

Mary Cunningham

From: Marianne Nelsen [mariannenelsen@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2010 3:53 PM
To: Mary Cunningham
Subject: waterfront

Hello,
I would like to comment about what I would love to see as part of the waterfront project.

I would love to see a place along the river for music to be played. I'm not talking about the Rolling Stones or any big groups. I am talking about acoustic guitar types, Lyle Lovitt types, cultural dancing and singing etc. This would be greatly appreciated.

I live in Lynnwood and I am 63 years old so I am not a teen ager. When the convention center was made here, there was no regard for music. That was a big mistake. As you can see the center sits empty most of the time.

Please consider this in your plan. I am so excited about this riverfront project. Music would be a great addition.

Thank you,

Marianne Nelsen

Cell: 425-210-4424

Hotmail: Free, trusted and rich email service. [Get it now.](#)

Letter B

Mary Cunningham

From: Eberlein, Mark [mark.eberlein@dhs.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2010 11:30 AM
To: Mary Cunningham
Cc: Graves, John
Subject: Everett Riverfront Redevelopment Addendum

Ms. Cunningham,

I briefly reviewed your addendum. Thank you for the notice. I have the following comment:

On page 24, the Trigger for the Floodplain Development Permit states that "Some projects, such as restoration, may be exempt or qualify for expedited reviews." Under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), restoration projects are considered development and therefore do require a floodplain development permit. There is a misunderstanding about state law exempting all restoration projects from local/state permits. This is incorrect. State law cannot usurp federal law such as the floodplain permit requirements necessary for a community to participate in the NFIP. For further clarification on this, contact Dan Sokol, Dept. of Ecology, 360-407-6796.

Recommend that you remove that last sentence or at least reference to the exemption.

Sincerely,

Mark Eberlein
Regional Environmental Officer
FEMA Region 10
425-487-4735

Mary Cunningham

From: Dick McManus [dick.mcmanus@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 6:07 PM
To: Mary Cunningham
Subject: I am Against the Proposed Riverfront re-development

Ms Cunningham,

For one, our city should not get into any debt because we are headed for a very great DEPRESSION. Because we are running out of cheap oil and natural gas, I don't see the economy ever improving.] 1

Secondly, this area needs to be restricted/zone-off to any development because of sea level rise due to global climate change.] 2
Dick

Joining the ROE caucuses we have 47 members

We have started a Running on Empty (ROE) caucus of Washington State Democrats . We have also started a national and Earth/UN ROE caucus. The goal of this caucus is to bring more emphasis by our Party to the coming end of cheap oil and natural gas which will result in an extreme disaster.

To become a member of our caucus we require some more information from you. If you agree or basically agree with the following statements and you are a Democrat, then we will accept you into our caucus.

Note we don't get into HOW the population should be reduced. I think that is a question for civil society.

1. There are no sustainable energy sources that will rescue us at our current population levels.
 2. Population reduction must be a part of any plan to rationally deal with peak oil (the end of cheap oil, natural gas, and coal), global climate change, biological/species decline, and natural resource depletion.
 3. Global climate change will **only** be mitigated with extremely stringent emissions policies that reduce consumption rates and this must be done before fossil fuels are depleted.
 4. Absent immediate attention to peak oil, our government and/or political system have no chance whatsoever to react soon enough to help us.
-

Books about Problem(s)

Richard Heinberg	The Party's Over
Richard Heinberg	Power down
James Kunstler	The Long Emergency
Thom Hartmann	Unequal Protection
David Korten	Agenda for a New Economy

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/RunningOnEmptyDemocratCaucusWA/>
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/ROEearthUN/>
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/RunningOnEmptyCaucusDemocratsUSA>

Letter D

February 1, 2010

Mary Cunningham
City of Everett Planning and Community Development Dept.
2930 Wetmore Ave., Suite 8A
Everett, WA 98201

**Comment re: Addendum No. 2 to Everett Riverfront Redevelopment FEIS
Addressing the Riverfront Development Public Amenities Master Plan**

Everett Shorelines Coalition (ESC) has previously reviewed and indicated support for previous versions of the Public Amenities Master Plan and EIS that addressed environmental objectives, impacts and mitigation. Our comments below suggest minor additions and/or clarifications to **EIS Addendum No. 2's** references to procedures and responsibilities for obtaining necessary project approvals.

A.) Permit Review

From Notice of Issuance of Addendum No. 2 to FEIS and Hearing on PAMP:

“The proposed action also includes issuance of permits for the public amenities, including wetland, stream and habitat enhancements.”

1. Because the Public Amenities Plan applies to separate locations within the overall Redevelopment area, including some that abut or enfold small segments constrained by external ownership or state jurisdiction, ESC recommends reconciliation of confusing inconsistencies between the two tables addressing potentially needed approvals:

Table 2 in Addendum No. 2, pp. 23, 24, Approvals Required for Amenities Projects and

Counterpart table in the PAMP Appendix, C-1 – C-4, Potential Permits Matrix

For instance,

- A. Potential Lease of Aquatic Lands is listed in Addendum No. 2 under “WA STATE PARKS AND RECREATION”, with DNR as Lead Agency, for three separate in-water riverbank modification sites. The table in the PAMP lists only the 3-Acre Park project site as potentially requiring Lease of Aquatic Lands, under “WA STATE DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES”, and lists all three of those same project sites under potential NPDES stormwater discharge easements from WA DEPT. OF ECOLOGY (?)
- B. Table 2 breaks out, as a separate potential approval requirement under the DOE section addressing “stormwater discharges from construction sites”: “Confirmation that fill is consistent with existing agreements for restrictive covenant”, in regard to project work at Wetland D (p. 24), which does not appear in the PAMP Table. Table 2 also adds “BNSF permission” (also not listed in the PAMP table) as potentially needed for “Drainage or Construction Easement or Design Review”,.

It's unclear which of these Tables represents the correct and most up-to-date starting assumptions for First Phase project planning.

2. Another minor clarification that would be helpful to public understanding in regard to the project site-specific *biological assessment and mitigation plans* (Addendum No. 2, sections 12.4.4, 12.7.4, 12.9.4, 13.1.4, 13.5.4, 13.7.4) would be addition of a statement indicating whether acceptance of this type of plan (mitigation plan) is **a**) based upon simple confirmation by the Planning Staff of satisfactory completion of a SEPA Environmental Checklist, or **b**) more formally decided and reported per EMC 15.16 Review Process 1.

2

B) PAMP Priorities

ESC continues to endorse the Plan's priorities on re-establishment of tidally-influenced stream connectivity to the Snohomish River for Bigelow and Walton Creeks and expansion of public access. We're also encouraged to note the Plan's attention to preservation, where feasible, of habitat supporting the existing natural range of wildlife, such as retention of snags for cavity nesting birds and well-vegetated stream corridors for beavers, in addition to habitat for aquatic species.

3

Thank you for considering our comments.

Peggy Toepel,
President, Everett Shorelines Coalition
P.O. Box 13288
Everett, WA 98206

Letter E

City Planning Dept.

Feb 8, 2010

Dear Mary Cunningham,

The final Environmental Impact Statement concerning ~~the~~ Everett's Riverfront Development looks excellent to me. Natural habitats are protected, public access is generous, including a lovely 3 acre city park. I appreciate your very diligent efforts on this plan. I look forward to its completion. Won't it be great when all the citizens of Everett get to walk, ride a bike, kayak, and play along the beautiful Snohomish (over) →

River waterfront:] |

Yours,

John Lindstrom

1211 Rucker Ev. 98201

RECEIVED
FEB - 8 2010

CITY OF EVERETT
Planning Dept.

Letter F

Mary Cunningham

From: Soine, Candice [spwccs@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2010 10:38 AM
To: Mary Cunningham
Cc: Stenstrom, Clarissa; Ritz, Crilly; Terwilleger, Debbie; Flint, Cindy; McCormick, Douglas; Godley, George; Bloodgood, Jim; Rucci, Melody; Soine, Candice; Strong, Leah; Hull, Fran; Santeford, Donna
Subject: Snohomish County Public Works Review Comments for the Everett Riverfront Redevelopment Addendum No. 2
Attachments: SWMComments_EvtRiverfrontAdd2.docx

Mary Cunningham, Sr. Planner
City of Everett Public Works

Snohomish County Public Works has reviewed the proposed Addendum No. 2 and our Surface Water Management Division offers the attached comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and submit comments. If you have any questions or concerns regarding our comments, please contact me and I will refer them to the appropriate reviewer.

Candice Soine, Environmental Review Coordinator

Snohomish County Public Works
TES - Environmental Services
3000 Rockefeller, 5th Floor Admin West
Everett, WA 98201

(425) 388-3488 extension 4259
candice.soine@co.snohomish.wa.us

Everett Riverfront Redevelopment Addendum No. 2
Snohomish County Surface Water Management Division

Comments:

The redevelopment of the Everett riverfront in the vicinity of Lowell is a unique and challenging project. The history of the site clearly shows previously intense commercial and industrial uses. The redevelopment of this site offers unique opportunities that can create wins for multiple public policy objectives, including urban development, flood protection, riverine habitat restoration (salmon recovery), water quality and public access to the river environment. Snohomish County Surface Water Management is engaged in a number of activities, including floodplain management, flood control, erosion control, habitat restoration etc. Snohomish County is the lead entity in WRIA 7, the Snohomish Basin, for salmon recovery. The following general comments are therefore offered in that context:

1. Any fill placed in the regulatory floodway must be compensated with fill removal to maintain the capacity of the Snohomish River to convey floodwaters.] 1
2. River bank erosion will likely be a long term problem. Bank stabilization measures should be bioengineered to facilitate habitat improvements along the river edge. Use of anchored large wood and rootwads in addition to riparian plantings are encouraged. Snohomish County's river management program may be able to provide design assistance.] 2
3. The restoration of Bigelow Creek in this tidal area of the Snohomish River should be designed to maximize juvenile salmonid access and habitat complexity.] 3
4. Use of innovative stormwater techniques is encouraged to minimize water quality impacts to the Snohomish River.] 4
5. Close coordination with Diking District 1 on Ebey Island and the Marshland Flood Control District is encouraged. These two districts are in the immediate vicinity of the project and have the most interest in continued flood protection.] 5

More specific comments are provided below:

Addendum 2, pages 71, 78, 89: In the Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation Plan (2005), increasing edge complexity in the estuary is a high priority. Given the documented high juvenile salmonid use of the Snohomish River mainstem in the estuary, consider increasing edge complexity in this important rearing area. This same edge complexity would also benefit areas that call for shoreline stabilization. Snohomish County has completed projects at Fields Riffle and Norwegian Bay that could serve as examples.] 6

Revised Appendix D, page 55-59: Given the overall scale and scope of the buffer enhancements, we strongly encourage the City and Oliver McMillan, LLC (OM) to maximize, to the extent possible, shoreline edge complexity (with large woody debris placement) up and downstream of the openings into the tidal wetland complexes. Furthermore, we strongly encourage the City and] 7

OM to maximize the potential use of this edge complexity at multiple (not a single) flow levels and tidal conditions in the estuary. This site is one of very few opportunities to establish greater habitat complexity along the mainstem Snohomish River in the estuary, an area where documented juvenile salmonid use is highest (Mindy Rowse, NOAA – Northwest Fisheries Science Center, pers. comm., 2009). The Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum and Snohomish basin Salmonid Recovery Technical Committee have expressed interest in this site for these reasons and would be willing to assist the City in this effort.

7
cont.

Addendum 2: Extensive fill is to be added for trail systems, parking lots, and structures. Some structures will be designed to withstand floods while other will be raised to a higher elevation. It is recommended that all structures be designed to withstand floods and thereby decrease the amount of fill needed. Parking lots and structures should be located as far from the river as possible to allow for a vegetated buffer along the shore while minimizing the impact to existing wetlands.

8

Addendum 2: In several areas of the project, the plan mentions adding fill to stabilize banks. SWM discourages the use of fill and recommends the use of bioengineering techniques.

9

Addendum 2, page 3: We encourage the City to do minimal channel excavation and rather allow natural habitat-forming processes to act in the area to form channels, also reducing the cost of construction.

10

Addendum 2, page 5: Water treatment for the Bigelow Creek and South Wetland Complex (and possibly other wetland areas) was designed to treat surface waters to the 2-year flood event. We are concerned that larger flows would bypass this treatment system. For the wetland complexes to have a significant impact on water quality, they must be designed to handle higher than 2-year flows. In addition, we encourage the City to consider designing the wetlands to handle a higher surface water capacity that will likely come with expected development in the areas surrounding this project.

11

Addendum 2, page 94: There is concern regarding the number and size of connections to the Snohomish River from the wetland complexes. We want to encourage as much tidal influence as possible and also minimize stranding of salmonids in the wetland complexes during low flows. Further, we hope designs will maximize the area open to tidal influence and allow the potential for scour around the openings, while still providing for flood protection and public use. These issues are not clearly outlined in the Addendum.

12

Addendum 2: It appears the proposed riparian buffer along most of the riverfront is 50ft or less, in part, to allow for a trail system that provides access and views of the river. Buffer enhancement is proposed, but limiting the buffer width will yield limited improvements for targeted buffer functions: sediment removal, nutrient removal, metals removal, maintenance of microclimate, contribution as wildlife habitat/corridor, and noise abatement (Appendix D, p. 56). It is suggested that this buffer be widened to provide for protection from bank erosion, increase wildlife habitat, and increase capacity for vegetation to filter pollutants and stormwater runoff associated with park management activities and development. A 100ft vegetated buffer with limited access points for public via trails is recommended.

13

Addendum 2, page 71: Without a detailed hydraulic analysis, we are concerned over the use of a culvert for the Bigelow Creek crossing. A bridge may be a better approach, with more capacity and fewer future maintenance issues.] 14

Revised Appendix D, page 53: Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis*) should be added to the proposed buffer enhancement planting list.] 15

Addendum 2, pages 5, 78, & 103: At the south end of the project site, in the existing Lowell Riverfront Park, several activities are proposed including pavement of parking areas, the addition of an interpretive center, and bank stabilization involving bioengineering, sheet pile, and rock rip-rap. This section is along the outer bend of the river in an area highly prone to erosion. Extensive erosion and bank undercutting is already occurring. Extensive planting of native trees to stabilize this portion of the bank is recommended and parking areas and the interpretive center would be better located elsewhere. We recommend a focus on bioengineering techniques for bank stabilization with limited use of rock rip-rap and oppose the use of sheet pile.] 16

Addendum 2, page 3: Removal of beaver dams is discouraged if possible to maintain an active beaver presence at the site. Current restoration/enhancement/relocation activities to encourage beavers once they are gone from a site have had a very low success rate.] 17

Addendum 2: Given the size and nature of the wetland, tidal, and stream elements enhanced in this project, we hope that the City will join with the Port, County and Tulalip Tribes on maintenance and monitoring of projects within the Snohomish Estuary. We suggest starting a monitoring bank, where these organizations can bank money and capacity for monitoring on an estuary-wide scale.] 18

Addendum 2: A monitoring and maintenance program should be developed for the created and restored wetland and riparian buffer areas. As Wetland C, and presumably other areas, are dominated by reed canarygrass, the recovery of these areas will likely take at least 5 years of intensive site maintenance to establish a partial canopy cover to shade out invasive weeds.] 19

Addendum 2, page 89: SEWIP is first mentioned here and not on page 81 where other documents are referenced.] 20

Addendum 2: We appreciate the City's continued commitment to adding restoration (and associated outreach/education) elements to this important development.] 21

Addendum 2: We appreciate the City's following the Snohomish Plan for the Estuary, where passive recreation is a preferred use over higher impact/intensity uses.] 21

Addendum 2: We appreciate the City's use of bioswales and other features to remediate stormwater water quality impacts, though they are not required.] 21

Letter G

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2010

CITY OF EVERETT
Planning Dept.

404 72nd St SE
Everett WA 982023
Feb 6, 2010

Dear Ms Cunningham:

My biggest fear concerning the Riverfront development just north of Rotary Park is that there will not be a sufficient green belt between the river and the commercial and residential development. And I'm not talking about some huge lawn that dumps nitrogen fertilizer continually into the river. I mean native trees and plants that would buffer the development from the natural beauty of the riverbank.

I walk on the Rivefront trail frequently and each time I walk there, I think about the serenity of the area, and that this is the last place in the South Everett area that one can walk on an extended trail away from traffic and development.

Please, for the sake of ordinary citizens who use the trail, do not take away this treasured walk that we have now, and expose the walker to the development.

Rick Hunter
425-710-9175
lillypad4343@gmail.com