Island *groundwater* balance for the entire *aquifer* system (water budget) was also evaluated. The *groundwater* balance components do not have EWLs, but were evaluated to provide additional context on the predicted changes in *groundwater* conditions.

Water Level Changes: The following rates of *groundwater* level change were based on comparing current and predicted *groundwater* levels in 100 years:

- The Perched *Aquifer* system showed an average 0.10 foot per year of water level decrease at 25 locations simulated across the Island;

- The Semi-Perched *Aquifer* system showed an average 0.13 foot per year of water level decrease at 12 locations simulated across the Island;
- The Sea Level *Aquifer* system showed an average 0.09 foot per year of water level decrease at 49 locations simulated across the Island;
- The Glaciomarine *Aquifer* showed an average 0.02 foot per year of water level decrease at 6 locations simulated across the Island; and
- The Fletcher Bay *Aquifer* showed an average 0.15 foot per year of water level decrease at 9 locations simulated across the Island.

The predicted *groundwater* level changes over a 100-year timeframe were less than the COBI EWLs.

Saltwater/freshwater Interface: The predictive model results indicated that, despite these slow declines, *groundwater* from the Bainbridge Island *aquifer* system flows to Puget Sound and keeps the freshwater/seawater interface at a distance from the Bainbridge Island shoreline. All wells within the Bainbridge Island shoreline maintained chloride concentrations less than 100 mg/L, and no trend in concentrations was observed based on predictive model results.

Water Budget: Though the predicted *groundwater* level declines did not appear to induce seawater intrusion, they can have impacts on other components in the system such as discharge to *streams* to help maintain summertime flows. Therefore, it is important to examine the components of the system's water budget.

Similar to a financial budget, a water budget represents a balance of inputs and outputs. If one component goes up or down, some other component(s) must go up or down to compensate. *Groundwater* balance components are typically difficult to measure directly (such as *recharge* and *groundwater* underflow). Thus, this *groundwater* balance assessment relies on modeling results without actual field measurements.

Based on the 2011 USGS Report, the relationship between *groundwater* balance inputs and outputs for the Bainbridge Island *aquifer* system is shown in the following equation:

$$R_{ppt} = W_{ppg} + D_{sw} + (GW_{ps} - GW_{kp})$$

Where:

Inputs include:

R_{ppt} is precipitation *recharge*.

Outputs include:

W_{ppg} is *groundwater* withdrawals;

D_{sw} is *groundwater* drainage to surface water (such as seeps to bluffs, creeks, *streams*, etc.); and

$(GW_{ps} - GW_{kp})$ is the net lateral *groundwater* underflow (*groundwater* flow toward Puget Sound submarine seeps (GW_{ps}) and *groundwater* flowing from the Kitsap peninsula in deeper *aquifers* (GW_{kp})).

To balance the modelled 50-percent increase in *groundwater* withdrawals and the 20-percent decrease in *recharge* due to *climate change*, the model showed projected changes in *groundwater* drainage to surface water (approximately 40-percent decrease) and lateral *groundwater* flow (approximately 24-percent decrease). Figure 6, excerpted from Aspect's technical memorandum (*Bainbridge Island Groundwater Model: Aquifer System Carrying capacity Assessment (Task 3 Scenario)*, 2016) compares the water balance components under current and projected conditions, based on model results.

The Bainbridge Island *groundwater* model results showed *aquifer* storage will be reduced by approximately 11,000 million gallons between current and projected conditions, reflecting the water level decreases described above. These *groundwater* balance results *should* be carefully interpreted, considering that the limited grid resolution may not be sufficient to accurately simulate *groundwater* discharge to surface water, and that the model has not been calibrated to observed flows.




Figure 2. Current and Projected *Groundwater* Balance Components.

As shown in Fig. 2, well pumping (also called production) is the amount of water taken out of the system through wells (water use). The 50% increase in this component represents the expected increase in water use due to population growth.

Drainage to surface water is *groundwater* contribution to surface water features such as *wetlands*, lakes, and *streams*. The 40% reduction shown here may have an impact on maintaining summer baseflows and water temperatures. It is cautioned that the model as it is currently constructed is not specifically designed to provide an estimate as to how much stream flow will be impacted, but it could be modified to answer specific questions around this topic in future model runs.

Groundwater underflow is the amount of *groundwater* that seeps or discharges into Puget

Sound at the shoreline. This value is influenced by the water levels in the *aquifers*, and the reduction shown here represents the impact from project water level decreases. The key importance to this component is that there has to be enough underflow to provide the pressure to keep the saltwater/freshwater interface offshore and prevent seawater intrusion.

Recharge is the portion of precipitation or rainfall that infiltrates the ground and reaches the *aquifer*. The estimated 20% reduction shown in the water balance accounts for *climate change* impacts.

The amount of *groundwater* underflow and discharge to *streams* is driven by the geological makeup of the *aquifer* system. Therefore, we have no direct ability to control these budget components. Rather it is the components of well pumping and *recharge* that we have more ability to directly control. We can reduce well pumping by reducing our water use through aggressive water conservation measures.

Though we cannot control precipitation patterns, we can take measures to enhance *recharge* through creative water capture and return measures (from the rain barrel scale to large scale *infrastructure*) and through protective *land use* measures such as *low impact development* and protection of *aquifer recharge areas* and other *aquifer* conservation areas.

Aquifer Recharge Areas

Understanding the Island's *aquifer recharge* system is important for both *groundwater* quantity and quality. The identification and protection of high *aquifer recharge areas* is important both from the standpoint of *groundwater* quantity and quality. *Aquifer recharge areas* have geologic and soil conditions which allow high rates of surface water infiltration, which also means they are particularly susceptible to contamination. Increasing *impervious surfaces* through development reduces the amount of *recharge* available to the Island's *aquifers*. At the same time, *runoff* from *impervious surfaces* in developed areas contains increased contaminants. Efforts to protect and preserve the Island's natural water supply are warranted, as the resources that would be required to clean up after contamination or to secure a new source would be prohibitive.


Where development overlays *aquifer recharge areas*, special considerations need to be made to preserve the volume of *recharge* available to the *aquifer* and to protect the *groundwater* from contaminants such as nitrates, biocides and heavy metals found in septic systems and *stormwater runoff*. The most extensively used *aquifer* underlies 85% of the Island and occurs under all zoning classifications.

To help the City assess *recharge* areas for special protection or designation, the model was run to determine *recharge* areas on the Island.

The Bainbridge Island model results indicate that areas across much of the Bainbridge Island area may have a critical recharging effect on *aquifers* that are sources of drinking

Wells in *shallow aquifers* (including the *Sea Level Aquifer* and above) may withdraw water that originates as *recharge* relatively close to the well head and is younger than 100 years old. See figure below which shows the *recharge* areas for *shallow aquifers* (green squares).

Fig. 3 – Aquifer System Recharge



Not all *groundwater* on Bainbridge Island comes from *recharge* on Bainbridge Island. Model results indicate several wells tapping the deeper *aquifers* withdraw water that

originates as *recharge* from areas on the Kitsap Peninsula and is greater than 1,000 years old. Wells in deep *aquifers* (including the Glacio-Marine *Aquifer* and the Fletcher Bay *Aquifer*) may withdraw water that originates as *recharge* relatively distant from the wellhead and is greater than 100 years old. See Figure 3 above that shows the *recharge* areas for deep *aquifers* (cross-hatched area).

Wells in bedrock were not simulated in the Bainbridge Island model as the method of water particle tracking was not appropriate for fractured bedrock. However, the bedrock is also considered a critical aquifer recharge area (CARA), because water supply wells have been installed at various depths in bedrock, and potable water supply is from *recharge*. Bedrock *recharge* area is shown as hatched area.

Surface Water


The surface waters of Bainbridge Island provide aesthetic, recreational, economic, and ecological benefits to Island citizens. Boating, fishing, and shellfish harvest are important recreational and economic activities, and the Island's *streams*, lake, harbors, shorelines, and *wetlands* provide habitat for a diversity of fish and wildlife species.

The harbors and numerous coves around the Island host anchorage, moorage, marinas, boat launches, waterfront access, and swimming beaches. Eagle Harbor, specifically, hosts marinas which provide permanent moorage for live-aboards and an open water mooring and anchoring area for the Island's live-aboard community.

In addition to providing forage and habitat for salmon, otter, sea lions, and waterfowl and swimming, boating, and fishing areas for people, the majority of the Island's shorelines and adjacent nearshore areas are designated commercial shellfish growing and harvest areas. Many shoreline residents recreationally harvest shellfish such as clam and geoduck as well. The Shoreline Master Plan also regulates aquaculture activities.

Surface water flows from high geographic points to lower elevations, collecting in *streams* and *wetland* systems within the *watersheds* of the Island. *Watershed* boundaries are determined by Island topography where ridgelines define the boundaries.

Fig. 4 – Watershed and Stream names



Bainbridge Island contains twelve distinct *watersheds* with 59 seasonal and perennial *streams* that contribute fresh water to Puget Sound (see Figure 4 excerpted from the Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Program Final Monitoring Plan, 2008). Five harbors, twelve estuarine *wetlands*, one lake, 1,242 acres of *wetland*, 965 acres of tidelands (between mean high and mean low tide), and 53 miles of shoreline comprise the remainder of the surface water system.

Each surface water feature serves a critical function in preserving hydrologic connectivity within the *watershed*. Recent research is finding that even those features that are seasonal such as ephemeral or intermittent *streams* and seasonally-flooded *wetlands* are critical faunal and floral habitat providers, biogeochemical processors, and connectivity corridors.

Stormwater

Stormwater is generated when the ground becomes saturated and rainwater drains overland to the nearest surface water body or rainfall encounters hard or *impervious surfaces* and drains into manmade drainage ditches, catch basins, and pipes.

There is no question that *stormwater runoff* is the leading transport pathway of pollution into Puget Sound and its associated *wetlands*, creeks, *streams* and rivers. Not only does it carry pollutants such as trash, gas, oil, and metal-laden sediment from road surfaces and parking lots; pesticides, fertilizers, and other chemicals used in lawn care, pet waste, and animal waste in agricultural areas, but the volume of *stormwater* generated by *impervious surfaces* has tremendous force and can cause erosion and damage to in-stream and *wetland* habitat.

Peak flows that follow immediately after a storm can be much greater than existed when the land was in a natural state with vegetative cover, causing *streams* to expand and overflow and creating flooding conditions on adjacent lands.

Therefore, *stormwater* has long been considered, at best, a nuisance and flooding hazard to be collected and delivered downstream as quickly and efficiently as possible and, at worst, a waste stream to be collected and removed from the *watershed*. Existing land development methods and *stormwater* drainage system *infrastructure* are designed to do just that.

However, as early as the year 2000, water-starved areas of the country started to view *stormwater* as a vital resource rather than a waste stream, first by limiting its generation by reducing *impervious surface*; then, retaining and infiltrating it on site where feasible; and, lastly, protecting it from pollution, capturing it, and reusing it to the maximum extent possible. On June 16, 2015, the California State Water Resources Control Board adopted an order that provides a framework to promote integrated *stormwater* capture and reuse to improve water quality, protect local beaches, and supplement water supplies. The new [*stormwater* discharge] permit focuses on using *stormwater* as a resource and encourages

green infrastructure and groundwater recharge (Stormwater Report, Water Environment Federation, June 2015).

The Pacific Northwest is not considered water-starved and local conditions are not nearly so dire as in California. However, *climate change* predictions suggest that local water supplies likely will see some reduction in *recharge*. Rainfall patterns will further tax existing ailing, and undersized drainage *infrastructure* and possibly diminish summertime stream flows and water quality, and warming temperatures will increase summertime stream temperatures. Therefore, local municipalities are, also, rethinking their view of *stormwater* and many have already started evaluating and planning for *climate change*, especially in *stormwater* drainage system maintenance and retrofit. In 2009, Kitsap County adopted resolution 109-2009, *Creating Kitsap County “Water as a Resource” Policy*, in which the county resolved to treat all of its waters, including *stormwater*, as a vital resource, incorporating *low impact development* and water capture and reuse into all of its *land use* and utility management planning.

Observed Surface and Stormwater Conditions

Department of Ecology Surface Water Quality Assessment

Every two years the State Department of Ecology (Ecology) identifies polluted water bodies and submits a list of impaired water bodies, called a 303(d) list, to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for approval in accordance with the federal Clean Water Act. This assessment is based on the assumption that each water body *should* support certain designated uses. Some of these uses are swimming and boating, fish and shellfish rearing and harvest, and wildlife habitat.

Ecology designates water bodies that frequently or consistently fail to meet standards or criteria as *Impaired*. Water bodies that only infrequently fail to meet standards are classified as *Waters of Concern* or *Sediments of Concern* if the sampled matrix was sediment. These assessments use water, fish/shellfish tissue, habitat, and sediment data.

Ecology’s [2012 Water Quality Assessment](#) determined that one stream, one harbor, two coves, one lagoon, and three Island-adjacent nearshore marine areas on Bainbridge Island were *Impaired* by one or more pollutants and were not able to provide the full recreational, habitat, and aesthetic benefits they once offered. An additional one bay, one harbor, and 28 other Island-adjacent nearshore marine areas were identified as *Waters of Concern* and/or *Sediments of Concern* for periodic excursions beyond the allowable standard or criteria for one or more pollutants.

Ecology’s proposed [2014 Water Quality Assessment](#) (under review by the EPA at the time of this printing), designated an additional two *streams* as *Impaired* by at least one pollutant. Tables 2-5 on the following pages detail those water bodies classified as

Impaired or of Concern according to the analyzed matrix (water, tissue, habitat, and sediment, respectively).

It *should* be noted that much of the sediment data were collected prior to 2003, some as early as the 1990's. These may not be representative of current conditions. Further, many of the identified pollutants are legacy pollutants resulting from historic *land use* such as large-scale, row-crop *farming* and the active lumber industry at the turn of twentieth century. The City's sediment sampling data collected in 2008 and 2013 may be more representative of current inputs to these water bodies. These data are summarized in the next section, *City Surface Water Quality Assessment*.

One example of legacy pollution is the former [Wyckoff Creosote Facility](#) located at the mouth of Eagle Harbor. Sites where sediments are contaminated by hazardous waste are regulated and managed through the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). Sites such as the former Wyckoff Creosote Facility, due to the complexity and size, are normally addressed through [EPA's Superfund program](#).

However, water bodies listed on the 303(d) list require TMDLs (Total Maximum Daily Loads) where identified sources of the pollutant of concern are allocated a pollutant load reduction in order for that water body to meet criteria. Currently, the City is a stakeholder in the [Sinclair and Dyes Inlets Fecal Coliform Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load \(TMDL\)](#). Four of the Island's *watersheds* are captured within the TMDL drainage basin boundaries (Fletcher Bay, Gazzam Lake, Pleasant Beach, and South Beach *Watersheds*).

Fig. 5 – Four tables from the Ecology Approved 2012 Water Quality Assessment

Table 2. Ecology Approved 2012 and Proposed 2014 Water Quality Assessment - Water

Waterbody	Parameter or Pollutant	2012	2014 (Proposed)
Eagle Harbor (Middle)	Bacteria	Impaired	Impaired
	Copper	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Eagle Harbor (Inner)	Dissolved Oxygen	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
	Temperature		
Agate Passage - Bridge	Dissolved Oxygen	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Agate Passage - Agate Point	Dissolved Oxygen	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
	Temperature		
Rich Passage - Pleasant Beach Cove/Pleasant Beach	Bacteria	Impaired	Impaired
	Dissolved Oxygen		
	pH	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Rich Passage - Point White	Dissolved Oxygen	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Rich Passage - Fort Ward	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
	Dissolved Oxygen		
	pH		
Port Orchard Passage - Lower Crystal Springs	Dissolved Oxygen	Impaired	Impaired
	Bacteria		
	Temperature	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Port Orchard Passage - Upper Crystal Springs	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Port Orchard Passage - Fletcher Bay	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Port Orchard Passage - Battle Point	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Port Orchard Passage - South of Rolston	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Puget Sound (Central) - Blakely Harbor (Mouth)	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Puget Sound (Central) - Blakely Harbor (Middle)	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Puget Sound (Central) - Blakely Harbor (Inner)	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Puget Sound (Central) - Murden Cove	Bacteria	Impaired	Impaired
Puget Sound (Central) - Rolling Bay	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Port Madison Bay - Point Monroe	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Port Madison Bay - Mouth	Bacteria	Waters of Concern	Waters of Concern
Springbrook Creek	Bacteria	Impaired	Impaired
Ravine Creek	Bacteria	---	Impaired
Murden Creek	Bacteria	---	Impaired

Table 3. Ecology Approved 2012 and Proposed 2014 Water Quality Assessment - Tissue

Waterbody	Parameter or Pollutant	2012	2014 (Proposed)
Eagle Harbor (Outer)	Benzo(a)pyrene	Impaired	Impaired
	Benzo(a)anthracene		
	Benzo[b]fluoranthene		
	Benzo[k]fluoranthene		
	Chrysene		
	Dibenzo[a,h]anthracene		
	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene		
Puget Sound (Central) - Rockaway	PCB	Impaired	Impaired
	Chrysene		

Table 4. Ecology Approved 2012 and Proposed 2014 Water Quality Assessment - Habitat

Waterbody	Parameter or Pollutant	2012	2014 (Proposed)
Puget Sound (Central) - Murden Cove	Habitat	Impaired	Impaired
Port Madison - Point Monroe Lagoon	Habitat	Impaired	Impaired

Table 5. Ecology Approved 2012 and Proposed 2014 Water Quality Assessment - Sediment

Waterbody	Parameter or Pollutant	2012	2014 (Proposed)
Eagle Harbor (Outer)	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	Impaired	Impaired
	1,2-Dichlorobenzene		
	1,4-Dichlorobenzene		
	2,4-Dimethylphenol		
	2-Methylnaphthalene		
	2-Methylphenol		
	4-Methylphenol		
	Acenaphthene		
	Acenaphthylene		
	Anthracene		
	Arsenic		
	Benzo(a)anthracene		
	Benzo(a)pyrene		
	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene		
	Benzo(a,b)fluoranthene (b+k+j), Total		
	Benzoic Acid		
	Benzyl Alcohol		
	Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate		
	Bioassay		
	Butyl Benzl Phthalate		
	Cadmium		
	Chromium		
	Chrysene		
	Copper		
	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene		
	Dibenzofuran		
	Diethyl Phthalate		
	Dimethyl Phthalate		
	Di-n-butyl Phthalate		
	Di-n-octyl Phthalate		
	Fluoranthene		
	Fluorene		
	Hexachlorobenzene		
	Hexachlorobutadiene		
	HPAH		
	Indeno(1,2,3-c,d) Pyrene		
	Lead		
	LPAH		
	Mercury		
	Naphthalene		
	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine		
	PCB		
	Pentachlorophenol		
	Phenanthrene		
	Phenol		
	Pyrene		
	Silver		
	Zinc		
Rich Passage - Pleasant Beach	Benzoic Acid	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
Rich Passage - Pleasant Beach Cove	Benzoic Acid	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
Port Orchard Passage - Upper Crystal Springs	Benzoic Acid	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
Port Orchard Passage - South of Rolston	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
	1,2-Dichlorobenzene		
	Benzyl Alcohol		
Port Orchard Passage - Manzanita Bay	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
	1,2-Dichlorobenzene		
Puget Sound (Central) - Wing Point	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene		
	1,4-Dichlorobenzene		
	2,4-Dimethylphenol		
	Hexachlorobenzene		
	Pentachlorophenol		
Puget Sound (Central) - Rockaway	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene		
	1,4-Dichlorobenzene		
	2,4-Dimethylphenol		
	Hexachlorobenzene		
	Hexachlorobutadiene		
	Naphthalene		
	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine		
Puget Sound (Central) - Blakely Harbor (Middle)	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	Sediments of Concern	Sediments of Concern
	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene		
	1,4-Dichlorobenzene		
	2,4-Dimethylphenol		
	Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene		
	Hexachlorobenzene		
	Hexachlorobutadiene		
	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine		
	Pentachlorophenol		

Commercial Shellfish Growing Area and Recreational Harvest Area Assessment

Department of Health (DOH) [routine bacterial and biotoxin assessments](#) of recreational shellfish harvest areas and commercial shellfish growing and harvest areas demonstrate a significant loss of designated uses. The entire east, north, and west shorelines are closed to recreational butter and varnish clam harvest, and the southern shoreline is closed to recreational varnish clam harvest. Only one small area around Point White is open to recreational harvest.

Most commercial shellfish growing area around the Island is open to harvest. However, two segments of commercial shellfish growing areas along Agate Passage and Crystal Springs are currently closed due to bacterial contamination in shoreline drainages to include private drains, *stormwater* outfalls, and *streams*. Point Monroe Lagoon is restricted for commercial harvest, requiring that shellfish be transplanted to approved growing area waters for a specified amount of time in order to naturally cleanse themselves of contaminants before they are harvested for market. Commercial Geoduck Tract 07850 at Restoration Point was closed four times in 2012-2013 for biotoxin. Commercial Geoduck Tract 07000 at the mouth of Manzanita Bay has been closed 14 times in the last five years for biotoxin, and is currently closed at the time of this printing.

In addition to annual commercial growing area reports, DOH publishes an annual threatened areas report to bring attention to monitoring sites where bacteria concentrations are close to exceeding the criteria. The [2015 report](#) (based upon 2014 data) identified one monitoring site (#457) immediate outside of the north side of the mouth of Fletcher Bay as a threatened site and one site (#418) along the southern shore of Blakely Harbor as a site of concern.

Swimming Beach Assessment

The Departments of Ecology and Health's BEACH Program conducts [swimming beach monitoring](#) for bacteria during the swimming season (Memorial Day through Labor Day). Typically, bacteria levels in marine waters tend to be fairly low in the summertime. In fact, most beach closures on the Island have been associated with *sanitary sewer* spills such as the Kitsap Sewer District #7 Fort Ward spill in 2012, and the City's sewer main breaks along the north side of Eagle Harbor in 2014.

In 2015, three of the Island's swimming beaches (Fay Bainbridge Park, Joel Pritchard Park, and Eagle Harbor Waterfront Park) were monitored. Bacterial concentrations in 2015 were acceptable, and there were no beach closures in 2015.

City Surface Water Quality Assessment

In 2007, the City received a Centennial Clean Water Fund Grant from Ecology to design and implement a long-term monitoring program to assess the ecological

health of the Island's freshwater (*streams* and lakes), marine water (harbors, bays, and nearshore areas), and *stormwater* discharge.

The Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Program (WQFMP) was pilot-tested in 2007-2008 and expanded to Island wide long-term status and trends monitoring in 2010. The program currently conducts routine monitoring for stream and *stormwater* chemistry, stream and nearshore sediment chemistry, rainfall, stream and *stormwater* flow, and stream biodiversity (benthic macroinvertebrates). Every five years, the program also conducts targeted storm event monitoring to assess *stormwater runoff* impacts in *streams* and nearshore marine waters.

Although the program's [Final Monitoring Plan](#) is comprehensive, staffing and funding are limited. Current monitoring gaps are *stormwater* best management practice effectiveness monitoring, lake monitoring, marine biological assessments (fish, aquatic macrophytes, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates), routine marine water chemistry, and freshwater and marine habitat assessments.

The program released its first edition [State of the Island's Waters](#) report in 2012 which summarized findings from data collected through Water Year 2011 (September 2011). Program staff are currently assessing data collected through Water Year 2015 (September 2015) and working on a second edition of the report. The following summary reflects assessments completed at the time of this printing.

Bacteria

All of the seven nearshore marine waters monitored during WY2014 targeted storm event monitoring failed to meet the state criteria for fecal coliform bacteria, while 13 (86%) of the 15 *streams* monitored on a monthly basis failed to meet the state criteria in WY2015. Given these results and the number of state listings for bacterial impairment (see Figure 5, Table 2 above), bacteria has proven to be the most prevalent pollutant in freshwater and marine water resources Island wide.

As described above in *Commercial Shellfish Growing Area and Recreational Shellfish Harvest Area Assessment*, commercial shellfish harvest areas along approximately twelve miles of shoreline are currently closed due to elevated bacteria in shoreline drainages, and nearly the entire Island is closed to recreational harvest of varnish and butter clams due to the biotoxins usually associated with bacteria.

Bacterial contamination is common to every season and every *watershed*, urban or rural, and its sources are as varied as the landscape itself. In rural *watersheds*, the most common sources of bacteria are failing septic systems, improperly-managed pet and livestock wastes, and wildlife. In urban *watersheds*, the most common sources are improperly-managed pet waste, improper food handling, poorly-maintained food waste receptacles, failing septic systems, poorly-maintained or failing *stormwater* drainage

infrastructure (private and public), failing *sanitary sewer infrastructure*, and illicit cross-connections between the *sanitary sewer* and the *stormwater* drainage systems.

In marine environments, common sources of bacteria aside from discharges from upland sources are improper boat waste disposal, failing *sanitary sewer infrastructure*, and wildlife.

Nutrients

Although they are essential to all plant, human, and aquatic life, phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations, if excessive, can overstimulate growth of aquatic vegetation and algal blooms. Applying Ecology's Water Quality Index using the ratio of total nitrogen to total phosphorus, Island *streams* generally rate of low to moderate concern during the wet season and moderate to high concern during the dry season relative to other Puget Lowland *streams*. In 2013, a year of below average rainfall, most *streams* rated of moderate concern even in the wet season, and 3 *streams* reached a high level of concern. During the extreme dry period in the summer of 2015, 7 *streams* climbed to a level of high concern.

Nuisance algal blooms have increased along eastern shorelines and harbors (see Ecology's [Eyes Over Puget Sound](#)). These blooms are not only aesthetically unpleasant, but dying and decomposing algae use up aquatic life-sustaining oxygen and render aquatic habitat unusable such as in Murden Cove and Point Monroe Lagoon which are covered year-round with ulvoid macroalgae (see Figure 5, Table 4 above).

Though more study is needed to establish natural background levels for Island *streams* and it is well-understood that a significant amount of nitrogen-loading in Puget Sound comes from the ocean through the Strait of Juan de Fuca via tidal action, ecosystems with naturally high background levels are particularly sensitive to any additional loading from human sources.

Aside from the natural sources of nutrients from forests and *wetlands*, human inputs include agricultural and residential fertilizers, phosphate-based laundry detergents and commercial washing agents, yard waste such as grass clippings and other vegetation dumped along shorelines and *streams*, failing residential septic systems (in some cases even functioning systems), failing municipal sewer *infrastructure*, and improperly handled pet and livestock waste.

Ammonia

Ammonia is considered a priority pollutant by the EPA, since it is toxic to both humans and aquatic life. Therefore, there are established acute and chronic criteria for ammonia in surface waters. Acute criterion is the concentration of a substance at which injury or death to an organism can occur as a result of short-term exposure. Chronic criterion is

the concentration of a substance at which injury or death to an organism can occur as a result of repeated or constant exposure.

Out of the 11 fish-bearing *streams* monitored on a routine basis, 8 (73%) consistently exceeded the chronic criteria, while the remaining 3 had seasonal exceedances only. During WY2014 targeted storm event monitoring, all 7 *streams* and corresponding nearshore areas monitored exceeded the chronic criteria. Murden Cove frequently exceeded the acute criteria. The cove exceeded acute criteria 14 times during the 3-year Murden Cove *Watershed* Nutrient and Bacteria Reduction Project (2013-2015).

Sediment and Metals

During rain events, sediment-laden *stormwater runoff* is a prominent pollutant on the Island. Not only does sediment cause excessive scouring and erosion, de-stabilizing *slopes* and stream banks and threatening property, but subsequent downstream deposition clogs stream bottoms, smothers fish eggs, and increases siltation rates in the Island's harbors and bays. Sediment also reduces fish's ability to find food and damages their gills as well.

Though ambient or background levels of suspended sediment in *streams* and nearshore areas are generally quite low, monitoring results show significant increases in suspended sediment in *streams*, nearshore marine waters, and *stormwater* outfall discharge during intense rain events.

Sediment-intolerant macroinvertebrate species (an important food source for fish) have diminished, some entirely, from half of the Island *streams* monitored, especially Ravine and Murden Creeks. In a recent King County assessment of the City's stream macroinvertebrate sampling data, it was observed that all of the City's sites typically had lower Fine Sediment Sensitivity Index scores than unimpacted reference sites, indicating that fine sediment may be a source of impairment to stream biological health.

Grain size analysis of stream substrate sampled in 2008 and 2013 demonstrates a significant shift in grain size in three streams. Ravine Creek's stream bottom shifted from 41.53% gravel, 56.79% sand, and 1.66% silt and clay in 2008 to 9.62% gravel, 85.34% sand, and 6.42% silt and clay in 2013. Schel Chelb Creek's stream bottom shifted from 82.66% gravel, 16.6% sand, and 0.29% silt and clay to 11.59% gravel, 82.94% sand, and 5.47% silt and clay. Only Springbrook Creek substrate showed a "coarsening" shift from 30.26% gravel, 65.66% sand, and 4.08% silt and clay to 40.7% gravel, 57.09% sand, and 2.21% silt and clay.

Equally concerning are the pollutants that sediment carries with it such as heavy metals. In King County's stream macroinvertebrate assessment, it was observed that Ravine Creek had the highest Metals Tolerance Index score, indicating that metal pollution may be a source of impairment to stream biological health in that stream.

Ambient heavy metal concentrations generally meet criteria. However, targeted storm event sampling in 2014 and 2015 revealed elevated metals concentrations in stormwater runoff and exceedances in some streams and nearshore areas during heavy rain events. Stormwater, Springbrook Creek, and Issei Creek all exceeded acute aluminum criteria. Stormwater also exceeded acute criteria for zinc and chronic criteria for copper. Ravine Creek, Manzanita Creek, Springbrook Creek, and Issei Creek exceeded the chronic criteria for copper, and Springbrook Creek, Ravine Creek and Schel Chelb Creek exceeded chronic criteria for lead. More concerning, Schel Chelb Creek exceeded acute criteria for zinc and cadmium.

Out of the seven harbors and bays sampled, only Eagle Harbor nearshore areas near the mouth of Ravine Creek/WSDOT Ferry Maintenance Facility and stormwater exceeded the chronic criteria, and for copper only.

Anywhere soil is exposed to rain there is a risk of sediment-laden *runoff*. Construction sites, croplands, sand and gravel pits or accumulations, and any other cleared or grubbed land surfaces are all potential sources of sediment. Likewise, poorly-maintained parking lots, *stormwater* drainage systems, and roadways become significant sources of sediment, particularly sediment laden with heavy metals. Metals are also carried to *streams* from uncontrolled discharges from auto washing washwater and industrial discharges.

Climate change may lead to an increase in landslide risk, erosion and sediment transport in the fall, winter, and spring seasons, while reducing the rates of these processes in the summer. Quantitative projections are limited, because of the challenge in distinguishing *climate change* impacts from factors such as development patterns and forest management.

Sediments that line the bottoms of water bodies are considered the long-term “record-keepers” of pollutants that move through the water body as many of the pollutants settle to the bottom and remain in the sediment for some time. Stream and marine nearshore bottom sediments collected in 2008 and 2013 were analyzed for contaminant chemistry to include gasoline, diesel, semivolatiles, polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and metals. None of the detected contaminants that have state or federally-established criteria exceeded marine or freshwater sediment criteria.

Relatively few contaminants were detected in stream sediments. The most common were diesel range organics (specifically motor oil or lube oil) and Butyl Benzyl Phthalate. Motor oil or lube oil was detected in all 6 streams monitored in 2008 and 6 of the 9 streams monitored in 2013. Sediments from one stream (Murden Creek) contained gasoline range organics as well, though at very low levels.

Butyl Benzyl Phthalate (BBzP) is mostly used as a plasticizer for polyvinylchloride (PVC). However, it is commonly used as a plasticizer for vinyl foams, which are often used as floor tiles, and other uses such as traffic cones, food conveyor belts, and artificial leather. BBzP was not detected in any of the stream sediments analyzed in 2008, but appeared as new detections in 8 of the 9 streams monitored in 2013 though at very low levels.

Additional contaminants were detected in two streams. In 2008 4-Methylphenol (antimicrobial agent) was detected in Schel Chelb Creek sediments, but at a level barely above detection limits. It was not detected in the 2013 sample. Dibutyl Phthalate was detected in the 2013 sample, but, again, barely above the detection limit.

Though not detected in the 2008 sample, Ravine Creek's 2013 sediment sample contained low levels of PAHs (Benzo(a)anthracene, Chrysene, Fluoranthene, Phenanthrene, and Pyrene) and Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate. PAH's come from burning carbon-containing compounds. PAHs in air are produced by burning wood and fuel for homes. They are also contained in gasoline and diesel exhaust, soot, coke, and cigar and cigarette smoke. Foods that contain small amounts of PAHs include smoked, barbecued, or charcoal-broiled foods, roasted coffees, and sausages.

Due to its suitable properties and the low cost, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate (DEHP) is widely used as a plasticizer in manufacturing of articles made of PVC, particularly in medical supplies. Plastics may contain 1% to 40% DEHP. It is also used as a hydraulic fluid and as a dielectric fluid in capacitors. DEHP is also used as a solvent in glowsticks.

Significantly more contaminants were detected in marine nearshore sediments, especially PAH's. Eagle Harbor, Blakely Harbor, and Murden Cove had the highest number of detections, while Manzanita Bay, Fletcher Bay, Hidden Cove, and Pleasant Beach Cove had fewer detections. However, nearly all of the detected PAH's decreased in concentration or fell below detection limits between 2008 and 2013 in all of the nearshore areas sampled.

Similar to stream sediments, motor oil or lube oil was detected in all of the nearshore areas sampled. Additionally, gasoline range hydrocarbons were detected in the nearshore area adjacent to the monitored stormwater outfall (OFL169), though barely above the detection limit.

Also similar to stream sediments, plasticizers DEHP and/or BBzP were newly detected or detected at increasing concentrations in all 9 nearshore areas sampled in 2013.

Although none of the contaminants exceeded sediment criteria where such criteria exists, it is prudent to continue to monitor over time for either new occurrences of a contaminant or an increase in a contaminant level, indicating potential developing or ongoing contaminant input.

In-situ Physical Chemistry

Several Island *streams* and nearshore areas experience periodic excursions in pH, temperature, and dissolved oxygen. Excursions in pH are fairly rare. However, Hawley (East and West Forks), Murden, Schel Chelb, Manzanita, Springbrook, Issei, and Mac's Dam Creeks and Murden Cove suffer chronically low levels of dissolved oxygen. While most only exceed standards in the summertime, Murden and Schel Chelb Creeks exceed standards year-round.

Several *streams* that had historically maintained acceptable water temperatures year-round, have started to exceed temperature criteria during the summertime since 2012 with excursions occurring more frequently over time. These *streams* are Hawley (East and West Forks) Springbrook, Schel Chelb, Linquist, Gazzam Lake, and Mac's Dam Creeks. Two nearshore areas (Eagle Harbor at Ravine Creek and Murden Cove) frequently exceed temperature criteria as well.

Continuous temperature and dissolved oxygen sensors were deployed in three separate reaches of Murden Creek as part of the 2013-2015 Murden Cove *Watershed* Nutrient and Bacteria Reduction Project. Summertime daily maximum temperatures at all three locations exceeded the criteria with temperatures increasing and exceeding criteria more often in the downstream reach. Similarly, summertime daily minimum dissolved oxygen levels exceeded criteria at all three sites. However, upstream reaches only infrequently exceeded criteria during the summertime, while oxygen levels were significantly lower in the downstream reach and exceeded criteria year-round.

Despite observed improvements in some water quality parameters such as phosphorus and bacteria over the project period, in-stream chemistry stayed the same or worsened. This indicates that the impact is most likely habitat driven (lack of canopy cover, reduced or absent buffers, lower summertime stream flows) rather than an illicit discharge of polluted water.

These excursions in physical chemistry, especially temperature and dissolved oxygen, significantly impair these waters' ability to support aquatic life.

Flow and Land Use Impacts on the Biological Community

Hydrology is perhaps the most fundamental driver of physical, chemical, and biological processes in streams and is often considered a "master variable" controlling geomorphology, substrate stability, faunal and floral habitat suitability, thermal regulation, metabolism, biogeochemical cycling, and the downstream flux of energy, matter, and biota [Power et al. 1988; Resh et al. 1988; Poff and Ward 1989; Poff 1996; Poff et al. 1997; Dodds et al. 2004] (McDonough, Hosen and Palmer, 2011).

In 2015, the City contracted with King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Water and Land Resources Division to conduct a stream benthos and hydrologic

evaluation of the City's stream benthic macroinvertebrate data and continuous flow gauging data.

Flow data analysis showed that stream flows increase more quickly following rain events and generally have higher peaks than would be expected under forested conditions. These results were generally consistent with increasing levels of urbanization upstream of each gauge and consistent with other data collected in other Puget Sound *watersheds*.

The average Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI) scores spanning all years of data were very poor for Ravine Creek; poor for Issei, Murden, and Whiskey Creeks; and fair for Cooper, Manzanita, Springbrook, and Woodward Creeks. None of the eight sites investigated had average scores that showed good or excellent stream benthic communities, although two sites (Cooper and Springbrook) did have individual sampling years that had good scores. Again, these data were generally consistent with the level of development in the study *watersheds* and with data collected in other Puget Sound *watersheds*.

Five statistically significant upward or downward B-IBI component metric trends were identified at four creek sites. Two Murden Creek site metrics showed a worsening trend in species diversity and percentage of pollution tolerant species versus intolerant species. Manzanita Creek showed an improving trend in species richness and both Cooper and Issei Creek showed an improving trend in percentage of pollution intolerant species versus tolerant species.

King County also examined three additional benthic macroinvertebrate diagnostic metrics for organic pollution (i.e., animal waste including human waste), fine sediment, and metals. The Fine Sediment Sensitivity Index was generally lower at all Bainbridge sites relative to reference sites, suggesting that fine sediment inputs may be a factor in benthic impairment in these *streams*. If confirmed through evaluation of sediment conditions at these sites, the cause is unlikely related exclusively to development as some of the stream basins are relatively undeveloped. It is possible that at least in some instances, past *land use* (e.g., historical logging and *farming* activities) is a factor in causing excess sediment to be (or to have been) delivered to these *streams*. Any development within these basins may also be a contributing factor as well; potentially delivering fine sediment through construction and land clearing activities and through stream bank erosion resulting from increased peak flows.

All three diagnostic metrics and the flashiness hydrologic metrics indicate that Ravine Creek is suffering from multiple stressors that potentially include organic and metal pollution, geomorphic alteration, and flashier flows, all typical of an urban stream. There was only one statistically significant upward or downward trend in these three additional metrics – an improving trend in metals-intolerant species in Issei Creek.

Habitat

As stated above in *City Surface Water Quality Assessment*, limited resources prevent the City's monitoring program from actively monitoring for freshwater and marine water habitat assessment aside from limited sediment sampling in select stream and adjacent nearshore areas (addressed above in Sediment and Metals section). Most of what we know about our nearshore marine and freshwater habitat is based upon work by non-profit entities such as the Bainbridge Island Land Trust, the Puget Sound Restoration Fund and the Bainbridge Island *Watershed* Council and outside agencies such as Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Ecology, Wild Fish Conservancy, and the Suquamish Tribe. Limited *land use/land cover* information is available through aerial photography and light detection and radar (*LIDAR*) technology, as well.

Land cover

Bainbridge Island encompasses an area of 17,471 acres, or approximately 28 square miles. The primary land cover is tree-cover at 73%, or 12,760 acres. Grass/scrub lands, developed areas with *impervious surfaces* and other coverages comprise 15%, 11% and 1%, respectively, with combined coverage of 4,712 acres (Table 1 next page).

Land use type does not vary widely by any great degree across the island due to a low percentage of industrial or commercial land development and the lack of available or developed *farm/range* land. The island's *land use* is consequently dominated by *residential uses* (75%). Other *land uses* such as recreation land (7%), agricultural (6%), transportation corridors (6%), commercial/light manufacturing (2%), *forest land-use* (2%) and public facilities (2%), make up the remainder of the *land use* as a percentage of the total acreage on the island. With a total overall population of 23,630 the greatest population *density* occurs at Winslow, Island Center, Lynwood Center and around the coastline of the island. Outside of urbanized areas, the Island is generally characterized by scattered, small communities, homes on acreage, and large parcels of undeveloped land.

Stream type

In 2014, the Wild Fish Conservancy (WFC) completed stream typing for Bainbridge Island as part of the [West Sound Watersheds, Kitsap Peninsula \(WRIA 15\) Stream Typing Project](#).

WFC's website states, "Water typing is the state-sanctioned process of mapping the distribution of fish and fish habitat. Regulatory water type maps are used to regulate *land use* decisions adjacent to *streams*, ponds, and *wetlands*. Because existing (modeled) regulatory maps often significantly misrepresent the presence, location, and extent of fish habitat, the effectiveness of state and local government fish habitat protection regulations is compromised. More information about the water typing process and its significance is available at: <http://wildfishconservancy.org/resources/maps/what-is-water-typing>."

WFC classified fish and fish habitat in Island *streams* and ground-truthed regulatory maps of stream presence and location, identifying an additional 25 previously unknown/unmapped miles of stream with 698 acres of previously unprotected habitat buffer on Bainbridge Island. The City is currently using WFC's updated stream data.

Figure 6. City of Bainbridge Island Watershed Land Cover Statistics

Watershed Name /Code	Watershed Area (Acres)	Watershed Size Ranking	Breakdown of Total Watershed Landcover (% of Total Area)								
			Forest	Wetlands	Natural	Grass & Turf	Bare Ground	% Total Impervious Area	Developed	Surface Water	Other
Agate Passage / AGPS	599.96	12	79.52	2.75	82.28	4.25	3.08	9.17	16.51	0.17	1.04
Blakely Harbor / BLKH	1,369.73	7	87.04	1.08	88.13	2.25	3.62	5.75	11.62	0.22	0.04
Eagledale / EGDLE	1,094.12	9	65.10	2.95	68.04	8.83	4.36	18.45	31.63	0.33	0.00
Fletcher Bay / FLBY	2,114.01	3	75.83	1.09	76.92	8.60	6.04	7.89	22.52	0.56	0.00
Gazzam Lake / GZLK	886.45	10	83.96	0.79	84.74	3.96	1.86	7.82	13.64	1.62	0.00
Manzanita Bay / MZBY	2,296.34	1	72.25	1.92	74.18	9.76	6.76	8.85	25.37	0.46	0.00
Murden Cove / MDCV	2,046.36	4	73.65	2.34	75.99	7.65	6.46	9.48	23.58	0.43	0.00
North Eagle Harbor / NEGH	2,184.91	2	50.64	2.46	53.11	8.30	10.57	26.95	45.82	0.44	0.63
Pleasant Beach / PLBH	1,437.63	5	70.66	3.00	73.66	6.01	6.64	13.56	26.21	0.13	0.00
Port Madison / PTMD	1,388.31	6	81.85	1.18	83.03	6.26	3.75	6.36	16.37	0.30	0.31
South Beach / SHBH	711.89	11	76.59	1.20	77.79	4.16	10.88	6.54	21.58	0.63	0.00
Sunrise / SNRS	1,342.24	8	79.08	1.92	81.00	4.49	6.41	7.97	18.87	0.13	0.00
TOTAL ACREAGE	17,471.95		12,760.44	333.49	13,093.92	1,194.76	1,089.27	1,994.28	4,278.31	74.84	24.88

Notes:


** Statistical sources include: Battelle GIS database, CoBI GIS data, and CoBI Level II Assessment (Kato & Warren, 2000)

(Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Program – Final Monitoring Plan, COBI, 2008)

Fish Passage Barrier Inventory

In 2014 the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) completed fish passage assessments on Bainbridge Island *streams*. As part of this assessment, WDFW identified 43 total passage barriers (40 road crossings and 3 dams) and 45 partial passage barriers (43 road crossings, 1 dam, and 1 miscellaneous) (see Figure 7).

Figure 7. WDFW Fish Passage Barrier Inventory



(<http://wdfw.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html>)