

**APPENDIX H**  
**Pearson Eddy Wetland Restoration Environmental Assessment**  
**Agency Response to Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment**

	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Concern(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Changes made in EA</b>
1	Floodway Impacts	County Jurisdiction & Permit Requirements	After consultation with King County, it was confirmed that the King County Zero Rise regulatory requirement for actions in floodplains/floodways does not apply to vegetation restoration. The preferred alternative has been permitted under Snohomish County Land Disturbing and Flood Hazard Permits. The County also exempted the project from SEPA and Shoreline Management.	Revised: Table 1.1; Section 4.2.3 Floodplain Management; Appendix B- Compliance Documentation and Supportive Correspondence
2	Restoration	Determination of target plant community & historic versus artificial channels	Desired floodplain vegetation is not strictly 1880s plant community described by GLO. Landscape level changes in hydrology and presence of invasive species preclude pre-settlement plant community. Target vegetation is a mix of woody and emergent plant communities that were present in the 1940's prior to the floodplain cleared for agriculture.	Revised: Section 4.1.2 PLANTS
3	Washington State Laws	SEPA & Water Quality	All permits have been issued by Snohomish County, WDFW, and WDOE. The project was exempted from Shoreline Management by Snohomish County	Revised: Table 1.1 and Appendix B- Compliance Documentation and Supportive Correspondence
4	Prime Farmland	Conversion	NRCS does not consider conversion of prime farmland to wetlands and wildlife habitat to be irreversible. In the future, should production of food and	Revised: Section 5.3.1 Prime & Unique Farmland

			<p>fiber become more critical than providing habitat, National policy and WRP regulations could be altered to restore prior prime farmland to production.</p>	
5	Stormwater Conveyance	Point Source Pollution, Clean Water Act, Turbidity	<p>Preferred Alternative has been permitted by the ACOE and WDOE to satisfy the Clean Water Act. Point source discharges located outside of the project area are not likely to cause negative impacts during periods of high flows where fish are present in Pearson Eddy and the restored floodplain channels.</p>	<p>Revised: Table 1.1, and Appendix B- Compliance Documentation and Supportive Correspondence, Section 5.3.2 Water Quality/Clean Water Act</p>
6	Threatened and Endangered Fish	Historic use of site, Water Quality, Section 7 consultation, Stranding	<p>There are no federally listed species utilizing Pearson Eddy during the summer construction window. Consultation with WDFW, NMFS, and USFWS indicates that listed Puget Sound Chinook, Puget Sound steelhead, and bull trout utilize the adjacent Snoqualmie River, but are not present in Pearson Eddy channel. Sediment and erosion control BMPs during construction would minimize short term impacts. When flood flows recede from floodplain, there is potential for fish to become stranded on the floodplain in depressions. Salmon have evolved to utilize floodplains as refuge areas during high flow events and any resulting stranding in</p>	<p>Revised: Section 5.3.6 Threatened &amp; Endangered Species/Species of Concern</p>

			restored depressional wetlands (such as Treen Lake) would be considered a natural process.	
7	Nuisance Wildlife	Crop Damage, water quality, beaver	Preferred Alternative contains CUA management activities on the WRP easement to improve quantity and quality of waterfowl forage in order to attract migratory birds to the easement and away from private cropland. CUA for beaver management and surface drainage maintenance actions would be issued at request of easement landowners.	Revised: Section 5.2.5 ANIMALS, Fish and Wildlife (Inadequate Food); Section 6.3 Future Mitigation
8	Hazardous Materials	Phase I environmental screening	See comments under Comment Category #5 Stormwater Conveyance	Revised: Section 4.2.2 & 5.3.2 Water Quality/Clean Water Act
9	Economics	Maintenance costs, noxious weeds	<p>NRCS is responsible for short and long term maintenance, including replacement, of structures installed as part of the WRPO.</p> <p>The easement landowners are responsible for noxious weed control and emergency control of pests as required by all Federal, State, and local laws.</p>	Revised: Section 3.6 Long Term Monitoring
10	Fluvial Geomorphology	Increase in flood elevation	See comments under Comment Category #1 Floodway Impacts	Revised: Table 1.1; Section 4.2.3 Floodplain Management; Appendix B- Compliance Documentation and

				Supportive Correspondence
11	Regulatory Compliance	NEPA (mandatory EIS for stream projects), ESA, CWA, WA state law, County floodway regulation	EIS policy for stream projects does not apply to restoration projects. All Federal, State, and local permits have been acquired.	Revised: Chapter 1 Introduction; Appendix B- Compliance Documentation and Supportive Correspondence
12	Surface Drainage Maintenance	Responsibility	NRCS would commit to issuance of Compatible Use Authorizations (CUA) for surface water drainage on the WRP and FPE properties at the request of and with willing participation of the easement landowners.	Revised: Section 3.4 (3.) Alternative #2: Floodplain Vegetation Modification