

SNOHOMISH COUNTY
COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROJECT
COMPLETION REPORT
FISCAL YEAR 1980

Project Number: 306-12

PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT
COASTAL ZONE PLANNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
Project No. Washington 306-12

The preparation of this report was financially aided through a grant from the Washington State Department of Ecology with funds obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and appropriated for Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

HT393
.W2
C66
1980

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT FOR
SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON
1980 Fiscal Year
Project Number 306-12

This project completion report sets forth Snohomish County's activities during the 1980 fiscal year which fulfilled CZM contract obligations.

Element 1 of the 1980 CZM Project Description related to program and permit administration. Permit and program administration activities generally involved on-going maintenance functions, which included processing of individual permits, public and agency contact, program interpretations, and enforcement activities. A specific delineation of these activities is contained within Exhibit A. Environmental analyses associated with these efforts were completed, but not charged to the CZM program.

Element 2 of Snohomish County's CZM Project Description (program refinement) entailed a review of the efficacy of program components vis-a-vis daily permit requests, parallel County regulatory tools, the regulatory efforts of other jurisdictions, and other land use dynamics. Code development and/or modifications, master program amendments (of both a textual and map nature), and County initiated efforts to implement comprehensive land use plans were among the techniques utilized to improve the CZM process. Exhibit B summarizes efforts specifically undertaken in this regard during the 1980 fiscal year.

Element 3 of the 1980 contract involved floodway analysis and floodplain permit regulations procedure review. Preliminary floodway studies conducted by the Corps of Engineers for the Stillaguamish and Snohomish river systems were assessed, and modifications suggested in order to insure the compatibility of the studies with existing land uses and management programs. The Corps studies were utilized as the basis for building permit review and action within CZM jurisdictional areas. Examples of the County's activity under Element 3 are contained within Exhibit C.

Element 4 of the CZM Project Description pertained to graphic activities which facilitated CZM program objectives. The major graphic element during the 1980 fiscal year involved the updating and redrawing of approximately 40 (of a total of 160) zoning base maps to delineate current land use information and CZM jurisdictional boundaries. This effort was initiated in the 1987 fiscal period. Examples of work undertaken as a part of Element 4 are appended as Exhibit D.

EXHIBIT A

ELEMENT 1 - Individual Permit Activity

1. Puget Sound - review and evaluation of permit application for planned residential development of several hundred units at Norma Beach - EIS in preparation.
2. Puget Sound - Review and evaluation of permit application for sewage treatment plant and outfall to serve future residential development at Kayak Point - EIS and amendment to Sewer District Comprehensive Plan in preparation.
3. Puget Sound - permit issued to Department of Fisheries for boat anglers' reef - Declaration of Non-Significance issued by Department of Fisheries.
4. Puget Sound - permit issued to Chevron Oil, Inc. for containment dikes around existing oil tank - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.
5. Puget Sound - review and evaluation of permit application for pedestrian overpass and park facility at Picnic Point.
6. Puget Sound - review and evaluation of permit application for boathouse/bathhouse/greenhouse atop existing bulkhead - hearing scheduled - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.
7. Puget Sound - review and evaluation of permit application for residential subdivision and beach access at Mission Head.
8. Puget Sound - permit issued for construction of tramway to provide beach access to single family residence on Port Susan - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.
9. Puget Sound - permit issued for construction of stormwater, outfall and water line at Picnic Point - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.
10. Snohomish Estuary - public hearings held on permit application for planned residential development on Quilceda Creek - EIS prepared - application withdrawn by applicant in face of permit denial.
11. Snohomish Estuary - permit issued for construction of office buildings on Smith Island - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.
12. Snohomish Estuary - permit issued for dredge spoils disposal and log storage on Smith Island - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.

13. Snohomish River - review and evaluation of permit application for landfill of wetlands on Smith Island - SEPA determination pending receipt of additional information - subject of enforcement action brought by County and Corps of Engineers.
14. Snohomish Estuary - permit revision approved for dry land marina on Smith Island - Declaration of Non-Significance issued - EIS prepared for previously issued permit.
15. Snohomish River - review and evaluation of permit application for completion of dike - review and evaluation of NEPA EIS to determine adequacy according to SEPA requirements.
16. Snohomish River - permit issued for expansion of stove works - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.
17. Stillaguamish River - permit issued for replacement of bridge and realignment of roadway at Hatt Slough - Declaration of Non-Significance issued.
18. Stillaguamish River - review and evaluation of permit application for well and subdivision in floodplain.
19. Stillaguamish River - public hearing held on permit application for campground in floodplain - Declaration of Non-Significance issued - final local decision forthcoming.
20. Stillaguamish and Snohomish Rivers - review and evaluation of approximately 10 individual applications for renewal of permits for sand and gravel extraction (from pits and bars) - Declarations of Significance issued - EISs in various stages of progress - Final EISs issued and public hearings held on 2 applications (1 pit, 1 bar) - final local decisions forthcoming.

Element 1 - Enforcement Actions

1. Puget Sound - Supervised removal of illegally constructed concrete boat ramp on Class I accretion beach at Kayak Point.
2. Puget Sound - Issued stop work order for illegal harvesting of timber on shoreline of statewide significance.
3. Snohomish Estuary - Held enforcement hearing on illegal landfill and non-compliance with substantial development permit conditions by developers of dry land marina on Smith Island.
4. Snohomish Estuary - Issued stop work order for illegal filling of wetlands on Smith Island - review and evaluation of permit application in process.
5. Snohomish Estuary - Reviewed and evaluated possible Section 40 violation pertaining to filling of wetlands in Snohomish Estuary
6. Snohomish Estuary - Reviewed and evaluated federal permit violation pertaining to illegal filling of wetlands in Snohomish Estuary on Indian land.

7. Snohomish River - Issued stop work order and initiated legal action to force removal of spoils from state highway project (for which shoreline permit was obtained) which were illegally deposited within the floodway.
8. Snohomish River - Assisted Department of Game in enforcement action to repair damages caused by violations of shoreline management permit issued in 1977 for gravel bar mining.

EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)



**SNOHOMISH COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201 • (206) 259 9311

George F. Sherwin, Jr., Director

July 2, 1979

Mr. Clemens H. Barnes
Graham and Dunn
34th Floor-Rainier Bank Tower
1301 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

Dear Mr. Barnes:

Re: Kayak Point-Repair of Concrete "Walkway"

Our department has reviewed your June 22, 1979 correspondence and field investigated the recently constructed concrete "walkway" at Kayak Point. It is our opinion that the structure, regardless of its cost, materially interferes with the normal public use of the shorelines of the state, and that the repair of the once gravel walkway goes beyond "normal maintenance." The structure is not exempt from the permit requirements of the Shorelines Management Act, and it will be necessary for ARCO to either procure a substantial development permit or remove the concrete.

A substantial development permit will be approved only if the project complies with the policies and regulations of the Shorelines Management Act and the County's Shoreline Master Plan. You should be aware that the present "walkway" is inconsistent with several of the requirements of our Shoreline Master Plan pertaining to development within Conservancy Environments. If the structure cannot be modified to overcome the inconsistencies and allay environmental concerns, it is probable that a permit will be denied and the concrete ordered removed.

We have enclosed a copy of the County's Shoreline Master Program regulations for development within Conservancy Environments, and a substantial development permit application.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Shannon Hart
Senior Planner

SH:wm

Enclosures

EXHIBIT A
(Sample Letter)

GRAHAM & DUNN

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

BRYANT H. DUNN
CHARLES S. MULLEN
JAMES D. BULFF
BRUCE M. FYN
STEPHEN A. GRABY
DWIGHT J. DRAKE
CLEMENTS H. DARNES
KENT WHITELEY
JOHN E. KING
JAN L. ESENDRUNG
MICHAEL W. DRESSLER
GEORGE T. GOWAN

JAMES WM. JOHNSTON
W. H. JAYNES, JR.
JOHN F. HALL
CHARLES L. SAYNE
MICHAEL J. SWOFFORD
GERALD T. PAKES, JR.
HANS O. H. JENSEN
JOHN T. JOHN
NANCY S. WHITTEN
ROBERT A. MEIVEL
DANIAN O. SMITH

FRANK T. ROSENQUIST
BEN J. GANTT, JR.
JACK G. STROTHER
FRANK N. MITCHELL
FREDERICK O. FREDERICKSON
EDWARD W. PETTIGREW
M. BRUCE JOHNSTON
JOSEPH O. FINLEY
ERIC ROSENQUIST
ALICE F. GUSTAFSON
BRUCE N. HOLLIDAY

DONALD G. GRAHAM (1964-1979)

34TH FLOOR
RAINIER BANK TOWER
1301 FIFTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101
(206) 824-8300

DONALD G. GRAHAM, JR.
PARTNER ON LEAVE

R. A. GUS MUEN
COUNSEL

July 12, 1979

Ms. Shannon Hart
Senior Planner
Snohomish County Planning Department
County Administration Building
Everett, Washington 98201

Re: Kayak Point - Repair of Walkway - Shoreline
Management Act ("Substantial Development") Permit

Dear Ms. Hart:

I have read your July 2 letter and reviewed it with representatives of Arco.

As I indicated in an earlier letter to Mr. Sherwin, although Arco was under the impression that a permit was not required, we will be guided by the Planning Department's interpretation of our responsibilities in this matter.

Although your letter states the Department's opinion that Arco has the option to either seek a permit or remove the concrete, I gather it is the Department's preference that the concrete be removed.

Accordingly, I am instructed by Arco to advise you that removal of the concrete--I assume the long-standing gravel walkway is not involved--will be commenced, as soon as practicable, in such fashion as you may direct. If you do not care to supervise this removal, please let me know and I will advise Arco to accomplish the project according to its own best judgment.

I would appreciate your letting me know whether you wish to supervise this removal, or to submit standards for its accomplishment, or to otherwise become involved in the surgical details. In this regard, you may wish to communicate

GRAHAM & DUNN

Ms. Shannon Hart
July 12, 1979
Page Two

directly with Jim Kernan, in Los Angeles (213-486-0614), whom I believe you have discussed this with.

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future on how you wish us to go about this removal project.

Very truly yours,

GRAHAM & DUNN

Clemens H. Barnes

CHB/ch

cc: George Sherwin

EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)



SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201 • (206) 255-9111

George F. Sherwin, Jr., Director

July 12, 1979

Mr. Jerry Keller
Regulation Branch, Operations Division
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1735 E Marginal Way South
Seattle, WA 98101

Dear Mr. Keller:

We hereby request your assistance to deal with a situation occurring on the Tulalip Indian Reservation West of Marysville, Washington.

The issue concerns a woodwaste/construction debris/solid waste landfiling operation which is underway on Indian land. This operation has encroached on what we would characterize as prime estuary habitat of the Quilceda Creek. In fact, debris placed on the site is actually up to the waterline in one instance.

There is no doubt, based on our interpretation, that this operation constitutes an activity subject to a Section 404 permit. Recognizing your authority in this matter, we request your determination.

Based upon our inspection of the site and reference to recent aerial photographs, the operator has covered a small tributary of the creek with twenty vertical feet of fill material. We believe this is an absolutely intolerable abuse of prime estuarine land. Even if the fill were allowed only up to the edge of the wetland area, we feel the damage to the wetland ecotone would be unacceptable for water quality and aesthetic reasons.

Because this regrettable situation has occurred on Indian land, Snohomish County cannot enforce the Shoreline Management Act nor other local land use authorities.

Because this operation is continuing its encroachment daily, we request your immediate attention. We understand from the Snohomish Health District that Corps personnel visited this site some time ago and staked the wetland perimeter. We did not observe any stakes last week and suspect they too have been covered.

Mr. Jerry Keller

July 12, 1979

Page two

I have enclosed materials for directions to the site. Someone from our staff will accompany you should you desire. Additionally, if you have questions, please do not hesitate to call me - 259-9324 in Everett.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT



Stephen Rice, Section Head
Resource Planning


SR:aw

cc: Rick Brunner, Snohomish County Health District
Martin Kenney, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Enclosure

EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)



SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201 • (206) 259-921

George F. Sherwin, Jr., Director

September 20, 1979

Colonel Leon K. Moraski
District Engineer
Seattle District, Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box C-3755
Seattle, Washington 98124

Dear Colonel Moraski:

Today our agency received a copy of a letter to you from Joseph Blum of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service dated September 10, 1979. The issue of this letter is also the topic of a letter I authored to Jerry Keller of your organization on July 12, 1979, a copy of which is attached.

The site in question is a perfect example of obviously poor judgment by those allowing the site to be used for landfill and construction debris, and were it not for the ownership status of the land, Snohomish County would have taken action under Shoreline Management jurisdiction some time ago.

Snohomish County is presently seeking grant funds for a project to improve streamside conditions and conduct educational programs using the Quilceda Creek and its immediate drainage basin as a geographic focus. It is our hope that you will find it appropriate to require full mitigation under federal jurisdiction. Accordingly, we fully support the position taken by the Fish and Wildlife Service that you halt further filling, require removal of all fill materials on lands under Section 404 jurisdiction, and require stabilization of the front face of remaining fill.

Given this site's proximity to the creek/wetland area, and the impact the fill has on the ecotone between this area and adjacent uplands, the preferable environmental solution would be removal of all fill. Certain difficulties with this solution must be recognized, but at a minimum, we would recommend the following in addition to the Fish and Wildlife Service's recommendation if complete removal is not possible.

Colonel Leon K. Moraski
Page two

- . regrading of the site after removal of fill on Section 404 lands to achieve a moderate slope to the creek and wetlands
- . covering the surface with soil materials which would minimize infiltration and subsequent leachate production if it is determined that the fill is composed of materials capable of generating leachate
- . planting the resultant surface with vegetation capable of fully mitigating erosion and sedimentation problems in the creek

Finally, we note that the Fish and Wildlife Service response may have been prompted by "project no. 071-04B-2-005380". If this means a Section 404 permit application is being reviewed, Snohomish County has not received a request for review.

We trust you will give this matter appropriate attention. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Stephen Rice
Stephen Rice, Section Head
Resource Planning

SR:mat

cc: Don Johnson, WDG, Seattle
Larry McCallum, WDC, Olympia
Dave Somers, Tulalip Tribe
Joseph Blum, Fish & Wildlife Service, Olympia
Martin Kenney, Fish & Wildlife Service, Olympia
Rick Brunner, Snohomish Health District

Encl: 1

EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)

Sk



SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201 • (206) 250-9311

George F. Sherwin, Jr., Director

February 6, 1980

Mr. Robert R. Spearman
Seattle District, Corps of Engineers
PO Box C-3755
Seattle, Washington 98124

Dear Mr. Spearman:

Re: 071-OYB-2-005380-C
Richard Grenier-Filling of Quilceda Creek Wetlands

Our department has, on two occasions, commented to the Corps on the illegal landfill on the Tulalip Indian Reservation (copies of previous correspondence enclosed).

As we have previously stated, because of the ownership status of the land, Snohomish County Codes and the Shoreline Master Plan can not be applied to this regrettable situation. Were the property under the County's jurisdiction, we would have acted long ago to stop the filling and reclaim the affected wetland area.


We commend the Corps for directing Mr. Grenier and Mr. Murphy to stop work. We recommend that the Corps now require full mitigation of the environmental damage which has occurred. The mitigative measures recommended in our September 20, 1979 correspondence should be implemented immediately.

The contractor, Mr. Don Murphy, is responsible for a number of illegal landfills on the Tulalip Reservation, and has repeatedly and knowingly violated applicable governmental regulations. Our department would support any punitive action against Mr. Murphy which could be taken under federal regulations to insure that this sort of destruction not happen again.

We trust you will give this matter appropriate attention. If you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


Shannon Hart
Senior Planner

SH:wm

Enclosures

EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)



**SNOHOMISH COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER • 1200 PL. WASHINGTON 98201 • (206) 221-9311

George F. Sherwin, Jr., Director

March 3, 1980

Thorn Meats
P.O. Box 424
Snohomish, Washington 98290

Dear Sirs:

Re: Illegal landfill on assessor's parcel # 052806-3-007

Our assessor's records indicate that you are the owner of the above referenced parcel. We have discovered that a substantial volume of spoils material has recently been deposited on your property, in flagrant violation of federal, state, and local laws.

The enclosed maps indicate that the property which has been filled occurs totally within the designated hydraulic floodplain of the Pilchuck River and, partially within the floodway. The parcel, therefore, should not have been filled without a flood control permit from the Department of Ecology, shoreline management, grading, and conditional use permits from Snohomish County and, possibly, a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is unlikely that any of these permits would have been issued, had you made the proper applications, as the deposition of fill within the floodplain is prohibited by the County's Shoreline Master Program and Zoning Code, as well as by state and federal regulations for development within flood control zones.

We hold you, as the owner of the parcel, responsible for the filling which has illegally occurred, and request that you take immediate action to rectify this situation (e.g. by the removal of all of the recently deposited spoils to an approved and appropriate disposal site outside of the floodplain, or receipt of the proper permits). We also ask that you provide us the name of your contractor (if other than yourself) so that we may contact him to advise him of the proper areas, and permits required, for filling. If, within thirty days of the date of this letter, you have not made a substantive effort to resolve this matter, we shall advise the Prosecuting Attorney's Office to initiate enforcement action.

Thorp Meats
March 3, 1980
Page 2

We look forward to hearing from you within the near future.

Sincerely,

SHONOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Shannon Hart

Shannon Hart
Senior Planner

SH:ds

cc: Roy Bishop, Dept. of Ecology
Bill Spurlock, Corps of Engineers
Joe Robel, Dept. of Fisheries
Bob Pfeifer, Dept. of Game
Bob Terwilliger, Prosecutor's Office
Lew Westcott, Dept. of Public Works

Enclosure

5
7
5

5 10 - 15

(10)

M 4

S E

S 6

CITY

OF

SNOHOMISH

0.000

EC-12.50

EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201 • (206) 222-1311

George F. Sherwin, Jr., Director



April 10, 1980

Thorp Meats
PO Box 424
Snohomish, Washington 98290

Dear Sirs:

Re: Illegal landfill on Assessor's Parcel 052806-3-007

This letter is intended to follow up our correspondence of March 3, 1980 (copy enclosed). We find that you have taken no substantive action to comply with our request to remove the fill which was deposited on your property in the floodplain, in violation of the County's Shoreline Master Plan, zoning, and grading laws, and the State's flood control laws. As you were previously advised, we are now turning this matter over to the Prosecuting Attorney's Office for enforcement.


In addition, we are asking the Department of Ecology and the County Building and Public Works department to take action to enforce the violations of their flood control and grading regulations.

We expect that, once the illegally deposited fill is removed to an appropriate location outside of the floodplain, your site will be reseeded and restored to its pre-fill condition.

Please feel free to contact me, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


Shannon Hart
Senior Planner

SH:wm

cc Roy Bishop, Department of Ecology
Bill Spurlock, Corps of Engineers
Bob Terwilliger, Prosecutor's Office
Ken Engelbretson, Building Department
Law Westcott, Department of Public Works

Enclosure

EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)



**SNOHOMISH COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING - EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201 • (206) 255-9311

George E. Shawan, Jr., Director

April 10, 1980

Mr. William Malloy
Washington State Department of Transportation
6431 Corson Avenue South C-81410
Seattle, Washington 98108

Dear Mr. Malloy:

Re: Disposal of spoils from the SR 2 project


It has come to our attention that certain of the contractors associated with the SR 2 project are illegally depositing spoils within the floodplain. Such a practice is in violation of the provisions of the Shoreline Management Act, Shoreline Master Program, Zoning Code, and State flood control laws.

We are currently attempting to enforce the removal of a substantial volume of SR 2 spoils, which was allegedly deposited by Fiorito Brothers (according to the property owner), north of the Three Lakes Road (see enclosed correspondence). We feel that your department is partially responsible for the violation which has occurred, and should provide assistance in the removal of the fill to an appropriate, non-floodplain location. We also request that your department immediately advise all contractors that spoils from the SR 2 project are to be deposited only in legitimate disposal areas, outside of the floodplain.

We trust that there will be no more such violations associated with the SR 2 project, and look forward to working with your department to correct those violations which have already occurred.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


Shannon Hart
Senior Planner

Enclosures



STATE OF
WASHINGTON

Dixy Lee Ray
Governor


EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of District Engineer, D 1, 6431 Carson Ave. So., C 81410, Seattle, Washington 98108

May 28, 1980



Snohomish County Planning Department
County Administration Building
Everett, Washington 98201

SR 2
Fobes Hill to
Campbell Road
L-3388

ATTENTION: Shannon Hart


Dear Ms. Hart:

We have received your April 10, 1980, letter regarding the disposal of spoils from the SR 2 project. Your concerns have been forwarded to the contractor (letter attached).

We appreciate your interest in this highway project.

Very truly yours,

J.D. ZIRKLE, P.E.
District Administrator

for: 
D.L. HOFFMAN, P.E.
District Design Engineer

WMM:jcw

Attachment

cc: J.J. Hansen

L.S. Stanton

Construction Administration



EXHIBIT A

(Sample Letter)

STATE OF
WASHINGTON

Dixy Lee Ray
Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of District Engineer, D-1, 6401 Carson Ave. So., C 81410, Seattle, Washington 98148

May 2, 1980

Florito Brothers, Inc.
1100 N.W. Leary Way
Seattle, Wa. 98107


SR-2 C.S. 3107
Fobes Hill to Sta. 312
Contract 1298

Gentlemen:

We have been notified by the Snohomish County Planning Department that you may have wasted material on property owned by Thorp Meats illegally. The county alleges that the depositing of the material without obtaining a flood control permit from the Dept. of Ecology, Shoreline Management, grading and conditional use permits from Snohomish County, and possibly a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers constitutes an illegal act.

The County is requesting that the material placed on the Thorp property be removed. We suggest that you contact the County and make whatever arrangements necessary to satisfy them.

Very truly yours,


Jack J. Hansen, P. E.
Project Engineer

80 Columbia Ave.
Marysville, Wa. 98270

JJH:meg
cc: Const. Admin ✓
File

DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS D-1	
Rec'd MAY 5, 1980	
☐	DISTRICT ENGINEER
☐	ASST. DIST. ENGR.
☐	CHIEF OF ENGINEERING
☒	CONSTRUCTION
☒	ASST. NORTH
☐	ASST. SOUTH
☐	ASST. EAST
☐	DOCUMENTATION
☐	CONSTRUCTION LIAISON
☐	OFFICE ASST.
☐	ACCOUNTING
☐	TRAFFIC
☐	UTILITIES
☐	MGMT. SERVICES
☐	LOCATION
☐	MAINTENANCE
☐	ADMINISTRATION
☒	FILES

EXHIBIT B

Element II - Program Refinements

1. Public hearings held on comprehensive land use plan for the Skykomish River Valley - final action forthcoming.
2. Public hearings held on, and adoption of comprehensive land use plan for lower Snohomish riverine and estuarine areas.
3. County initiated rezoning of lower Snohomish riverine and estuarine areas to implement comprehensive land use plan.
4. Review and redrafting of Title 21 (the County's Shoreline Management Ordinance) to conform with recent amendments to state law and expedite permit processing procedures.
5. Review and evaluation of potential amendment to Shoreline Master Program regulations for subdivision densities.
6. Review and evaluation with other agencies (concerned with fisheries resources and river hydraulics) of potential amendment to Shoreline Master Program regulation prohibiting pit mining within the hydraulic floodway.
7. Review of potential amendments to Title 18 (the County's Zoning Code) pertaining to development within floodplain areas.

Excerpts from Skykomish Valley Plan

AREA G - COMMUNITIES ON THE SKYKOMISH RIVER LOW- LANDS AND ON HIGH ROCK (east of SR 203)

Area G is that portion of the planning area south of SR-2, west of Area F, and east of SR-203 as is shown on Figure 13. Two different terrain types are predominant: The Skykomish River and the High Rock uplands.

The Skykomish River lowlands consist of four community areas. Farming is the main activity of three of these communities: One is located between SR-2 and the river, another around the west end of Ben Howard Road, and the third is south of Sultan. The fourth community, southeast of Sultan is used primarily for recreation. Currently, these recreation uses include small lot plats, a rental camp area and a state fishing access to the river. This community is designated as Residential Estate, while the other farming communities are designated Agricultural.

The High Rock uplands are predominately in timber production with residential uses accessible from

SR-203 located on the western edge of the area. All of the uplands are designated Forestry with a small strip of lowland adjacent to SR-203, currently in rural and industrial use, designated as Rural. The Forestry designation has been used primarily due to the inability of government to provide services for the area if it changes from its historical use of timber production to a residential use. Sewer and other urban services are difficult to provide for the area due to its remoteness.

SPECIAL CONCERNS

Area G contains the Braided Channel of the Skykomish River which is recognized as valuable to the County for recreation, flood control, natural resources of agriculture and forestry, and as fish and wildlife habitat. It is in the public interest that Braided Channel development be minimal because of its flood control characteristics. The Shoreline Management Master Program dramatically reduces potential channel development through its classification of much of the channel land in the Conservancy Environment. Public purchase

of the Braided Channel should be considered to provide use of the channel area for recreation and flood control purposes and to retain the public's right of access to the channel. Throughout the Skykomish floodplain, the plan has designated land not in current agricultural use as Forestry or Wetland with the intent to discourage channel development.

Access to existing residential development and the recreation lakes located on the upland is provided by narrow roads inadequate to handle increased traffic. Until the road network can be improved, High Rock uplands should remain in timber production with continued limited outdoor recreation uses. At the present level of taxation and subsequent expenditures for countywide road work, Snohomish County is experiencing difficulty meeting road repair and improvement needs. Any major road improvement for the High Rock uplands would be in the distant future. Therefore, High Rock is designated for continued timber production.



SNOHOMISH RIVER VALLEY

All of the Snohomish River Valley is within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers designated 100 year flood plain. Because of the high probability of serious flooding in most of the valley, there is a functional limit to the types of land use permitted in the flood plain. Any additional residential, commercial, or industrial use should be strictly regulated. The most suitable uses are agricultural, recreation, and open space.

EXHIBIT B

The "highest and best use" of a major portion of the Snohomish Flood Plain is agriculture. The valley contains some of the most productive dairy farms in Washington State if not the United States. These farms make a valuable economic and irreplaceable social contribution to this county and planning area. If the experience of other agricultural valleys in Western Washington is repeated in this valley, these farms are in grave danger of conversion to other more intensive land uses. Flood

plain status reduces the danger of conversion a great deal. However, there are other economic factors which threaten farmlands.

One of the more substantial costs of operation in Snohomish Valley farming is maintaining adequate drainage. Most of the land is diked to prevent inundation and is channeled and pumped to control local runoff. As urban development increases on the uplands surrounding the valley, so does the storm water runoff. Increased runoff from the uplands increases the drainage problem and cost of farming in the lowlands. This plan recommends that the upland property owners assume responsibility for aggravating drainage problems and help to pay for the solution.

Another cost of farm operation is taxation. If farmers were forced to pay taxes on the potential uses for their land, they would be forced off of their land. If they pay tax on the actual use of the land for agriculture, they may survive. The




FIGURE 40

SNOHOMISH RIVER VALLEY

agricultural open space tax designation limits the property tax assessment to actual use rather than potential use. This plan recommends that farmers on prime agricultural land be given agricultural open space tax designation on their land and farm buildings. Farm buildings are currently exempt from open space tax credit and farmers maintain that this is an inequitably high tax burden. This plan recommends that the tax assessment of farm buildings be carefully reviewed and considered for inclusion under open space taxation.

Many County residents are advocating a Purchase of Development Rights proposal to further assist County farmers. Essentially, farmers would be paid a lump sum equal to the difference in the value of their land as farmland and its value as residential land. After accepting the development rights payment, the land could be sold but only for use as farmland. A purchase of development rights program as well as other agricultural lands preservation programs should be carefully evaluated

for use in the Snohomish Valley.

Another major land use in the Snohomish Valley is ecologically important marsh and wetlands. In 1978, the Corps of Engineers completed a survey of the Snohomish Estuary Wetlands. This study establishes boundaries of river influence and identifies valuable remaining marsh and swamps. The study provides environmental base data for evaluating a variety of Corps required hydrology permits.

The Corps wetlands study identifies many "areas of importance" which are unique to the functioning of the Snohomish Estuary ecosystem. The Corps will not issue hydrology permits in these wetlands of importance unless the proposed project is, in the public interest with project benefits outweighing wetland damage. If the Corps actually reviews and acts on permit applications as this study suggests, they will functionally create several wilderness areas in the Snohomish Estuary. The implications of the Corps study are considered in this comprehensive plan.

134

If the Corps intends to preserve wetlands in the Snohomish Estuary, this should be reflected in the Shoreline Management Master Program and in this comprehensive plan. This comprehensive plan recommends that those areas identified as "wetlands of importance" by the Corps of Engineers be preserved as wilderness - natural wetlands. These areas should be zoned Wetlands which would prohibit any human modification of them. In addition, this plan recommends that the Shoreline Management Master Program (SMMP) be amended so that Corps identified wetlands are designated Conservancy or Natural in the SMMP. Since most of the wetland areas are privately owned and since county, state and federal regulations make development of wetlands extremely difficult, this plan recommends that the Estuary wetlands be publically acquired. The Cathcart Gap is another valuable wetland area in the Snohomish River Valley. Unlike the Estuary wetlands, the Cathcart Gap is in the gravel bar - braided channel section of the river. The Gap is an extremely scenic area with Lord's Hill and

Seattle Hill rising steeply from the gravel bars at the edge of the slowly meandering river. In addition, portions of the Gap are highly valued fishing holes for local sports fishermen. Because of its beauty and its role as vital habitat for fish, this plan recommends that Cathcart Gap be preserved in its natural state. The entire Gap from Thomas' Eddy to Highway 522 should be zoned Wetlands designated as Natural or Conservancy on an amended Shoreline Management Master Program, and actively considered for public acquisition. A third significant land use in the Snohomish Flood Plain is the industrial land at the mouth of the Estuary. Most of the existing land use and zoning on the land west of Interstate 5 is industrial. Scott Paper Company has a large mill in this area. They use much of their land in the Estuary for log storage and waste treatment facilities. In addition to Scott Paper, there are a number of small manufacturers on Smith Island.

Much of Smith Island provides access to deep draft, ocean going vessels. For these reasons, the portions of Smith Island west of Interstate 5 which are currently used for industry should continue to serve that purpose. No industrial use should encroach on the Corps of Engineers identified wetlands at the extreme west end of Smith Island or onto any wetland east of I-5.

EXHIBIT B
(Sample Letter)

May 16, 1980

Roy Bishop
State Department of Ecology
4350 150th Ave. NE
Remond, Washington 98052

Dear Roy:

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss our mutual concerns regarding sand and gravel extraction (pit excavations) in the riverine environment.

Our meeting of May 15, 1980 has been very beneficial in defining the type of information necessary for inclusion in Environmental Impact Statements for gravel mining proposals located in the floodplain. I will be transmitting a summary outline of that information to your office for additional comment in the near future.

We intend to give full consideration to your expressed concerns relative to our current Shoreline Master Program prohibition of pit excavations in a designated floodway. In order to facilitate our present examination of this prohibition, we ask that your specific concerns be itemized and transmitted to our office in writing at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

SNOROMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Gary Reiersgard
Senior Planner

GR:ida

EXHIBIT B

(Sample Letter)


DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SEATTLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX C-3755
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98124



NPSN-PL-FP

12 June 1980

Mr. Gary Reiersgard
Snohomish County Planning
County Administration Building
Everett, Washington 98201



Dear Mr. Reiersgard:

This is in response to your letter of 16 May 1980 requesting our comments relative to Snohomish County's Shoreline Management Master Program prohibition of pit excavations in a designated floodway.

Our concern stems from the idea of the floodway being used for regulating an activity that is not in conflict with the floodway concept. A floodway is an instrument that was intended to be used for restricting development in the portion of the flood plain that is necessary to safely pass floodwaters. Generally, the floodway boundaries are determined by a hydraulic analysis that "squeezes" the 100-year flood until the depth increases one foot higher than natural flow conditions. According to this definition of a floodway, a pit excavation would have no harmful effect. We feel the use of floodway boundaries to control nonflood related activities will diminish the effectiveness of the floodway concept as a flood damage mitigation tool and tends to confuse the public.

We realize that a pit excavation in a floodway/flood plain may create certain hydraulic problems, so we suggest careful consideration of the following items in evaluating proposed pits:

- a. Would pit allow or encourage the channel to shift and flow through the pit?
- b. Would pit act as a trap for sediment, debris, or fish?
- c. Would stream degrade upstream riverbed and banks to refill pit?
- d. If pit acts as sediment trap, will "clear" water from pit degrade downstream riverbed and banks?
- e. Could degradation of upstream or downstream riverbed and/or banks endanger public or private facilities such as bridge piers, bank stabilization (e.g., riprap), buried pipelines at river crossings, and roads or other improvements located alongside the stream?


NPSEN-PL-FP

Mr. Gary Reiersgard

f. Would berms, levees, material stockpiles, or processing plants increase local flow velocities or raise local flood levels?

Thank you for contacting the U.S. Corps of Engineers on this matter, and if you have any further questions, please call us at 764-3660.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Gerald M. Gardner". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Gerald" being more prominent.

GERALD M. GARDNER

Acting Chief, Flood Plain Management Section

EXHIBIT B

(Sample Letter)



STATE OF
WASHINGTON


Dixy Lee Ray
Governor

DEPARTMENT OF GAME

600 North Capitol Way, 2nd Fl. Olympia, WA 98501

206/753 5700

May 28, 1980



Ms. Shannon Hart
Senior Planner
Snohomish County Planning Department
County Administration Building
Everett, Washington 98201

RE: Gravel Pits in Hydraulic Floodway, Snohomish County

Ms. Hart:

Your attempts to involve our agency in the early stages of your shoreline planning process are appreciated. Our comments follow on gravel pits in the hydraulic floodway.

We are concerned about potential impacts to fish and wildlife that might result from gravel pits. Streambed gravels are necessary for trout and salmon to spawn. If excessive mining, channel change or erosion occurs, spawning beds could be depleted of gravel upstream or downstream from the site and fish production would be reduced.

Pits left in the floodway would trap fish when floodwaters recede. Trout and salmon require high levels of dissolved oxygen and cool water to survive. Temperature of pits could rise above lethal limits and have too little dissolved oxygen to support salmonids. Fish food production in ponds would also likely be insufficient to support trapped fishes.

As with any development in the floodway, gravel operations hold potential for removing critical wildlife habitat provided by riparian vegetation and wetlands. Any mining or stockpiling in these critical areas would impact fish and wildlife.

Because of our concerns, we support your prohibition on new gravel pits in the hydraulic floodway. If you would permit for pits in the floodway, we recommend it only be done with a conditional use permit and environmental impact statement. The proposal should be evaluated by an independent geo-hydrologist to determine the likelihood of channel change, excess gravel removal or increased erosion.


Information would be necessary on plant life in the proposed area. This should include not only the areas where the gravel would be mined, but also the areas where gravel would be stockpiled. Other information on a plan to prevent stranding of fish or to return fish to the river should be provided.

Page 2
May 28, 1980

Thank you for the opportunity to respond. If you have any questions, please call us at 753-3318.

Sincerely,

THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME


Bob Zeigler, Applied Ecologist
Environmental Affairs
Habitat Management Division

BZ:njf

cc: Agencies
Regional

EXHIBIT B



STATE OF
WASHINGTON

Dixy Lee Ray
Governor

(Sample Letter)

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

115 General Administration Building, Olympia, Washington 98501


206753 (6/80)

May 29, 1980

Snohomish County Planning Department
County Administration Building
Everett, Washington 98201

Attention Mr. Gary Reiersgard, Senior Planner

Gentlemen:



Snohomish County Shoreline Master
Program - Prohibition of Gravel
Excavations
Snohomish County WRIA A-05,07

We appreciate the opportunity to express our concerns regarding gravel excavations in Snohomish County and commend your effort to obtain a wide range of opinions and ideas.

A word or two regarding natural salmon production in Western Washington streams will serve to put our concerns in perspective. We consider a conservative approach to man-made environmental changes to be the most sound as it relates to our fishery management responsibilities. Under present geological, climatic and biological conditions, we can expect a certain, and in some cases predictable, level of salmon production for a particular river system. This level is that which the system will support and we can depend on this consistency as a basis for prediction or enhancement efforts. It follows then, that changes to the environment which will have an unpredictable impact on any facet of salmonid production will jeopardize our ability to manage that resource.

Our concerns with gravel pit excavations within the flood zone all involve the unpredictable riverine environment changes which could occur as a result of floods.

1. Loss of spawning area. A net loss of gravel from the bedload into the open pits could alter upstream spawning areas and remove important replacement gravel to downstream salmonid spawning areas. We would expect less effects the further pits are located from the river.
2. Channel changes. Gravel pits provide a low point in the floodway which encourages rerouting of floodwater. They have been responsible for channel changes in the Wynoochee River, for example. Rearing areas can be severely impacted in such cases. Also severe bank erosion can occur.

Snohomish County
Planning Department

- 2 -

May 29, 1980

3. Fish entrapment. Probably somewhat less of a concern than the other two because entrapment occurs under natural conditions to a certain extent. However, the presence of open pits may increase the chance of entrapment due to channel changes.

Thank you for the chance to comment on your Shoreline Master Program Prohibition. Please contact Bill Young (753-2546) of our Natural Production Division if you have further questions.

Sincerely,


William Rees, Chief
Fisheries Natural Production

EXHIBIT C

(Sample Letter)



**SNOHOMISH COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • FIVE WET, WASHINGTON 98001 • (206) 259-9311

George F. Sherwin, Jr., Director

June 21, 1980

Mr. William Spurlock
Floodplain Management
Department of the Army
Seattle District, Corps of Engineers
PO Box C-3755
Seattle, Washington 98124

Dear Mr. Spurlock:

Our department has completely reviewed the Pilchuck River Study. We have found two locations in the study area where the floodway boundary should be repositioned, if possible.

The first location encompasses Lots 7 through 31, and Lots 34, 36, 38, 40, 44, 46, and 47 in the plat of Pilchuck Riviera, recorded on October 19, 1964. Most of this plat (including several of the lots which are presently within the designated floodway) has been developed. In recognition of the established development, we are requesting that you investigate the feasibility of relocating the floodway boundary so that it would occur exactly 60 feet from the edge of Pilchuck Way (see enclosed map). This alternative would provide a minimal building site, outside of the floodway, for the remaining undeveloped lots. The establishment of a floodway boundary at a fixed distance from an existing improvement would simplify floodplain permit administration.

The second area of concern involves Lots 2 through 12 in the plat of Pilchuck 26 Tracts, recorded on September 9, 1968. A similar situation exists within this area as to the extent of existing development. Likewise, we are requesting that you evaluate the implications of an alternative floodway boundary exactly 60 feet from the westerly edge of the access road (see attached map).

We have enclosed maps of the affected areas and our suggested boundary adjustments. You will also find a copy of a letter from the County Council indicating their desire to investigate alternatives to the present floodway designation within the plat of Pilchuck Riviera. We are aware that there is a potentially confining steep bluff on the bank opposite Pilchuck Riviera, and that an alternative equal conveyance floodway in this area may be problematic. Topography in the Pilchuck 26 Tracts vicinity is generally similar and predominantly level on both sides of the river.

Mr. William Spurlock
July 21, 1980
Page two

Please evaluate the hydrological implications of the two alternatives we have suggested, and advise us of the extent of downstream or upstream flood study adjustments which would be necessary to accommodate our suggested modifications. Upon receipt of your analysis, we will present the alternatives to the County Council for their evaluation and action.

Please feel free to give me a call, if I can assist you in any way.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

 Shannon Hart
Senior Planner

SH:wm

Enclosures

SA - 1 - ACRE (INTERIM)

R 40 (7 - 70)

EXPIRED DEC. 1, 1971

RR -
9600
R 09 -
77

See S.C.

S 20° 30' E

1170.00'

S 04° 11' W
100.14'

S 60° 39' 47" E

601.93'

I-001

N 84° 01' 27" E

3088.00'

I - 29 - 4

FHZ

PUGET
SOUND

A -

R 20

ACTED UPON BY RESOLUTION DATED..... BY SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Barbara L. Huxford
CHAMAN

George F. Sherman Jr.
SECRETARY - DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

EXPIRED BY.....

DATED..... BY SNOHOMISH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

PHONE NO.....
ADDRESS.....
APPLICATION FILE NO.....

NOTE: 7 - 29
This is not a survey, it is a plat used for location of property.

1 - 2

31 - 30 - 5

493.10

295



80

17

5

nej mas
f,

N

EXHIBIT D

Scale 1" = 400'

9 - 1 0 6

222

Additional Information Requested by Department of Ecology
for period from October 1, 1979 through June 30, 1980

Approximate number of inquiries regarding CZM/SMA:	850
Approximate number of inquiries regarding shoreline substantial development permits:	450
Number of peroposals substantially modified to meet master program requirements:	6
Number of federal permits reviewed to implement pro- visions of master programs which are exempt from a SMA permit:	1
Number of shoreline permits requested:	31
Number of shoreline permits issued:	20
Number of shoreline permits denied:	3
Number of site inspections:	40
Number of shoreline violations:	10
Number of actions against violators (including injunctions, forced permit applications, stop work orders, and other actions):	10
Number of SMA/CZM educational programs conducted (i.e. displays, workshops, speeches, etc.):	0

2

Grantee's Name & Address		Contract Number		Cost Period & Element Completed	
Snohomish County Planning County Admin. Bldg. Everett, WA 98201		CZM - FY 1980		Element I 4/1/80 through 6/30/80	
Project Budget: Federal \$ 20,924		I certify that costs listed below have been incurred in conformance with this contract. <i>Shenna Hart</i> For Greg Williams (Signature of Project Official)			
State _____					
Local 5,231					
Total Budget: \$ 26,155					
Cost Categories (as approved in grant budget)	Costs for Report Period			Total Cost Per Category	
	Federal	State	Local		
1. Salaries and Wages	4,573.00		1,143.26	5,716.26	
2. Employee Benefits	777.41		194.35	971.76	
3. Consultant & Contract Services					
4. Consumable Supplies					
5. Copying Service					
6. Travel	114.70		28.67	143.37	
7. Equipment	640.00		160.00	800.00	
8. Indirect Costs	457.30		114.33	571.63	
					Agency
Totals this report	6,562.41		1,640.61	8,203.02	
Total of Prior Claims	16,588.07		4,147.02	20,735.09	
Accumulated Project Totals	23,150.48		5,787.63	28,938.11	

(Note: Snohomish County will only claim amount budgeted by contract for this element.)

-24-



STATEMENT OF COSTS AND
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

CLAIM NUMBER 4

Grantee's Name & Address	Contract Number	Cost Period & Element Completed
Snohomish County Planning County Admin. Bldg. Everett, WA 98201	CZM - FY 1980	Element II 4/1/80 through 6/30/80

Project Budget: Federal \$ 2108
State
Local 527
Total Budget: \$ 2635

I certify that costs listed below
have been incurred in conformance
with this contract.

Shannon Hart
for Greg Williams
(Signature of Project Official)

Cost Categories (as approved in grant budget)	Costs for Report Period			Total Cost Per Category	Agency
	Federal	State	Local		
1. Salaries and Wages	695.89		173.97	869.86	
2. Employee Benefits	118.30		29.58	147.88	
3. Consultant & Contract Services					
4. Consumable Supplies					
5. Copying Service					
6. Travel					
7. Equipment					
8. Indirect Costs	69.59		17.40	86.99	
Totals this report	883.78		220.95	1104.73	
Total of Prior Claims	1228.26		307.06	1535.32	
Accumulated Project Totals	2112.04		528.01	2640.05	

(Note: Snohomish County will only claim amount budgeted by contract
for this element.)
ECY 030-3-15(a)

Rev. 9/78



STATEMENT OF COSTS AND
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

CLAIM NUMBER 4

Grantee's Name & Address	Contract Number	Cost Period & Element Completed
Snohomish County Planning County Admin. Bldg. Everett, WA 98201	CZM - FY 1980	Element III 4/1/80 through 6/30/80

Project Budget: Federal \$ 1751
State _____
Local 438
Total Budget: \$ 2189

I certify that costs listed below
have been incurred in conformance
with this contract.

Shanna Hart
(Signature of Project Official)

Cost Categories (as approved in grant budget)	Costs for Report Period <i>For Greg Williams</i>			Total Cost Per Category	
	Federal	State	Local		
1. Salaries and Wages	1501.25		375.31	1876.56	
2. Employee Benefits	255.22		63.80	319.02	
3. Consultant & Contract Services					
4. Consumable Supplies					
5. Copying Service					
6. Travel					
7. Equipment					
8. Indirect Costs	150.13		37.53	187.66	
Totals this report	906.60		476.64	2383.24	Agency
Total of Prior Claims	2172.19		543.03	2615.22	
Accumulated Project Totals	4078.79		1019.67	4998.46	

(Note: Snohomish County will only claim amount budgeted by contract
for this element.)



STATEMENT OF COSTS AND
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

CLAIM NUMBER 4

Grantee's Name & Address	Contract Number	Cost Period & Element Completed
Snohomish County Planning County Admin. Bldg. Everett, WA 98201	CZM - FY 1980	Element IV 4/1/80 through 6/30/80

Project Budget: Federal \$ 2036
State _____
Local 577
Total Budget: \$ 2883

I certify that costs listed below
have been incurred in conformance
with this contract.

Shannon Hart
(Signature of Project Official)
for Greg Williams

Cost Categories (as approved in grant budget)	Costs for Report Period			Total Cost Per Category	
	Federal	State	Local		
1. Salaries and Wages	1099.12		274.78	1373.90	
2. Employee Benefits	186.85		46.71	233.56	
3. Consultant & Contract Services					
4. Consumable Supplies					
5. Copying Service					
6. Travel					
7. Equipment					
8. Indirect Costs	109.91		27.48	137.39	
Totals this report	1395.88		348.97	1744.85	
Total of Prior Claims	3392.32		847.85	4240.39	
Accumulated Project Totals	4788.20		196.82	5985.24	

Agency

(Note: Snohomish County will only claim amount budgeted by contract
for this element.)

ECY 030-3-15(a)

Rev. 9/78

STATE OF WASHINGTON INVOICE VOUCHER

AGENCY NAME

Department of Ecology
Olympia, WA

INSTRUCTIONS TO VENDOR OR CLAIMANT: SUBMIT THIS FORM IN TRIPLICATE TO CLAIM PAYMENT FOR MATERIALS, MERCHANDISE OR SERVICES. SHOW COMPLETE DETAIL FOR EACH ITEM.

AGENCY PR OR AUTHORIZATION NO.

INVOICE VOUCHER DATE

July 11, 1980

VENDOR OR CLAIMANT

Snohomish County Planning
County Administration Bldg.
Everett, WA 98201

VENDOR'S CERTIFICATE. I HEREBY CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE ITEMS AND TOTALS LISTED HEREIN ARE PROPER CHARGES FOR MATERIALS, MERCHANDISE OR SERVICES FURNISHED TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, AND THAT ALL GOODS FURNISHED AND/OR SERVICES RENDERED HAVE BEEN PROVIDED WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON THE GROUNDS OF RACE, CREED, COLOR, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, OR AGE.

HY

for Greg Williams (Assistant Dir.)

(TITLE)

DATE	DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	FOR AGENCY USE
7/11/80	Salaries/Wages (as limited by contract)				4770.15	
	Benefits (as limited by contract)				694.21	
	Equipment				800.00	
	Transportation				143.37	
	Indirect Costs (as limited by contract)				411.86	
	TOTAL EXPENSE				6819.59	
	less 20% match				1363.92	
					5455.67	
	less 10% retainer				545.57	
	TOTAL CLAIM				4910.10 * (OVER)	
DOCUMENT #	LIQUIDATION DATE					

BUS.	AUTO FR.	P.P.	EX.	RAIL	CARRIER	SHIPPING DOC. NO.	COLL.	PPD.	NO. OF PCS	RECEIVED BY	
DIV. OR UNIT RECEIVED FOR						DIV. OR UNIT RECEIVED BY				DATE OF RECEIPT	FRT. CHARGE

[illegible]

RECEIVED
BY

(DATE)

TOTAL

CHECKED AND APPROVED
FOR PAYMENT BY:

INVOICE DATE

INVOICE NO.

GROSS INV. AMT.

DISCOUNT IN \$

NET INV. AMT.

VOUCHER NO.

WARRANT NO.

*Note: Actual costs to Snohomish County were as reported on attached statements. We are charging, however, only that amount budgeted by contract. For Element I we are charging only \$3342.75 for salaries, \$542.88 for benefits, and \$334.28 for indirect costs. For Element II we are charging only \$770.77 for salaries, \$151.33 for benefits, and \$77.58 for indirect costs. For Element III we are transferring the unused monies we had budgeted for transportation in Elements I, II, and III (\$456.63) to salaries and wages. For Element IV we are transferring the unused monies we had budgeted for equipment in that Element (\$200) to salaries and wages. The total amount of monies transferred in less than 5% of the contract amount.

NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CTR LIBRARY



3 6668 14112912 4