

SUBMITTED TO: Port of Everett 1205 Craftsman Way, Suite 200 Everett, WA 98201



BY: Shannon & Wilson 400 N. 34th Street, Suite 100 Seattle, WA 98103

(206) 632-8020 www.shannonwilson.com

YEAR 3 MONITORING REPORT Bay Wood Interim Action Cleanup and Shoreline Restoration Project CITY OF EVERETT, WASHINGTON







January 30, 2025 Shannon & Wilson No: 102336-025 Submitted To: Port of Everett 1205 Craftsman Way, Suite 200 Everett, WA 98201 Attn: Mr. Jake Kirschner

Subject: YEAR 3 MONITORING REPORT, BAY WOOD INTERIM ACTION CLEANUP AND SHORELINE RESTORATION PROJECT, CITY OF EVERETT, WASHINGTON

Shannon & Wilson participated in this project as a consultant to the Port of Everett.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. If you have any questions about the contents of this report, please contact Sarah at (206) 695-6674 or <u>sarah.corbin@shanwil.com</u> or Amy at (206) 695-6685 or <u>amy.summe@shanwil.com</u>.

Sincerely,

SHANNON & WILSON

Sarah Corbin, PWS, MSES Senior Biologist/Permit Specialist

AJS:SCC:KLW/ajs:scc

AmyfSumme

Amy Summe, PWS Senior Biologist/Permit Specialist

1	Introduction1						
2	Location1						
3	Restoration Plan Summary2						
4	Goa	s and Objectives2					
	4.1	Goal 1 – Shoreline Cleanup					
	4.2	Goal 2 – Shoreline Restoration					
	4.3	Goal 3 – Buffer Enhancement					
	4.4	Goal 4 – Public Access					
5	Perf	rmance Standards4					
6	Yea	3 Methods5					
7	Yea	3 Results and Observations					
	7.1	Woody Plant Survival					
	7.2	Native Emergent Cover7					
	7.3	Woody Plant Cover9					
	7.4	Noxious and Nuisance Weed Cover					
	7.5	Large Woody Debris					
	7.6	Shoreline Condition					
8	Mai	tenance and Contingency Measures14					
	8.1	Requirements					
		8.1.1 Maintenance					
		8.1.2 Plant Replacement					
	8.2	Recommendations					
9	Futı	re Performance Monitoring16					
10	Clos	ıre16					
11	Refe	rences					

#### Exhibits

Exhibit 5-1: Vegetation Performance Standards	.5
Exhibit 7-1: Observed Live Woody Plants on the Waterward Side of the Bay Wood Nature	
Trail	.7
Exhibit 7-2: Emergent Cover in Sample Plots	.8

Exhibit 7-3: Example Planted Emergent Areas on the South Shore	9
Exhibit 7-4: Year 3 Installed Plant Aerial Cover	9
Exhibit 7-5: Photos of the Southern (Left) and Northern (Right) Supplemental Rock	
Placement Areas on the West Shore	13
Exhibit 7-6: Photos of Beach Areas on the South Shore	13
Exhibit 8-1: Approved and Installed Woody Vegetation Species Replacements	15

#### Figures

Figure 1:	Vicinity Map
Figure 2:	Monitoring Map
Figure 3:	<b>Emergent Vegetation Communities</b>

#### Appendices

Appendix A: Final Construction Plans Appendix B: Site Photographs Appendix C: Native Woody Cover Data Important Information

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Shannon & Wilson prepared this monitoring report on behalf of the Port of Everett (Port) for the Bay Wood Interim Action Cleanup and Shoreline Restoration Project (Project) to document the Year 3 performance of the Project, consistent with the *Bay Wood Shoreline Interim Cleanup and Restoration Plan* (Project Restoration Plan) (Shannon & Wilson, 2019a). This Project was completed as a Model Toxics Control Act Interim Cleanup Action with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) under an Agreed Order (AO) (AO No. 5490, amended in February 2020) and received a Remedial Action Grant from Ecology. The Project was designed to achieve environmental cleanup, habitat restoration, and buffer enhancements along most of the upland shoreline.

The Project was completed in conjunction with and in support of upland site redevelopment of the Bay Wood property (Property). The shoreline cleanup and restoration has significantly improved ecological function of the shoreline as part of an interim cleanup action with Ecology. These benefits also fulfilled the requirements of a critical area buffer reduction granted by the City of Everett (City) to support the upland development of the Property. The interim action and associated monitoring were conducted in consultation with Ecology staff and in accordance with the AO and subsequent planning documents, including the *Restoration Design Criteria Memorandum* (Shannon & Wilson, 2019b), *Final Compliance Monitoring Plan* (Landau Associates, Inc. [LAI], 2020a), *Interim Action Work Plan* (LAI, 2020c), the Engineering Design Report (LAI, 2020b), and associated authorizing permits. See the *As-Built Restoration Monitoring Report* (Shannon & Wilson, 2022) for additional regulatory background.

This Year 3 monitoring report documents the progress of the Project towards achievement of the performance standards, as set forth in the Project Restoration Plan.

## 2 LOCATION

The site is located at 200 West Marine View Drive, Everett, Washington (Section 07, Township 29N, Range 05E) (Figure 1). Adjacent land uses include tidal mudflats and vacant land owned by Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. to the north; West Marine View Drive, BNSF railroad tracks, and Maulsby Swamp to the east; the W&W Everett Industries property to the south; and the Snohomish River and Port Gardner Bay to the west. The Project area includes the shoreline associated with the Property and 50 feet upland of the ordinary high water mark (Figure 2). The inland portion of the Property is a recently completed commercial building complex.

### 3 RESTORATION PLAN SUMMARY

The Project temporarily impacted wetlands, streams, and their buffers as a result of debris removal, shoreline grading, and removal of invasive species to prepare the site for shoreline and buffer restoration. The final construction plans are included in Appendix A; the original Project Restoration Plan and the more detailed descriptions of the Restoration Plan elements and implementation can be found in the *As-Built Restoration Monitoring Report* (Shannon & Wilson, 2022) and the *Year 1 Monitoring Report* (Shannon & Wilson, 2023).

- November 2020 February 2021: Grading and large woody debris (LWD) installations.
- March 2021: Initial plant installation.
- June 2022: Re-installed plantings that were removed related to upland site development activity.
- August 2022: As-Built Restoration Monitoring Report finalized and then submitted by the Port to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Ecology, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and the City on January 4, 2023.
- December 2022: Supplemental erosion protection installation on the west shore following coordination with Ecology, WDFW, and the Tulalip Tribe. See the *As-Built Restoration Monitoring Report* (Shannon & Wilson, 2022) and the *Year 1 Monitoring Report* (Shannon & Wilson, 2023) for more information.
- May 2023: In response to planting plan recommendations based on Year 1 percent survival results, an additional 12 trees, 362 shrubs, and 6 groundcovers were installed.
- October 2024: In response to planting plan recommendations made by Shannon & Wilson and approved by Ecology, based on a spring 2024 plant count, an additional 50 trees and 547 shrubs were installed.

## 4 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following goals and objectives were established in the Project Restoration Plan and are based on the City's Shoreline Master Program (City, 2019a<sup>1</sup>), the recovery actions for the Snohomish estuary found in the *Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation Plan* (Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, 2005), and the *Snohomish Estuary Wetland Integration Plan* (City, 1997). Following each of the stated goals and objectives is an assessment of whether the goal/objectives have been met, when they were met as applicable, or if fulfilment is still in progress/being evaluated.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> At the time of Project Restoration Plan development, the 2016 version of the Shoreline Master Program was the most recent adopted edition. The goals and objectives are still consistent with the most recent 2019 version.

#### 4.1 Goal 1 – Shoreline Cleanup

Goal 1: Clean up the shoreline by removing anthropogenic debris to restore the shoreline to a more natural state.

- Objective 1.1: Remove bulkheads and replace with soft shore stabilization measures.
- Objective 1.2: Remove debris, including dimensional lumber and wood chips, log skids, riprap rock (quarry spalls), asphalt, concrete, and trash, to the extent feasible.

☑ Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 have been met.

 $\square$  Goal 1: ACHIEVED. This goal and the related objectives have been met as of construction.

#### 4.2 Goal 2 – Shoreline Restoration

Goal 2: Restore the degraded shoreline habitat to improve habitat for fish and wildlife species, specifically aquatic habitat to support juvenile salmonids using the Snohomish River estuary.

 Objective 2.1: Restore shoreline grades to a gradual slope that can support native intertidal and riparian vegetation on the west- and south-facing shorelines. The north-facing shoreline will not be graded due to restrictions imposed by the Corps training wall and associated easement.

Objective 2.1 has been met, although the west shore is not suited to intertidal emergent vegetation establishment at this time, based on erosion associated with wind and wave exposure and the supplemental placement of erosion protection.

• Objective 2.2: Install LWD to stabilize the slope and provide habitat.

Objective 2.2 has been met.

 Objective 2.3: Restore and expand estuarine wetlands along the shoreline to create saltmarsh habitat.

□ To date, installed emergent vegetation on the south shore is establishing, increasing in density and continuing to spread in some areas. Achievement of Objective 2.3 will continue to be monitored during future site visits. A determination of completion will be made once the newly establishing emergent communities appear to be stable.

Goal 2: Objectives 2.1 and 2.2 have been met as of construction, with long-term monitoring underway for Objective 2.3.

#### 4.3 Goal 3 – Buffer Enhancement

Goal 3: Establish native riparian vegetation community along the shoreline that includes long-term sources of LWD to support productive shoreline habitat.

• Objective 3.1: Reestablish native riparian plant communities along the shoreline.

To date, the native riparian plantings are doing well, with relatively high survival and installation of additional planting in 2023 and 2024 (see Sections 7.1 and 7.2). Achievement of Objective 3.1 will continue to be monitored during future site visits.

• Objective 3.2: Reintroduce LWD through plantings and wood placement.

Objective 3.2 has been met.

Goal 3: Objective 3.2 was met as of construction, with long-term monitoring underway for Objective 3.1.

#### 4.4 Goal 4 – Public Access

Goal 4: Create public access/use opportunities consistent with the City's Shoreline Public Access Plan (City, 2019b<sup>2</sup>).

 Objective 4.1: Integrate trails and amenities for public access into shoreline restoration actions, as appropriate considering development requirements, safety considerations, availability of space, restoration goals, existing easements, etc.

Objective 4.1 has been met.

Goal 4: ACHIEVED. The trail was formally opened to the public in July 2022. Many trail users have been observed during each monitoring visit.

### 5 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Success of the mitigation (restoration and enhancement) will be determined based on meeting standards for minimum plant survival (through Year 2); minimum cover of native vegetation; and maximum allowed cover of invasive, nonnative plant species over ten growing seasons (Exhibit 5-1). Invasive, nonnative plant species include those on the Snohomish County Noxious Weed List, including any revisions to the list during the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> At the time of Project Restoration Plan development, the 2016 version of the Shoreline Public Access Plan was the most recent adopted edition. The goals and objectives are still consistent with the most recent 2019 version.

ten-year monitoring period for the Project. Removal of invasive species not on the Snohomish County weed list is encouraged; however, presence of these species will not contribute to the 10% invasive cover performance standard.

#### **Exhibit 5-1: Vegetation Performance Standards**

	Standard	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 5	Year 7	Year 10
1	Woody Plant Survival Rate (%) <sup>2</sup>	100	>80				
2	Native Emergent Vegetation Cover (%) <sup>1,2</sup>	>20	>30	>40	>60	>70	>90
3	Native Woody Vegetation Cover (%) <sup>2</sup>			>30	>60	>80	>90
4	Invasive, Nonnative Plant Cover (%)	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10

NOTES:

As noted in the As-Built Report, native emergent vegetation cover performance standards were adjusted from the Project Restoration Plan to reflect a natural establishment process that develops gradually over time; the long term goal of 90% cover in wetland areas was not changed. The emergent vegetation cover performance standards do not apply to those stretches of shoreline where exposure and erosive wave energy prevent establishment of emergent species.

2 Natural recruitment of both native woody and emergent species is expected. These recruits will be included in the survival rates and vegetation cover performance standards identified above.

### 6 YEAR 3 METHODS

Shannon & Wilson biologists completed the Year 3 monitoring site visit on August 6, 2024, as described below.

- Woody Plant Cover: Native woody plant cover was recorded for each of the ten transects using the line-intercept method (see locations in Figure 2). Percent cover was calculated by documenting the point where the canopy began and ended along each transect. Where the canopies for different species overlapped, only the start and end point of the aggregated cover was recorded (e.g., no double-counting). These distances were then totaled and divided by the total length of the transect to calculate percent cover.
- Native Emergent Cover: Percent cover of native emergent species, by species, was
  visually estimated in each of the seven 1-meter-square plots established during the
  baseline visit in the mid-shore and lower shore planting zones. The emergent plot
  locations were measured in reference to the closest transect t-post using a tape measure
  and compass. Their presence in tidal, high wave energy areas prevented installation of
  t-posts or other physical markings at the emergent plots.
- Emergent Community Development: Considering the dynamic nature of non-armored marine shorelines and the anticipated patchy and shifting evolution of the emergent plant community, the seven emergent plots will also be supported by geographic information system mapping of the general bounds of the developing emergent community (Figure 3).

- Invasive Plant Cover: An assessment of invasive species cover was made through qualitative visual assessment through the planting areas.
- Photo Points: Photos were taken at each of the 14 photo points (P1 through P14) established during the baseline visit (Figure 2; Appendix B).

## 7 YEAR 3 RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS

#### 7.1 Woody Plant Survival

As shown in Exhibit 5-1, there is no woody plant survival standard for Year 3. As noted in the Year 2 monitoring report (Shannon & Wilson, 2024a), percent survival of the woody vegetation was 77% based on an August 2023 plant count, just shy of the Year 2 performance standard of 80% survival. To meet the 80% Year 2 survival standard, 197 replacement plants would be required. However, per the Port's landscape maintenance bond with the Contractor, any plant replacements to maintain the number of plants originally installed would be planted at the end of Years 1 and 3; the bond did not require plantings at the end of Year 2.

An additional plant count was conducted on May 2, 2024, to support closeout of the maintenance bond (Exhibit 7-1). Due to construction-related plant disturbances described in the *As-Built Monitoring Report* (Shannon & Wilson, 2022), the Port only held the landscaper responsible for plants on the waterward side of the pedestrian trail. Based on the Contractor's 100% survival bond requirement, this means that the waterward side of the pedestrian trail should have, or be restored to, a total of 4,005 native woody plants. Based on the May 2024 plant count, percent survival for the area on the waterward side of the trail was 100% for trees, 86% for shrubs, and 8% for woody groundcovers (kinnikinnick), with a percent survival of 73% for combined woody vegetation. The May 2024 plant count indicated that 1,095 plants should be replaced on the waterward side of the trail, with more than half of those being kinnikinnick.

		Ali	Dead or			
Vegetation Type	South Shore	West Shore	North Shore	Total	Missing	Required
Trees	107	36	1	144	-4	140
Shrubs	1,139	702	873	2,714	531	3,245
Groundcover	13	18	21	52	568	620
Total	1,259	756	895	2,910	1,095	4,005

Exhibit 7-1: Observed Live Wood	/ Plants on the Waterward Sid	de of the Bay Wood Nature Trail
		ao or the Bay freed ratare rian

That assessment was summarized in a letter from Shannon & Wilson to the Port dated May 14, 2024 (Shannon & Wilson, 2024b), and included a recommended plant replacement table that was subsequently approved by Ecology. The plant replacement recommendations incorporated seven tree and shrub species that have exhibited a high percent survival on the site and the most vigorous growth. The Contractor installed the additional native plants in October 2024, after the Year 3 monitoring site visit on August 6, 2024; see Section 8.1 for the approved and installed plant replacement table.

#### 7.2 Native Emergent Cover

The Year 3 performance standard provided in Section 5 requires that cover of the establishing emergent community exceed 40%. Each of the seven plots established during the as-built effort was evaluated (Exhibit 7-2). Because of the significant erosion of installed substrate and high wave energy on the west shore, only one area of installed emergent remained on the west shore at the time of the as-built site visit. For that reason, only one plot was proposed at that time on the west shore, off the south end of Transect 8. As noted below and in the Year 1 report (Shannon & Wilson, 2024a), continued erosion and subsequent placement of supplemental rock since the as-built effort eliminated the emergent vegetation in that plot as well. However, a few individuals of emergent vegetation appeared on the west shore in Year 2 and continued into Year 3. Monitoring of Transect 8, Plot 1, for information purposes is continuing to document the dynamic condition of the west shore and to help inform the Port's ongoing adaptive management; however, this data is not considered in the emergent cover calculations for the site. The aggregate cover of the remaining six plots is 66%, an increase of 12% over Year 2, exceeding the 40% native emergent vegetation cover performance standard established for Year 3.

	Aggre	gate Percent	Cover			
Plot Location	Year 1 Year 2		Year 3	Individual Species' Cover in Year 3		
Transect 2, Plot 1 (17 feet from south end of T2, 270°)	22	20	45	The plot included Baltic rush (Juncus balticus).		
Transect 2, Plot 2 (25 feet from north end of T2, 210°)	33	65	80	The plot included Baltic rush, hardstem bulrush ( <i>Schoenoplectus acutus</i> ), spear saltbush ( <i>Atriplex patula</i> ), and a grass. Pickleweed ( <i>Salicornia virginica</i> ), birds-foot trefoil ( <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> ), and red sandspurry ( <i>Spergularia rubra</i> ) were nearby.		
Transect 4, Plot 1 (20 feet 6 inches from east end of T4, 230°)	41	65	80	The plot included Pacific silverweed ( <i>Argentina pacifica</i> ), Baltic rush, Lyngbye's sedge ( <i>Carex lyngbyei</i> ), and a grass.		
Transect 4, Plot 2 (26 feet from west end of T4, 175°)	70	70	95	This plot included hardstem bulrush, saltgrass ( <i>Distichlis spicata</i> ), sea plantain ( <i>Plantago maritima</i> ), and a grass.		
Transect 5, Plot 1 (31 feet from north end of T5, 230°)	10	43	50	The plot included hardstem bulrush and Pacific silverweed.		
Transect 5, Plot 2 (31 feet from south end of T5, 250°)	18	60	45	The plot included sea plantain, saltgrass, Douglas aster ( <i>Symphyotrichum subspicatum</i> ), and Pacific silverweed. Birds-foot trefoil (7%) was also present.		
Average of emergent plots with vegetation	32	54	66			
Transect 8, Plot 1 (28 feet from north end of T8, 220°)	0	6	5	This plot contained Baltic rush, spear saltbush, and strawberry clover ( <i>Trifolium fragiferum</i> ). Less than 1% birds-foot trefoil was also present.		

Exhibit 7-2: Emergent Cover in Sample Plots

All the emergent and herbaceous species in the low- and mid-shore planting zones plant schedule were observed, and the dominants included baltic rush, hardstem bulrush, saltgrass, coast gumweed<sup>3</sup> (*Grindelia integrifolia*), Pacific silverweed, and Douglas aster (Exhibit 7-3). The pre-existing estuarine wetlands dominated by hardstem bulrush, Lyngbye's sedge, alkali bulrush (*Bolboschoenus maritimus*), and spear saltbush are still thriving. These existing estuarine wetland species are expected to naturally expand into the low- and mid-shore planting areas and appear to be expanding incrementally.

To support the plot data and observations, the general boundaries of areas with emergent vegetation were captured in the field with hand-held global positioning system equipment

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Coast gumweed was abundant in the mid-shore planting zone, but was coincidentally absent from the emergent cover plots.

and are shown in Figure 3. Continued monitoring of the emergent communities is necessary to determine if the areas are expanding or increasing in density and cover.



Exhibit 7-3: Example Planted Emergent Areas on the South Shore (Photos Taken August 6, 2024)

#### 7.3 Woody Plant Cover

Ten transects were established during the as-built site visit in 2021 — four in the upper shore planting zone and six in the riparian planting zones, distributed in the South Shore, West Shore, and North Shore planting areas. A summary of data collected using the line-intercept method and general observations for each transect are provided in Exhibit 7-4. Appendix C contains the raw data for each transect, and photos taken from photo points at one end of each transect are included in Appendix B.

Exhibit 7-4: Year 3 Installed Plant Aerial Cove
Exhibit 7-4: Year 3 Installed Plant Aerial Cove

	Percent Aerial Cover by Woody Species			Groundcover Notes	
Transect # (length)	Year 2 Year 3		Woody Cover Notes		
T1 (65 feet)	16.2	21.5	This transect was dominated by willow, but also included snowberry, rose, twinberry, and a shore pine.	Dense seashore lupine, strawberry clover, and grasses.	
T2 (65 feet)	42.8	50.0	This transect only included willow.	Dense seashore lupine and strawberry clover, with Queen Anne's lace, English plantain, and grasses.	
T3 (100 feet)	15.9	18.2	This transect was dominated by rose, with significant presence of Oregon grape and shore pine. Crabapple and twinberry were also present.	Strawberry clover, grasses, English plantain, and abundant field horsetail.	

Percent Aerial Cover by Woody Species					
Transect # (length)	Year 2	Year 3	Woody Cover Notes	Groundcover Notes	
T4 (100 feet)	15.7	22.4	This transect only included willow.	Dense seashore lupine and strawberry clover, with English plantain and grasses. Also present were non-native bull thistle, white sweet clover, and Scotch broom.	
T5 (100 feet)	15.6	17.5	This transect was dominated by willow, with significant presence of Douglas-fir and serviceberry.	Dense strawberry clover, with grasses and English plantain.	
T6 (100 feet)	7.8	12.5	This transect only included willow.	Dense seashore lupine and strawberry clover, with English plantain, grasses, and Douglas aster. Also present was non-native yellow glandweed ( <i>Bellardia viscosa</i> ).	
T7 (100 feet)	6.5	5.1	This transect was dominated by snowberry and thimbleberry, but also included serviceberry, Oregon grape, and willow.	Dense strawberry clover	
T8 (adjusted to 48.6 feet from 65 feet due to sand beach encroachment in Year 3)	6.2	23.7	This transect only included willow.	Mix of Douglas aster, strawberry clover, English plantain, seashore lupine and a few non-native Scotch broom.	
T9 (100 feet)	18.9	33.1	This transect was dominated by willow; snowberry, twinberry, and serviceberry were also present.	Mix of grasses, strawberry clover, and seashore lupine, with a few western dock and non-native birds-foot trefoil.	
T10 (100 feet)	7.1	10.1	This transect was dominated by rose; thimbleberry was also present.	Mix of grasses, strawberry clover, and seashore lupine, with a few western dock and non-native birds-foot trefoil.	
Average Cover <sup>1</sup> :	14.5	20.1			

NOTE:

1 Average cover = (total length of cover/total length of transect)

Generally, the surviving plants appeared healthy, although some showed moderate signs of stress following a third exceptionally hot and dry summer, and others may have been inadvertently impacted by landscape maintenance. The general success is likely attributable to continued hand-watering combined with proper installation of quality plant material. The woody species showed some growth since the Year 2 site visit in 2023, although the degree of growth varied across the site (see the side-by-side photos from 2021, 2023, and 2024 in Appendix B). Percent cover measured this year averaged 20.1%, but ranged from a low of 5.1% at T8 (west shore) to a high of 50.0% at T2 (south shore).

As noted, the percent cover standard for Year 3 is 30%. The growth trajectory of installed plants is commonly summarized as "Sleep, Creep, Leap," with the "leap" (a growth spurt) typically at Year 3. The combined effect of unusually hot and dry summers and the delay in replacement plant installation has contributed to a reduced "leap" magnitude. The Port's October 2024 installation of 597 woody shrubs targeted areas that have had lower survival and cover. The replacement plants were installed after this Year 3 monitoring event, and therefore the Year 3 percent cover can be assumed to be slightly higher than what was observed. This, combined with the Port's commitment to watering and other recommended maintenance in 2025 and 2026 are anticipated to result in a stronger "leap" in the coming years, and will support achievement of the Year 5 performance standard of 60% woody cover in 2026.

#### 7.4 Noxious and Nuisance Weed Cover

During the Project's monitoring period, invasive, nonnative plant cover of plant species included on the Snohomish County Noxious Weed List cannot exceed 10%. The Project Restoration Plan defines invasive, nonnative plant species as those on the Snohomish County Noxious Weed List (Snohomish County, 2024). Percent cover of invasive plants on Snohomish County's Noxious Weed List is less than 1%. The Project is meeting the Year 3 performance standard for invasive cover.

Similar to Year 2 results, some white sweet clover (*Melilotus alba*) and birds-foot trefoil were observed, but ongoing maintenance appears to be keeping it in check. Smaller amounts of flat pea (*Lathyrus sylvestris*), Scotch broom (*Cytisus coparius*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), evergreen blackberry (*R. laciniatus*), crimson clover (*Trifolium incarnatum*), Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), and button tansy (*Tanacetum vulgare*) were also noted through the restoration area in small clumps. Additionally, three locust trees were observed on the south shore. Tansy ragwort (*Jacobaea vulgaris*) was also observed on the site for the first time; tansy ragwort is a regulated Class B weed in Snohomish County which means that control is required.

White sweet clover and birds-foot trefoil are not on the Snohomish County list but are nonnative and invasive. White sweet clover is on many other states' noxious weed lists and birds-foot trefoil is a weed of concern on neighboring King County's noxious weed list. Other nonnative and invasive species at the site that are not on Snohomish County's list but are on adjacent counties' lists include Scotch broom and button tansy (non-regulated Class B in King and Skagit Counties), Canada thistle (Class C control required in Skagit County and non-regulated Class C in King County), and Himalayan blackberry and evergreen blackberry (non-regulated Class C in King and Skagit Counties). While removal of these species is not required and their cover will not contribute to the invasive cover performance standard, control is recommended to improve coverage and survival of native species.

#### 7.5 Large Woody Debris

Similar to observations made in 2021, 2022, and 2023, the LWD installations and associated anchors remain in place along the shoreline. No excessive scouring or other erosion issues associated with the LWD were observed. It appears that some of the LWD shifts slightly in places during high tide and during storm activity, as evidenced by depressions and marks in the sand underneath the installations.

#### 7.6 Shoreline Condition

As documented in the Year 1 report, the Port installed rounded rock on two areas of the west shore that experienced substantial erosion and loss of the installed emergent vegetation and willow stakes. Exhibit 7-5 shows those two areas shortly after installation in January 2023 and later in August 2024. The placed material appears to be stable and the sand beach section between the two areas has been preserved. The supplemental substrate areas have not recruited sufficient fines to accommodate emergent vegetation.

The south shore has shown little signs of being adversely impacted by wind or wave energy. The shoreline remains generally a shallow-sloped sandy, silty beach with some variablesized bands of gravels (for examples, see Exhibit 7-6 below and Exhibits C-3 and C-6 in Appendix B).



Exhibit 7-5: Photos of the Southern (Left) and Northern (Right) Supplemental Rock Placement Areas on the West Shore (Top Photos Taken by Port on January 5 and 11, 2023; Bottom Photos Taken by Shannon & Wilson on August 6, 2024)



Exhibit 7-6: Photos of Beach Areas on the South Shore (Photos Taken August 6, 2024)

### 8 MAINTENANCE AND CONTINGENCY MEASURES

#### 8.1 Requirements

#### 8.1.1 Maintenance

Per the Port's bid documents, the Contractor provided a three-year planting guarantee to include "inspections, weeding, maintenance, replacement, fertilizing, seeding, mulch replenishment, water and irrigation as required to water...planting areas to ensure acceptable coverage and seed and plant establishment." That bond concluded in early summer 2024. As mentioned in Section 7.1, the timing of the bond closure was not suitable for installation of replacement plants, so plant replacement was not completed until fall.

The Port is now responsible for managing the establishment of native plants during the remainder of Year 3 and in Years 4 through 10, with the goal of achieving performance standards. Routine maintenance activities include weed control, supplemental irrigation, mulching, reseeding, and plant replacement. If performance standards for percent cover of woody plants (shrubs and trees) and nonnative, invasive species are not satisfied, "adaptive management measures may include, but are not limited to, plant replacement, plant supplementation, plant species substitution, adjustment of the planting layout to reflect specific or changing site conditions, weed control, and installation and adjustment of plant protection devices" (Shannon & Wilson, 2019a).

The tansy ragwort, which is required for control by the County, should be removed by hand pulling up the entire plant, including its roots. If the plant is flowering, it should be sealed in a plastic bag and placed in the trash to prevent seed spread.

#### 8.1.2 Plant Replacement

As previously mentioned, a landscape contractor installed additional native woody vegetation in early October 2024, consistent with the Ecology-approved schedule with the exception of a few minor deviations (Exhibit 8-1). A Shannon & Wilson biologist reviewed the plant material before installation and provided guidance on locations and layout.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Approved Quantity	Installed Quantity	Condition
Trees				
Alnus rubra	Red alder	50	50	1-gallon container
Shrubs				
Amelanchier alnifolia	Serviceberry	99	95	1-gallon container
Holodiscus discolor	Oceanspray	99	103	1-gallon container
Rosa nutkana	Nootka rose	99	98	1-gallon container
Rubus parviflorus	Thimbleberry	99	101	1-gallon container
Salix scouleriana	Scouler's willow	50	50	1-gallon container
Symphoricarpos albus	Snowberry	99	100	1-gallon container
Total Woody Replacement	ts	595	597	

#### Exhibit 8-1: Approved and Installed Woody Vegetation Species Replacements

#### 8.2 Recommendations

The following actions should be taken to support achievement of performance standards:

- 1. Although not required, continue to remove nonnative, invasive species that are not on the Snohomish County Noxious Weed List particularly white sweet clover, birds-foot trefoil, Himalayan blackberry, Scotch broom, flat pea, and evergreen blackberry, which can outcompete the native plants. The non-native locust trees should also be removed.
- 2. All restoration plants (or at least the plants installed in October 2024) should receive the equivalent of 2 inches of water, three times a week, during the dry season (generally June 1 through October 1). This frequency should be increased as needed to minimize stress during periods of abnormally high temperatures.
- 3. Removal of dense grass and other herbaceous vegetation that is hampering growth appeared to have occurred around the plantings (within 1 foot) on the south and west shores but still needs to be completed on the north shore.
- 4. Any remaining ties and tags holding trees to support sticks should be removed; as the trees have grown, the ties have become quite tight and may constrict growth.
- 5. The supplemental substrate areas will continue to be monitored to assess whether the new material has trapped any fines or may have developed conditions suitable for future plantings. Depending on the findings, recommendations for supplemental emergent or other plantings may be made.
- 6. Areas of emergent vegetation gaps along the southern shoreline, where wind and wave erosion do not prevent plant establishment, will also continue to be monitored and assessed for potential emergent plant replacement in future years.

### 9 FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING

The Project's Restoration Plan requires performance monitoring of the planting sites for 10 years (Years 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 10). The monitoring program consists of monitoring events and reports. After each monitoring event, a performance monitoring report must be prepared to document the degree of success or failure in the mitigation area and to identify any adaptive, remedial actions needed to ensure that the goals of the mitigation plan are achieved. This Year 3 Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the Corps, Ecology, WDFW, and the City. Subsequent annual monitoring reports shall be submitted to the Corps, Ecology, WDFW, and the City after each monitoring event.

The schedule for performance monitoring events is as follows:

- Year 1 summer/early fall 2022 (completed)
- Year 2 summer/early fall 2023 (completed)
- Year 3 summer/early fall 2024 (completed)
- Year 5 summer/early fall 2026
- Year 7 summer/early fall 2028
- Year 10 summer/early fall 2031

### 10 CLOSURE

The findings and conclusions documented in this report have been prepared for specific application to this Project. They have been developed in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill normally exercised by members of the environmental science profession currently practicing under similar conditions in the area. The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are professional opinions based on interpretation of information currently available to us and made within the operational scope, budget, and schedule constraints of this Project. No warranty, express or implied, is made.

Shannon & Wilson has prepared, "Important Information About Your Wetland Delineation/ Mitigation and/or Stream Classification Report," to assist you and others in understanding the use and limitations of our reports.

### 11 REFERENCES

- City of Everett (City) Department of Planning and Community Development, 1997, Snohomish estuary wetlands integration plan (SEWIP): Everett, Wash., City of Everett, April.
- City of Everett (City), 2019a, Shoreline master program: Everett, Wash., 194 p., Available: <u>https://www.everettwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/19658/Shoreline-Master-Program-October-2019</u>.
- City of Everett (City), 2019b, Shoreline public access plan: Update 2019: Everett, Wash., 62 p., available: <u>https://everettwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/20571/Shoreline-Public-Access-Plan-2019</u>.
- Landau Associates, Inc. (LAI), 2020a, Final compliance monitoring plan, Bay Wood Products cleanup site, Everett, Washington: Report prepared by Landau Associates, Inc., Seattle, Wash., July 27.
- Landau Associates, Inc. (LAI), 2020b, Final engineering design report, Bay Wood Products cleanup site, Everett, Washington: Report prepared by Landau Associates, Inc., Seattle, Wash., November 10.
- Landau Associates, Inc. (LAI), 2020c, Final interim action work plan, Bay Wood Products cleanup site, Everett, Washington: Report prepared by Landau Associates, Inc., Seattle, Wash., July 29, 106 p.
- Shannon & Wilson, 2019a, Restoration plan, Bay Wood Shoreline interim cleanup and restoration: Report prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Seattle, Wash., 102336-014, for Port of Everett, Everett, Wash., November 21, 39 p.
- Shannon & Wilson, 2019b, Restoration design criteria memorandum, Bay Wood Shoreline interim cleanup and restoration: Memorandum from Shannon & Wilson, 102336-006, to Port of Everett, Everett, Wash., June 20, 32 p.
- Shannon & Wilson, 2022, As-built restoration monitoring report, Bay Wood interim action cleanup and shoreline restoration project: Report prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Seattle, Wash., 102336-020, for Port of Everett, Everett, Wash., August 23, 164 p.
- Shannon & Wilson, 2023, Year 1 monitoring report, Bay Wood interim action cleanup and shoreline restoration project: Report prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Seattle, Wash., 102336-021, for Port of Everett, Everett, Wash., February 28, 71 p.
- Shannon & Wilson, 2024a, Year 2 monitoring report, Bay Wood interim action cleanup and shoreline restoration project: Report prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Seattle, Wash., 102336-022, for Port of Everett, Everett, Wash., February 28, 75 p.

- Shannon & Wilson, 2024b, Draft Year 3 spring plant count for the Bay Wood interim action cleanup and shorelin restoration: Letter prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Seattle, Wash., 102336-026, for Port of Everett, Everett, Wash., May 14, 22 p.
- Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, 2005, Snohomish River Basin salmon conservation plan: Everett, Wash., Snohomish County Department of Public Works, Surface Water Management Division, June, 402 p., available: <u>https://www.govlink.org/watersheds/7/pdf/WRIA%207 Plan/Final Compiled Plan.</u>

Snohomish County, Wash., 2024, Noxious weed list: Available: https://snohomishcountywa.gov/750/Noxious-Weeds-List, accessed October 2024. Document Path: I:\EF\SEA\102000s\102336 Port of Everett\Baywood\GIS\MXD\Final\DCM Fig1 Vicinity.mxd





102336-025



#### Notes:

Ν

- 1. Plot locations and dimensions are approximated.
- 2. Transect ends marked with orange-flagged t-posts.
- 3. Transects and photo point locations collected with an ESRI Collector utilizing an EOS Arrow 100 GPS device.

100 200 0

#### January 2025 **Monitoring Map** 200 Feet Figure 2

**EIII** SHANNON & WILSON

Bay Wood Shoreline Interim Cleanup Action & Restoration Port of Everett Everett, WA

#### 102336-025



\MXD\Year3\

02000s\102336 Port of Everett

GIS \SEA \

100

Areas of Emergent Vegetation

0

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Training Wall

#### Notes:

XXX

50

1. Areas of emergent community locations collected with an ESRI Collector utilizing an EOS Arrow 100 GPS device.

**100 Feet** 

#### January 2025 Emergent Vegetation Communities Figure 3

## Appendix A Final Construction Plans (August 2020)

## PORT OF EVERETT

# EVERETT, WASHINGTON **BAY WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE RESTORATION & CLEANUP**



SHEET LIST TABLE						
SHEET NO.	REV. NO.	SHEET TITLE				
01	0	COVER SHEET				
02	0	GENERAL NOTES & ABBREVIATIONS				
03	0	LEGEND				
04	0	EXISTING CONDITIONS				
05	0	TESC PLAN				
06	0	DEMOLITION PLAN (1)				
07	0	DEMOLITION PLAN (2)				
08	0	GRADING PLAN				
09	0	DEMOLITION & GRADING PLAN (1)				
10	0	DEMOLITION & GRADING PLAN (2)				
11	0	DEMOLITION & GRADING PLAN (3)				
12	0	TYPICAL SECTIONS				
13	0	SOIL MANAGEMENT PLAN - TYPICAL SECTION				
14	0	SECTIONS A - D				
15	0	SECTIONS E - H				
16	0	SECTIONS I - L				
17	0	SECTIONS M				
18	0	LWD DETAIL				
19	0	PLANTING PLAN				
20	0	PLANTING DETAILS (1)				
21	0	PLANTING DETAILS (2)				
22	0	PLANTING SCHEDULE				
23	0	SPLIT RAIL FENCE & TRAIL DETAILS				
24	0	LOW AREA CLEANUP PLAN				
25	0	LOW AREA CLEANUP SECTIONS				

					-	PROJECT ENGINEER:	SCALE:	DODT OF EVEDETT
					NID R. CLINA	D. CLINE	AS SHOWN	FURI OF EVEREII
					A CON WASHING	DESIGNED BY:	date: AUGUST 10 2020	
							7.00001 10, 2020	BAT WOOD INTERIIVIACTION - SHURELINE
					J	drawn by: A. PICCINI	CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	<b>RESTORATION &amp; CLEANUP</b>
STRUCTION					PDFIGISTERED INST	APPROVED BY:		
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	10/2020			COVER SHEET

PORT OF EVERETT COMMISSIONERS

- GLEN BACHMAN TOM STIGER
- DAVID SIMPSON

PORT STAFF

- CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER: LISA LEFEBER
- CHIEF OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT : TERRIE BATTUELLO
- CHIEF OF ENGINEERING: JOHN KLEKOTKA, P.E.
- DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS: ERIK GERKING, L.G.
- PORT PLANNER: LAURA GURLEY

**CONSULTING ENGINEERS** 

• SHANNON & WILSON: DAVID CLINE, P.E.

LANDAU ASSOCIATES

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

DWG. NO. 01

CIP NO.

PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020

SHEET NO. 01 OF 25

## **GENERAL NOTES**

- 1. ALL WORKMANSHIP AND MATERIALS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, SPECIFICATIONS AND LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS.
- 2. ALL WORK SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH, AND THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ADHERE TO, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PROJECT PERMITS. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO SECURE APPLICABLE PERMITS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN PROVIDED BY THE OWNER.
- 3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS RELATED TO SAFETY OF PERSONNEL, OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PUBLIC. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ADHERE TO ALL ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND PERMIT CONDITIONS RELEVANT TO THE PROJECT. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF PERSONNEL ONSITE.
- 4. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING THEIR OWN ELECTRICITY, COMMUNICATIONS, WATER AND SANITARY FACILITIES.
- 5. ALL AREAS DISTURBED DURING CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE RESTORED TO PRE-CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS, OR AS SHOWN ON PLANS.
- 6. SEE TESC PLANS AND NOTES FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL REQUIREMENTS.
- 7. CONTAMINATED OR TURBID DEWATERING EFFLUENT FROM CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT OPERATION, TRUCK WASH WATER, OPEN TRENCHES OR SPECIAL HANDLING WASTE WATER SHALL BE HANDLED SEPARATELY FROM STORMWATER, TREATED AND DISPOSED PER THE SPECIFICATIONS AND LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS.
- 8. ALL STATIONING REFERS TO THE CENTERLINE OF CONSTRUCTION AND IS THE MEASURED HORIZONTAL DISTANCE.
- 9. ALL TRASH, RUBBLE, ASPHALT, CONCRETE, DEBRIS AND BURIED DEBRIS, WITHIN THE PROJECT WORK LIMITS, SHALL BE REMOVED AND DISPOSED OF OFFSITE BY THE CONTRACTOR AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS.
- 10. ANY MATERIALS EXCAVATED WATERWARD OF SPECIAL MATERIAL HANDLING BOUNDARY SHALL BE DISPOSED OF IN SUBTITLE D LANDFILL, AS APPROVED BY THE PORT.
- 11. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM EXCAVATION IN A SAFE CONDITION AND IN A MANNER TO AVOID ADVERSE IMPACTS TO WATER QUALITY. THE CONTRACTOR IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR SHORING, SHEETING, BRACING, BENCHING, DEWATERING AND ALL NECESSARY PROTECTIVE MEASURES TO PREVENT DAMAGE TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES, STRUCTURES OR UTILITIES.
- 12. IF UNANTICIPATED CONDITIONS ARE ENCOUNTERED, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL IMMEDIATELY BRING THE CONDITION TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ENGINEER/OWNER.
- 13. DETAILS ARE INTENDED TO SHOW FINAL CONDITIONS OF THE DESIGN. MODIFICATIONS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUIT THE JOB SITE DIMENSIONS OR CONDITIONS, AND SUCH MODIFICATIONS SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE WORK.
- 14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAKE ALL NECESSARY PROVISIONS TO PROTECT AND REPAIR IMPACTS TO EXISTING STRUCTURES INCLUDING ROADWAYS, DRAINAGES, AND VEGETATION UNLESS SUCH ITEMS ARE TO BE DISTURBED OR REMOVED AS INDICATED IN THE CONSTRUCTION PLANS AND DOCUMENTS.
- 15. CONTRACTOR SHALL, IF PRESENT, COORDINATE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WITH ADJACENT UPLAND DEVELOPMENT CONSTRUCTION.
- 16. EXCAVATION AND GRADING LINES AND LIMITS ARE SHOWN ON THE PLANS. ANY EXCAVATION BEYOND THE LINES AND LIMITS SHOWN IN THE PLANS IS NOT ALLOWED.
- 17. OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL INCLUDES SMALL MARINE WOOD DEBRIS, QUARRY SPALLS, CONCRETE, AND METAL PIECES TO BE REMOVED BY PLUCKING AND PICKING DEBRIS FROM THE LOWER SHORELINE PER DIRECTION OF THE ENGINEER. CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM OPERATIONS IN FULL COORDINATION WITH THE PORT AND ENGINEER.
- 18. MASS EXCAVATION AND DREDGING OF SEDIMENTS AND SOILS SURROUNDING THE OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS PIECES IS NOT ALLOWED AND CONSIDERED OVER-EXCAVATION. PAYMENT FOR OVER-EXCAVATION IS NOT ALLOWED.



#### SHANNON & WILSON, INC. GEOTEGHNIGAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

400 North 34th Street, Suite 100 Seattle, Washington 98103 P.O. Box 300303 (206) 632-8020 FAX: (206) 633-6777

٨	7/01/20	AWP	ISSUED FOR BID & CO
NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION

## SURVEY NOTES

- 1. SURVEY DATUM IS WASHINGTON STATE PLANE NORTH NAD(83)/NGVD(29). CONVERSION TO MLLW AND NAVD88 ON SHEET 03.
- 2. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE ON THE PLANS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF ALL EXISTING SURVEY MONUMENTS AND OTHER SURVEY MARKERS DURING CONSTRUCTION. ANY DAMAGE TO SURVEY MARKERS AND MONUMENTS IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONTRACTOR TO REPAIR.

## UTILITY NOTES

- 1. THE LOCATIONS AND EXTENTS OF EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ON THE PLANS ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE NOT NECESSARILY COMPLETE. A REASONABLE EFFORT HAS BEEN MADE TO LOCATE AND DELINEATE EXISTING UTILITIES BASED UPON AVAILABLE RECORDS & SURVEYS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE TYPE, LOCATION, SIZE, AND/OR DEPTH OF THE EXISTING UTILITIES WITHIN THE WORK AREA BEFORE COMMENCING WORK. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT THE UTILITIES UNDERGROUND LOCATION CENTER AT (800) 424-5555 OR 811 AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ASSUME COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DAMAGED UTILITIES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL HIRE A PRIVATE LOCATOR PRIOR TO COMMENCING WORK.
- 2. AT NO TIME SHALL THE CONTRACTOR INTERRUPT THE OPERATION OF ANY UTILITIES WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL FROM THE UTILITY OWNERS. APPROVAL SHALL BE REQUESTED AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE TIME THAT THE INTERRUPTION OF THE SYSTEM IS REQUIRED.
- 3. ALL LOCATIONS OF EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN SHOULD BE CONSIDERED APPROXIMATE. IT IS THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE ACCURACY OF ALL UTILITY LOCATIONS SHOWN OR NOT SHOWN ON THE PLANS. EXISTING UTILITIES SHALL BE AVOIDED, PROTECTED, SUPPORTED AND MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION AND ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR. ALL UTILITIES WITHIN CONSTRUCTION, STAGING AND ACCESS AREAS WILL BE FIELD-LOCATED BY THE CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION.

SOIL QUANTITIES							
DESCRIPTION	UNITS	CUT	FILL				
EXCAVATION, HAUL & STOCKPILE - RUESABLE FILL	CY	7,032					
EXCAVATION, HAUL & DISPOSAL TO MUNICIPAL LANDFILL OR RECYCLING	TONS	4,000					
OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL, HAUL & DISPOSAL	TONS	500					
EXCAVATION, HAUL & DISPOSAL - SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING (SUBTITLE D LANDFILL)	TONS	270					
EXCAVATION, HAUL & DISPOSAL FOR WOOD WASTE (SUBTITLE D LANDFILL)	TONS	2,000					
TOPSOIL IMPORT	TONS		4,995				
SAND/GRAVEL IMPORT	TONS		2,565				
	MISC. QUANTITIES						
DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUAN	NTITY				
CLEAR AND GRUB	AC	5.	23				
MARINE STRUCTURE DEMOLITION	TONS	1,5	580				
SILT FENCE	LF	2,6	50				
LARGE WOODY DEBRIS, ANCHORS, FASTENERS, INSTALLATIONS	EA	5	0				

					NID R. CLIN	project engineer: D. CLINE	scale: AS SHOWN	F
						designed by: D. CLINE	date: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY \
					39326	prawn by: A. PICCINI	checked by: J. KLEKOTKA	
STRUCTION					FOR EGISTERE STREET	APPROVED BY:		
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	570NAL BITO/2020			GEN

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

С	-	ACRE
	-	APPROXIMATE
M	_	BENCH MARK
IVI T N A		BOTTOM
	-	
VV _	-	
В	-	CATCH BASIN
L	-	CENTERLINE
LL	-	CLEARING LIMITS
LR.	-	CLEARANCE
ONC	-	CONCRETE
SBC	-	CRUSHED SURFACING BASE COURSE
STC	-	CRUSHED SURFACING TOP COURSE
V	_	
T L	-	
ВН	-	
	-	EAST
A.	-	EACH
LEV	-	ELEVATION
Х	-	EXISTING
G	-	EXISTING GRADE
	-	FACULTATIVE WETLAND
	_	
	-	
40	-	
G	-	
DPE	-	HIGH DENSITY POLYETHYLENE
Т	-	HEIGHT
TL	-	HIGH TIDE LEVEL
)	-	INSIDE DIAMETER
	-	INVERT ELEVATION
- I\ /	_	INVERT
	-	
	-	
-	-	
ND	-	LARGE WOODY DEBRIS
FG.	-	MANUFACTURER'S
IN.	-	MINIMUM
ISC	-	MISCELLANEOUS
\W/	-	MONITORING WELL
vv	_	
-	-	
E	-	
IC	-	NOTIN CONTRACT
L	-	NOT LISTED
Ο.	-	NUMBER
TS	-	NO TO SCALE
W	-	NORTHWEST
C	-	ON CENTER
	_	
	-	
PECS.	-	
	-	RADIUS
D.	-	ROAD
EQ'D	-	REQUIRED
EV.	-	REVISION
/W	-	RIGHT OF WAY
Π	_	STORM DRAIN
E	-	SOUTHEAST
	_	SECTION
	-	
HI.	-	
	-	SUUIH
.F.	-	SQUARE FEET
TA	-	STATION
ESC	-	TEMPORARY EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL
BD	-	TO BE DETERMINED
OR	_	TOP OF BANK
	_	ΤΥΡΙΩΑΙ
	-	
	-	
1.5.	-	
1	-	WEST
/L	-	WETLAND

## PORT OF EVERETT

WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE RESTORATION & CLEANUP

NERAL NOTES & ABBREVIATIONS

	02				
CIP NO.					
PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020					
SHEET NO.	02	OF	25		

DWG NO

## EXISTING

5
1
<b>→</b> →
—— онw—— онw——
WLWL лмлм
TP-1-19 <b>=</b>
TP-1 (
$\wedge$
Δ
X X
OP OP

MAJOR CONTOUR (5') MINOR CONTOUR (1') **RIPARIAN BUFFER LIMIT** ORDINARY HIGH WATER (OHW) EXTREME TIDE (8.6') HTL (6.8') MHHW (5.4') TOP OF BANK PROPERTY LINE EXISTING MATERIAL WETLANDS

WETLAND BUFFER

RIVER SETBACK (100') SHORELINE MANAGEMENT ZONE (200') EXISTING SUBGRADE TEST PIT, APPROXIMATE LOCATION GRAB SAMPLE, APPROXIMATE LOCATION SURVEY CONTROL POINT

QUARRY SPALL/WOOD WASTE

MARINE STRUCTURES

FENCE

OVERHEAD POWER UTILITY EDGE OF PAVEMENT



SURVEY DATUM: NAD83 WASHINGTON STATE PLANE, NORTH ZONE, US FOOT

VERTICAL DATUM CONVERSIONS: NGVD29 + 5.59' = MLLW NGVD29 + 3.68' = NAVD88

SOURCE: PUGET SOUND LIDAR CONSORTIUM CEDAR RIVER WATERSHED, 2014 DEA SURVEY



GENERAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS 400 North 34th Street, Suite 100 Seattle, Washington 98103 P.O. Box 300303 (206) 632-8020 FAX: (206) 633-6777

	-		
∕∆	7/01/20	AWP	ISSUED FOR BID & C
NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION

## LEGEND

## \*NOTE: LEGEND PROVIDED ON SHEETS SUPERCEDES THIS LEGEND



SHEET SYMBOLS



NOTE REFERENCE REFERENCE DESIGNATION TO NOTE APPEARING ON SAME SHEET



1\_

A 1

## SECTION

					-	PROJECT ENGINEER:	SCALE:	
					NID R. CLA	D. CLINE	AS SHOWN	ſ
					COLOF WALL CA	DESIGNED BY:	DATE:	
						D. CLINE	AUGUST TU, ZUZU	BAY V
					39326	drawn by: A. PICCINI	CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	
CONSTRUCTION					POPEGISTERE	APPROVED BY:		
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	3/10/20			

EBRIS	REMOVAL

OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL **WITH NO** SPECIAL HANDLING WASTE AS DIRECTED BY PORT

OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL WITHIN SPECIAL HANDLING WASTE AREA AS DIRECTED BY PORT

DETAIL DESIGNATION

SHEET LOCATED ON DETAIL

SECTION DESIGNATION

SHEET LOCATED ON

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE **RESTORATION & CLEANUP** 

PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020 SHEET NO. 03 OF 25

03

CIP NO.

DWG. NO.

LEGEND





#### <u>NOTES</u>

- 1. VERTICAL PROJECT DATUM: NGVD29.
- 2. HORIZONTAL PROJECT DATUM: NAD83 WASHINGTON STATE PLANES, NORTH ZONE, US FOOT.
- 3. PUGET SOUND LIDAR CONSORTIUM (PSLC) CEDAR RIVER WATERSHED & FLOODPLAIN LIDAR, 2014.
- LIDAR CONVERTED FROM NAVD88 TO NGVD29.
   TEST PIT AND GRAB SAMPLE DATA CAN BE FOUND IN THE PROJECT SPECIFICATION.

SURVEY CONTROL POINTS						
POINT	NORTHING (NAD83)	EASTING (NAD83)	ELEVATION (FT.) (NGVD29)			
CP-1	373563.63	1303765.75	12.94			
CP-2	373419.43	1304017.62	12.80			
CP-3	373708.59	1304143.77	19.65			

PORT OF EVERETT	dwg. no. <b>04</b>			
WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE	CIP NO.			
EXISTING CONDITIONS	PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020			
	SHEET NO. 04 OF 25			





5	0	100
cale	in Feet	

1. STAKE PROPERTY BOUNDARIES (WHITE), CLEARING LIMITS (YELLOW), WETLAND BOUNDARIES (GREEN), AND SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARIES (PINK) PRIOR TO STARTING CONSTRUCTION. 2. CLEAR AND GRUB ALL GRADING AREAS ABOVE THE OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL UPPER LIMIT.

3. STRIP 1-FT OF SURFACE MATERIAL. SCREEN ORGANIC MATERIAL AND WOOD WASTE, DISPOSE OF OFF-SITE. REMAINING (CLEAN) SURFACE MATERIAL MAY BE PLACED IN REUSABLE FILL STOCKPILE. 4. EXCAVATE AND REUSE SUBSURFACE MATERIALS FREE OF ORGANICS AND DEBRIS, AND UPLAND OF THE SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARY IN THE REUSABLE FILL STOCKPILE.

5. EXCAVATE AND DISPOSE OF SUBSURFACE MATERIALS WATERWARD OF SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING

6. TRANSFER REUSABLE FILL TO REUSABLE FILL STOCKPILE AREA.

7. PERFORM OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL PER DIRECTION OF THE ENGINEER. MATERIALS REMOVED FROM UPLAND OF THE SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARY SHALL BE DISPOSED OF AT MUNICIPAL LANDFILL. MATERIALS REMOVED WATERWARD (BELOW) SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARY ELEVATION SHALL BE HANDLED FOLLOWING THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE SPECIFICATIONS AND DISPOSED OF AT SUBTITLE D LANDFILL OR TRANSFER STATION.

8. BACKFILL AREAS WITH TOPSOIL PRIOR TO TIDAL INUNDATION PER THE TOPSOIL COMPACTION SPECIFICATIONS PRIOR TO INUNDATION FOR EACH TIDAL CYCLE. EXPOSED SUBSURFACE SOILS ARE NOT ALLOWED IN TIDAL INUNDATION AREAS. BACKFILL AREAS IN OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL POCKETS WITH SAND/GRAVEL MIX. EXCAVATION AND BACKFILL NOT ALLOWED IN THE WET.

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

DWG. NO.

06

CIP NO.

PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020

SHEET NO. 06 OF 25

**BAY WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE RESTORATION & CLEANUP** 

**DEMOLITION PLAN (1)** 









MARINE STRUCTURE (5)







MARINE STRUCTURE (6) VIEW 2



SHANNON & WILSON, INC. Geotechnical and environmental consultants

400 North 34th Street, Suite 100 Seattle, Washington 98103 P.O. Box 300303 (206) 632-8020 FAX: (206) 633-6777

	E BY	REVISION	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	53710NAL ES 10/20			
▲ 7/01/20	20 AWP	ISSUED FOR BID & CONSTRUCTION					TO REGISTERED IN	APPROVED BY:		
							39326	drawn by: A. PICCINI	CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	
						T	ALL OF THE PARTY OF	designed by: D. CLINE	date: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY \
							WID R. CLI	D. CLINE	scale: AS SHOWN	F
								PROJECT ENGINEER:	SCALE:	





ARINE STRUCTURE (3





MARINE STRUCTURE (7)



OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL (TYP.)

## PORT OF EVERETT

WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE **RESTORATION & CLEANUP** 

## **DEMOLITION PLAN (2)**

DWG. NO.	07
CIP NO.	
PROJECT	

NO. PD-BW-2020

SHEET NO. 07 OF 25





0	20	40
	Scale in Feet	t

### NOTES:

- 1. CONTRACTOR TO MAINTAIN SLOPE BETWEEN POINTS AND SECTIONS. CONTRACTOR TO SMOOTH TRANSITIONS BETWEEN SLOPES.
- 2. BACKFILL VOIDS WITH SAND/GRAVEL MIX.
- 3. ALL EXCAVATION AND BACKFILL TO BE PERFORMED IN THE DRY. FOR AREAS IN THE TIDAL RANGE, EXCAVATION AND BACKFILL TO OCCUR AT LOW TIDE. NO EXCAVATION OR BACKFILL IN THE WET ALLOWED. BACKFILL MUST OCCUR BEFORE INUNDATION FROM EACH TIDAL CYCLE.

GRADING TABLE						
SECTION	POINT NO.	NORTHING (NGVD29)	EASTING (NAD83)	TAGET ELEV. (FT)		
	1	373433.00	1303564.57	4.02		
_	2	373428.22	1303569.72	4.14		
A	3	373403.60	1303596.20	11.03		
	4	373366.05	1303636.60	11.77		
	1	373477.52	1303554.55	3.97		
P	2	373481.57	1303558.26	4.03		
В	3	373508.05	1303582.50	12.26		
	4	373536.91	1303608.91	13.04		
	1	373517.20	1303489.40	3.28		
6	2	373522.91	1303492.13	3.42		
C	3	373562.88	1303511.19	12.48		
	4	373575.62	1303517.26	12.83		
D	1	373597.01	1303419.45	3.42		
	2	373600.76	1303422.90	3.50		
	3	373629.70	1303449.53	12.38		
	4	373638.06	1303457.22	12.58		
F	1	373622.74	1303345.51	4.69		
C	2	373630.27	1303350.66	4.87		

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

DWG. NO. 09 CIP NO. PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020 SHEET NO. 09 OF 25

## **DEMOLITION & GRADING PLAN (1)**

**RESTORATION & CLEANUP** 



		20 Scale in Feet		40		
	NOTES: 1. CONTI AND S TRANS 2. BACKF 3. ALL EX THE D AND B OR BA OCCU	RACTOR TO I ECTIONS. CO SITIONS BETV FILL VOIDS W (CAVATION A RY. FOR ARE ACKFILL TO 0 CKFILL IN TH R BEFORE IN	MAINT ONTRA VEEN ITH SA AND BA EAS IN OCCU IE WE IUNDA	AIN SLO CTOR SLOPE AND/GF ACKFILI THE TI R AT LO T ALLO TION F	OPE BETWEE TO SMOOTH S. AVEL MIX. TO BE PERF DAL RANGE, DW TIDE. NO WED. BACKFI ROM EACH TI	N POINTS FORMED IN EXCAVATION EXCAVATION LL MUST DAL CYCLE.
	SECTION		GRADI	NG TAB THING	LE EASTING	TARGET ELEV.
LI.		2	(NG)	VD29)	(NAD83)	(FT)
	E	4	3736	2069.46 206.24	1303377.45	12.07
		1	3737	08.45	1303326.73	2.87
		2	3737	/09.46	1303331.59	2.96
	F	3	3737	16.91	1303367.38	12.28
		4	3737	22.30	1303393.30	12.85
		1	373813.54		1303299.05	2.52
		2	373814.27		1303304.46	2.69
	G	3	373819.68		1303344.74	12.20
		4	373821.23		1303356.24	12.44
		1	3738	87.68	1303241.06	4.10
	Ц	2	373890.75		1303251.55	4.31
< > /\	11	3		008.03	1303310.48	12.23
D		4	3739	914.78	1303333.48	12.72
	1	1	3740	01.40	1303256.56	6.72
		2		07.08	1303260.15	6.85
	J	1	3740	08.52	1303135.18	3.99
ATCHLINE - SEE SHEET 09		2	3740	)18.36	1303144.67	4.27
PORT OF E	VERE	ETT		DWG.	NO. <b>1</b> 0	
WOOD INTERIM AC	TION - SH	ORELINE		CIP N	0.	
RESTORATION &	CLEANU	Р				020
MOLITION & GRA	DING PI	LAN (2)		SHFFT	NO. 10	0F 25
						<u> </u>


		GRADING TAE	BLE	
SECTION	POINT NO.	NORTHING (NGVD29)	EASTING (NAD83)	TARGET ELEV. (FT)
	3	374033.04	1303276.15	12.94
	4	374043.46	1303282.56	13.16
J	3	374043.14	1303168.54	12.11
	1	374121.92	1303132.62	4.00
V	2	374118.61	1303141.59	4.20
N N	3	374111.07	1303162.00	11.37
	4	374085.94	1303230.02	12.82
	1	374218.14	1303218.03	4.00
	2	374213.52	1303266.30	4.10
L	3	374201.01	1303248.76	12.08
	4	374185.81	1303276.03	12.84
	1	374322.34	1303257.64	4.00
NA	2	37313.77	1303273.26	4.34
IVI	3	374294.21	1303308.90	11.80
	4	374287.70	1303320.77	12.08



REVISION

BAY V NO. DATE ΒY REVISION

NOTES:

- 1. STAKE CLEARING LIMITS, WETLANDS, AND SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARY 50-FT O.C. WETLANDS AND SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARY SHALL BE STAKED USING NEON COLORS IDENTIFYING THOSE AREAS TO AVOID EXCAVATION OR PERFORM EXCAVATION USING SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING PROCEDURES. WETLANDS SHALL BE STAKED USING NEON GREEN STAKES AND FLAGGING AND SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARY SHALL BE STAKED USING NEON PINK STAKES AND FLAGGING. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND MAINTAIN STAKING DURING CONSTRUCTION AND OBTAIN PORT APPROVAL PRIOR TO STARTING WORK.
- 2. CLEAR AND GRUB FROM THE CLEARING (GRADING) LIMITS TO THE OUTER EDGE OF THE REUSABLE FILL STOCKPILE AREA.
- 3. ALL WORK BELOW OHW SHALL BE PERFORMED DURING THE INWATER WORK WINDOW AS SPECIFIED IN THE PERMITS, JULY 16 -FEB. 15, AND IN THE DRY DURING LOW TIDES.
- 4. ALL EXCAVATIONS, DEBRIS REMOVALS, AND DEMOLITIONS BELOW OHW SHALL BE BACKFILLED AND COMPACTED WITH SAND/GRAVEL MATERIAL PRIOR TO TIDAL INUNDATION ON EACH TIDAL CYCLE.
- 5. STRIP 1' SURFACE LAYER AS SHOWN ON PLANS. DISPOSE OF AT MUNICIPAL LANDFILL OR RECYCLING FACILITY.
- 6. EXCAVATE REUSABLE FILL AND WOOD WASTE TO THE DESIGN GRADES. STOCKPILE REUSABLE FILL PER PLAN. DISPOSE OF WOOD WASTE AT MUNICIPAL LANDFILL
- 7. PERFORM OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL PRIOR TO PLACEMENT OF TOPSOIL AND PLANTINGS. IN SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING AREAS EXCAVATION, HANDLING, AND DISPOSAL SHALL FOLLOW THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE SPECIFICATION "REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF CONTAMINATED SOILS".
- 8. BACKFILL OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL AND MARINE STRUCTURE DEMOLITION VOIDS/CUTS WITH SAND/GRAVEL MATERIAL AND COMPACT WITH EXCAVATOR BUCKET.
- 9. PLACE 2' THICK TOPSOIL (AND SAND/GRAVEL LAYER IN AREAS IDENTIFIED IN PLANS).
- 10. HYDROSEED AND PLANT TOPSOIL AREAS PER PLANTING PLAN AND SPECIFICATIONS.

Scale in Feet

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE
<b>RESTORATION &amp; CLEANUP</b>

### **TYPICAL SECTIONS**

DWG. NO.	12
CIP NO.	
PROJECT	-BW-2020

NO. PD-BW-2020

SHEET NO. 12 OF 25

![](_page_38_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_2.jpeg)

REVISION

## SOIL MANAGEMENT PLAN - TYPICAL SECTION

![](_page_38_Figure_8.jpeg)

- NOTES: 1. CLEAR AND GRUB FROM THE CLEARING (GRADING) LIMITS TO THE OUTER EDGE OF THE

- REUSABLE FILL STOCKPILE AREA. 2. STRIP 1' SURFACE LAYER. HAUL AND STOCKPILE AS REUSABLE FILL FROM SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING BOUNDARY TO RIPARIAN BUFFER LIMIT. 3. EXCAVATE REUSABLE FILL AND WOOD WASTE TO THE DESIGN GRADES. STOCKPILE REUSABLE FILL PER PLAN. DISPOSE OF WOOD WASTE AT SUBTITLE-D LANDFILL FOR MATERIALS GENERATED FROM SPECIAL HANDLING WASTE AREAS. OVER EXCAVATION BEYOND THE DESIGN LIMIT LINES IS NOT ALLOWED AND WILL NOT BE PAID FOR BY THE PORT 4. PERFORM SELECTIVE OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOVAL PER THE DIRECTION OF THE ENGINEER PRIOR TO PLACEMENT OF TOPSOIL AND PLANTINGS. DEBRIS REMOVAL SHALL
- - 5
  - 6

	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	3570NAL ES 10/20			
STRUCTION					PEGISTEREL INT	APPROVED BY:		301
					39326	prawn by: A. PICCINI	CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	SOU
						designed by: D. CLINE	date: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY V
					WID R. CLI	D. CLINE	AS SHOWN	
						PROJECT ENGINEER:	SCALE:	

INCLUDE PICKING OUT MARINE WOOD DEBRIS, QUARRY S AND OTHER WOOD WASTE, AND IS NOT WHOLESALE EXC SPECIAL WASTE HANDLING AREAS EXCAVATION, HANDLIN FOLLOW THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE SPECIFICATION REM CONTAMINATED SOILS. BACKFILL AND COMPACT OPPORTUNISTIC DEBRIS REMOV DEMOLITION VOIDS/CUTS WITH SAND/GRAVEL MATERIAL PLACE 2' THICK TOPSOIL (AND SAND/GRAVEL LAYER IN AN HYDROSEED AND PLANT TOPSOIL AREAS PER PLANTING	SPALLS, CONCRETE BLOCKS, AVATIONS OF THE AREAS. IN NG, AND DISPOSAL SHALL MOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF VAL AND MARINE STRUCTURE WITH EXCAVATOR BUCKET. REAS IDENTIFIED IN PLANS). PLAN AND SPECIFICATIONS.
	0 10 20
PORT OF EVERETT	DWG. NO. <b>13</b>
WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE	CIP NO.
L MANAGEMENT PLAN - TYPICAL	PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020
SECTION	SHEET NO. 13 OF 25

![](_page_39_Figure_0.jpeg)

					NTD R. CLIA	project engineer: D. CLINE	scale: AS SHOWN	F
				T	Strong and the second s	designed by: D. CLINE	date: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY \
					39320	drawn by: A. PICCINI	CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	
NSTRUCTION					POPERCISTERE'S	APPROVED BY:		
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	5.10NAL 18770720			

![](_page_40_Figure_0.jpeg)

					PROJECT ENGINEER:SCALE:D. CLINEAS SHOWN	
					DESIGNED BY: D. CLINE DATE: AUGUST 10, 2020	ВАΥ
					DRAWN BY: A. PICCINI J. KLEKOTKA	
ISTRUCTION					APPROVED BY:	
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION		

![](_page_41_Figure_0.jpeg)

					PROJECT ENGINEER: SCALE: D. CLINE AS SHOWN	F
					Designed by: D. CLINE DATE: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY V
					DRAWN BY: A. PICCINI CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	
STRUCTION					APPROVED BY:	
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION		

![](_page_42_Figure_0.jpeg)

						PROJECT ENGINEER:	SCALE:	
					NID R. CLINA	D. CLINE	AS SHOWN	
					ALL OF ANHINE FE	designed by: D. CLINE	date: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY
						drawn by: A. PICCINI	CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	
STRUCTION					PORTEGISTERED ST	APPROVED BY:		
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	-310NAL KOP 10420			

PORT OF EVERET	Γ
----------------	---

WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE RESTORATION & CLEANUP

### SECTION M

DWG. NO. <b>17</b>
CIP NO.
PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020
SHEET NO. 17 OF 25

Scale in Feet

![](_page_43_Figure_0.jpeg)

			_			
					PROJECT ENGINEER: SCALE:	
					D. CLINE AS SHOWN	
					DESIGNED BY: D. CLINE DATE: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY
					A. PICCINI CHECKED BY: 39320 A. PICCINI J. KLEKOTKA	
ONSTRUCTION					APPROVED BY:	
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION		

![](_page_44_Figure_0.jpeg)

	PEDESTRIAN TRAIL PLANTING BUFFER								
	SPLIT-RAIL FENCE								
	LOWER SLOPE PLANTING ZONE (WETLANDS) (EL. 2'-4')								
////	MID SLOPE PLANTING ZONE (WETLAND/RIPARIA	N MIX) (EL. 4'-7')							
Ţ	UPPER SLOPE PLANTING ZONE (RIPARIAN) (EL.	7'-11')							
$\overline{\lambda}$	RIPARIAN PLANTING ZONE (1) (RIPARIAN) (EL. 11	'+)							
$\nabla$	RIPARIAN PLANTING ZONE (2) (RIPARIAN, NO TREES)								
	PEDESTRIAN TRAIL								
	EROSION CONTROL SEEDING AREA								
	CRITICAL AREA SIGN								
OR	T OF EVERETT	DWG. NO. <b>19</b>							
OOD	INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE	CIP NO.							
NEO		PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020							
	PLANTING PLAN	SHEET NO. 19 OF 25							

LEGEND

PROPOSED MAJOR CONTOUR

PROPOSED MINOR CONTOUR

**RIPARIAN BUFFER LIMIT** 

Scale in Fee

![](_page_45_Figure_0.jpeg)

30X 538

EVERETT, WA 98206 (425) 259-3164

REVISION

▲ 7/01/20 AWP

ΒY

NO. DATE

FORM PILOT HOLE WITH ROCK BAR, REBAR OR OTHER PLANTING TOOL. DO NOT HAMMER OR POUND IN CUTTINGS WITHOUT FIRST FORMING

**INSTALL CUTTINGS TRIANGULARLY** 

![](_page_45_Figure_5.jpeg)

NOTES:

1. SOIL SHALL BE MOIST TO WET AT TIME OF PLANTING.

![](_page_45_Figure_10.jpeg)

					PROJECT ENGINEER:	SCALE:	
				WID R. (	D. CLINE	AS SHOWN	
				The second	D. CLINE	date: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY
				39326	A. PICCINI	checked by: J. KLEKOTKA	
ISSUED FOR BID & CONSTRUCTION				POPEGISTE	APPROVED BY:		
REVISION	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	BYTR/20		

![](_page_45_Picture_14.jpeg)

### NOTES:

1. PLANT SHRUBS NO CLOSER THAN 2.5 FT. FROM PEDESTRIAN TRAIL AND FENCE.

![](_page_45_Figure_17.jpeg)

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE **RESTORATION & CLEANUP** 

### PLANTING DETAILS (1)

CIP NO.

PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020

SHEET NO. 20 OF 25

20

![](_page_46_Figure_0.jpeg)

### PLANTING NOTES:

- SHOWN IN THE TESC PLAN AND CONTRACTOR PROVIDED SWPPP.
- AN APPROVED LOCATION.
- INCHES IN DIAMETER AND LARGER SHALL BE RAKED UP, REMOVED, AND DISPOSED OF BY THE CONTRACTOR.
- 4. WHERE SOILS ARE COMPACTED BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY, DECOMPACT THE SOIL AS SPECIFIED IN SECTIONS 31 20 20 AND 31 20 30.
- 5. AMEND ALL PLANTING AREAS WITH MINIMUM 3 INCHES OF COMPOST AND MIX INTO DECOMPACTED SOILS TO A DEPTH OF 12 INCHES.
- AND APPLY HYDROMULCH AND TACKIFIER IN SECOND PASS.
- 7. RECOMMENDED TIME FOR TREE, SHRUB, AND GROUNDCOVER INSTALLATION IS LATE FALL OR EARLY SPRING (BETWEEN NOVEMBER 1 AND MARCH 31). RECOMMENDED TIME FOR EMERGENT INSTALLATION IS EARLY SPRING (JANUARY 15 TO MARCH 1). RECOMMENDED TIME FOR SEEDING IS MARCH 15 TO SEPTEMBER 1.
- SHADED LOCATION FOR PROTECTION AGAINST DRYING. PLANTS SHALL BE INSPECTED BY A QUALIFIED ECOLOGIST PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- 9. PLANT LAYOUT WILL BE DIRECTED AND APPROVED BY THE ONSITE ECOLOGIST.
- PLANTING).
- SHALL BE MOVED AWAY FROM PLANT STEMS TO PREVENT STEM ROT.

MAINTENANCE

- IMPLEMENTING ANY OTHER MEASURES NEEDED TO ENSURE PLANT SURVIVAL. AN ECOLOGIST WILL REVIEW PROPOSED MAINTENANCE.
- MONITORING SO THAT IT IS AVAILABLE IF NEEDED.

PROJECT ENGINEER: SCALE: **PORT OF EVERETT** AS SHOWN d. cline DATE: ESIGNED BY AUGUST 10, 2020 CLINE **BAY WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE** CHECKED BY: **RESTORATION & CLEANUP** J. KLEKOTKA PICCINI **PLANTING DETAILS (2)** PPROVED BY: NO. DATE ΒY REVISION

NO. DATE

ΒY

REVISION

1. PRIOR TO CLEARING AND GRADING ACTIVITIES, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS

2. CLEAR AND GRUB ALL BLACKBERRIES, SCOTCH BROOM, AND EXISTING VEGETATION FROM PLANTING ZONES. REMOVE MATERIAL FROM THE SITE AND DISPOSE AT

3. TOPSOIL WILL EITHER BE STOCKPILED ON SITE DURING GRADING ACTIVITIES AND REUSED, OR OBTAINED FROM A CLEAN, OFF-SITE LOCATION. ONLY CLEAN TOPSOIL EXCAVATED ONSITE FROM WETLANDS SHOULD BE PLACED IN LOWER AND MID SLOPE PLANTING AREAS. ANY TOPSOIL STOCKPILED FOR PROJECT USE SHALL BE PROTECTED TO PREVENT EROSION AND WEED GROWTH. AFTER TOPSOIL HAS BEEN SPREAD, ALL LARGE CLODS, HARD LUMPS, LITTER, AND ROCKS 2

6. IMMEDIATELY AFTER SOIL PREPARATION, HYDROSEED EXPOSED SOILS IN RIPARIAN ZONE WITH APPROPRIATE NATIVE EROSION-CONTROL SEED MIX SPECIFIED MIXED WITH A TACKIFIER AT A RATIO RECOMMENDED BY THE SEED SUPPLIER. USING A TWO-PASS METHOD, APPLY SEED AND TACKIFIER TO SOIL IN FIRST PASS

8. PROCURE PLANTS AND STORE PROPERLY. PLANTS SHALL CONFORM WITH THE CODE OF STANDARDS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN. PLANT MATERIAL WILL BE NATIVE TO THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND FROM PLANT STOCK GENOMES FROM WESTERN WASHINGTON. ALL PLANTS SHOULD BE INSTALLED THE SAME DAY THEY ARE DELIVERED TO THE SITE. PLANTS THAT CANNOT BE PLANTED WITHIN ONE DAY AFTER ARRIVAL SHOULD BE "HEELED-IN' TO THE SOIL IN A

10. INSTALL PLANTS AS SHOWN ON PLANS IN NATURAL, RANDOM CLUSTERS FOLLOWING THE DETAILS FOR CONTAINER-GROWN PLANTS, LIVE STAKES, BARE ROOT, AND PLUG CONDITIONS. TREES, SHRUBS, AND GROUNDCOVERS SHOULD BE INSTALLED PER THE CLUSTERING DETAIL. EMERGENTS SHOULD BE INSTALLED IN GROUPS OF 15 TO 20 INDIVIDUALS OF THE SAME SPECIES. FOR SPECIES IN THE LOWER SLOPE PLANTING ZONE, INSTALL PLANTS ALONG THE HIGHER ELEVATION.

11. WATER PLANTS THOROUGHLY TO AVOID CAPILLARY STRESS (TYPICALLY, PLANTED AREAS SHOULD BE WATERED WITH APPROXIMATELY 1 INCH OF WATER AFTER

12. INSTALL MULCH RINGS AROUND SHRUBS AND TREES. RINGS SHOULD BE THREE INCHES OF GUARANTEED WEED-FREE COARSE WOOD CHIP MULCH. WOOD CHIPS

1. THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING ALL PLANTING AREAS FOR THE FIRST THREE YEARS FOLLOWING CONSTRUCTION. THE PORT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING THE PLANTING AREAS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 10-YEAR MONITORING PERIOD. MAINTENANCE WILL INCLUDE WATERING, WEEDING AROUND THE BASE OF INSTALLED PLANTS, REPLACING OR ADDING PLANTS TO MEET SURVIVAL AND COVER REQUIREMENTS, REMOVING ALL CLASSES OF NOXIOUS WEEDS (SEE WASHINGTON STATE NOXIOUS WEEDS LIST, WAC 16-750-005, -011, AND -015 AND SNOHOMISH COUNTY'S NOXIOUS WEEDS LIST), AND

2. TEMPORARY IRRIGATION OR WATERING SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE UPPER SLOPE AND RIPARIAN PLANTING ZONES, AS NEEDED, FOR THE FIRST THREE YEARS AFTER PLANT INSTALLATION TO FACILITATE PLANT SURVIVAL AND ESTABLISHMENT. WATER SHOULD BE PROVIDED BY A TEMPORARY, ABOVE GROUND IRRIGATION SYSTEM AND/OR A WATER TRUCK. WATER SHOULD BE APPLIED AT A RATE OF 1 INCH OF WATER, TWO TIMES PER WEEK FROM JUNE 15 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 15, OR AS DIRECTED BY THE PORT. TIDES AND GROUNDWATER ARE ANTICIPATED TO SUPPLY ADEQUATE HYDROLOGY TO THE LOWER AND MID SLOPE PLANTING AREAS FOLLOWING CONSTRUCTION. IF A TEMPORARY IRRIGATION SYSTEM IS INSTALLED, IT SHOULD BE LEFT IN PLACE THROUGH AT LEAST THE SECOND YEAR OF

CIP NO.

PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020

SHEET NO. 21 OF 25

21

							PLANTING ZONE				
							RIPARIAN 1	RIPARIAN 2	UPPER SHORE	MID SHORE	LOW SHORE
STRATUM	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	INDICATOR STATUS	SIZE AND CONDITION	SPACING	TOTAL QUANTITY	11 FT+	11 FT+	7-11FT	4-7 FT	2-4 FT
	ACER MACROPHYLLUM	BIG LEAF MAPLE	FACU	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	20	20	0			
	ALNUS RUBRA	RED ALDER	FAC	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	10	10	0			
	MALUS FUSCA	PACIFIC CRABAPPLE	FACW	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	20	20	0			
TDEE	PICEA SITCHENSIS	SITKA SPRUCE	FAC	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	20	20	0			
IREE	PINUS CONTORTA	SHORE PINE	FAC	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	20	20	0			
	POPULUS BALSAMIFERA SPP TRICHOCARPA	BLACK COTTONWOOD	FAC	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	10	10	0			
	PSEUDOTSUGA MENSIEZII	DOUGLAS FIR	FACU	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	20	20	0			
	TSUGA HETEROPHYLLA	WESTERN HEMLOCK	FACU	1-GAL CONT.	15' O.C.	20	20	0			
	AMELANCHIER ALNIFOLIA	SERVICEBERRY	FACU	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	GAULTHERIA SHALLON	SALAL	FACU	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	HOLODISCUS DISCOLOR	OCEANSPRAY	FACU	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	LONICERA INVOLUCRATA	BLACK TWINBERRY	FAC	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	MAHONIA AQUIFOLIUM	TALL OREGON GRAPE	FACU	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	PHILADELPHUS LEWISII	MOCK ORANGE	NL	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
SHRUB	RIBES DIVARICATUM	BLACK GOOSEBERRY	FAC	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	ROSA NUTKANA	NOOTKA ROSE	FAC	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	RUBUS PARVIFLORUS	THIMBLEBERRY	FACU	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	SALIX HOOKERIANA	HOOKER WILLOW	FACW	LIVE STAKE	5' O.C.	570			570		
	SALIX SCOULERIANA	SCOULER'S WILLOW	FAC	LIVE STAKE	5' O.C.	800	95	135	570		
	SAMBUCUS RACEMOSA	RED ELDERBERRY	FACU	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	SYMPORICARPOS ALBUS	SNOWBERRY	FACU	BARE ROOT	5' O.C.	230	95	135			
	ARCTOSTAPHYLOS UVA-URSI	KINNIKINNICK	FACU	BARE ROOT	2.5' O.C.	620			620		
	FRAGARIA CHILOENSIS	COAST STRAWBERRY	FACU	BARE ROOT	2.5' O.C.	620			620		
	GRINDELIA INTEGRIFOLIA	COAST GUMWEED	FACW	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	620			620		
GROUNDCOVER	LEYMUS MOLLIS	AMERICAN DUNE GRASS	FACU	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	620			620		
	LUPINUS LITTORALIS	SEASHORE LUPINE	NL	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	620			620		
	SYMPHYOTRICHUM SUBSPICATUM	DOUGLAS ASTER	FACW	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	620			620		
	AGROSTIS EXARATA	SPIKE BENTGRASS	FACW	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	225				225	
	CAREX LYNGBYEI	LYNGBYE'S SEDGE	OBL	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	285				225	60
	DESCHAMPSIA CAESPITOSA	TUFTED HAIRGRASS	FACW	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	225				225	
	DISTICHLIS SPICATA	SALTGRASS	FACW	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	225				225	
	ELEOCHARIS PALUSTRIS	COMMON SPIKERUSH	OBL	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	285				225	60
	GRINDELIA INTEGRIFOLIA	COAST GUMWEED	FACW	10 INCH PLUG	2.5' O.C.	225				225	
EMERGENT	JUNCUS ARCTICUS SSP		FACW		25'00	225				225	
					25'00	225				225	
					25'00	225				225	60
					25'00	200				223	60 60
	SYMPHYOTRICHUM				2.5' 0.0	200				220	
						220				220	
		SEASIDE ARROWGRASS	ORL		2.5 U.C.	285				225	60

![](_page_47_Picture_1.jpeg)

# GEALE SHANNON & WILSON, INC. 400 North 34th Street, Suite 100 Seattle, Washington 98103 P.O. Box 300303 (206) 632-8020 FAX: (206) 633-6777

Â	7/01/20	AWP	ISSUED FOR BID & C
NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION

					NID R. CLIN	project engineer: D. CLINE	scale: AS SHOWN	
				T	ALL OF ANALNESS	designed by: D. CLINE	date: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY
					399-00	drawn by: A. PICCINI	CHECKED BY: J. KLEKOTKA	
ONSTRUCTION					PORTEGISTERE	APPROVED BY:		
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	5570NAL BEHO/20			

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

WOOD INTERIM ACTION - SHORELINE **RESTORATION & CLEANUP** 

PLANTING SCHEDULE

DWG.	NO.

NO.	
	22

CIP NO.

PROJECT NO. PD-BW-2020

SHEET NO. 22 OF 25

![](_page_48_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_8.jpeg)

$\triangle$	7/01/20	AW
		Ľ,

![](_page_48_Figure_14.jpeg)

					PROJECT ENGINEER: SCALE: D. CLINE AS SHOWN	
					Designed by: D. CLINE DATE: AUGUST 10, 2020	BAY
					A. PICCINI J. KLEKOTKA	
NSTRUCTION					APPROVED BY:	
	NO.	DATE	ΒY	REVISION		

### LEGEND

	SITE BOUNDARY
CLL	CONSTRUCTION ZONE BOUNDARY
	RETAINING WALL
T	TIMBER BULKHEAD
WL	WETLAND
X X	SILT FENCE
10.0	EXISTING GRADE (FT)
<u> </u>	APPROXIMATE FINISH GRADE ELEVATION (FT
	EXCAVATION DEPTH = 1 FT
	EXCAVATION DEPTH = 2 FT
	EXCAVATION DEPTH = 3 FT

### NOTES:

- 1. CONTRACTOR SHALL CONFIRM EXISTING ELEVATIONS, PRESENCE OF DEBRIS, AND UTILITIES IN THE EXCAVATION BOUNDARY AND IMPLEMENT TESC MEASURES.
- 2. REMOVE VEGETATION AND DEBRIS THROUGHOUT EXCAVATION BOUNDARY AND DISPOSE OF OFFSITE.
- 3. EXCAVATE TO THE DEPTHS INDICATED (1, 2, OR 3 FT) TO REMOVE CONTAMINATION, AND DISPOSE OF THE SOILS OFFSITE AT A RCRA SUBTITLE D DISPOSAL FACILITY.
- 4. AFTER EXCAVATION TO FINAL DEPTHS, PROVIDE ACCESS TO PORT FOR OBSERVATION AND SAMPLE COLLECTION PRIOR TO BACKFILLING.
- 5. AFTER THE PORT HAS COMPLETED OBSERVATIONS OF THE FINAL EXCAVATION FLOOR AND SIDEWALLS AND APPROVES THE EXCAVATION, INSTALL GEOTEXTILE / STEEL MESH STABILIZATION / ECOLOGICAL BARRIER ON BASE AND SIDEWALLS, OVERLAPPING PANELS BY 12 INCHES.
- 6. PLACE AND COMPACT A MINIMUM SOIL COVER 2 FT IN THICKNESS THROUGHOUT THE REMOVAL AREA TO ACHIEVE FINISHED GRADE ELEVATIONS USING REUSABLE FILL SOURCED ONSITE.
- 7. COVER SOIL AT FINISHED GRADE WITH STRAW FOR STORMWATER RUNOFF PROTECTION.

VERTICAL ELEVATION DATUM: NAVD88

BASE SOURCE: TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY: METRON AND ASSOCIATES INC.,

NOVEMBER 2018 AERIAL IMAGE: BING AERIAL IMAGERY, 2020

![](_page_49_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_14.jpeg)

Landau Associates 130 2nd Avenue South

130 2nd Avenue South Edmonds, Washington 98020 (425) 778-0907 0 7/30/20 DHF NO. DATE BY

ISSUED FOR BID AND COR

CONSTRUCTION	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION	A CLARE K. CI.	APPROVED BY:		
					19 43775 10 P 43775	drawn by: J VALLUZZI	CHECKED BY: D FRAZER	
					A LE S LE	designed by: J DAVIS	date: AUGUST 2020	
					WICHAEL SIN OF WASH O	J DAVIS	1" = 20'	
					- 6888.	PROJECT ENCINEER	SCALE	

## **PORT OF EVERETT**

BAY WOOD INTERIM ACTION -SHORELINE RESTORATION & CLEANUP

LOW AREA CLEANUP PLAN

DWG. NO. <b>24</b>						
CIP NO. ##-04						
PROJECT NO. 0147053.010.017						
SHEET NO. 24 OF 25						

![](_page_50_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_2.jpeg)

SECTION B-B': EXCAVATION

Horizontal Scale in Feet: 1"=5' Vertical Scale in Feet: 1"=5'

![](_page_50_Picture_5.jpeg)

В (WEST) 20 ¬ EXISTING GROUND REMOVED TIMBER BULKHEAD ASSUMED SHORELINE FINAL 15 -**GRADE TRANSITION TO** WETLAND EXISTING GRADE (SEQ. NOTE 4) -10 -WÉTLÁND 0+00

SECTION B-B': BACKFILL

Vertical Scale in Feet: 1"=5'

### SEQUENCING NOTES:

- 1. EXCAVATE LOW AREA TO DEPTH AS NOTED ON SHEET 24
- 2. INSTALL GEOTEXTILE/STEEL MESH STABILIZATION/ECOLOGICAL BARRIER AT BASE OF EXCAVATION
- 3. ADD FILL TO 2-FT DEPTH ON TOP OF INSTALLED BARRIER
- 4. SHORELINE RESTORATION WORK WILL INCLUDE REMOVAL OF THE BULKHEAD AND REGRADING SHORELINE. SHORELINE RESTORATION GRADE SHOWN CONCEPTUALLY FOR REFERENCE. WORK AT THE TRANSITION BETWEEN THE LOW AREA EXCAVATION AND THE SHORELINE RESTORATION MUST BE CONDUCTED UNDER DIRECTION OF PORT REPRESENTATIVES.

					MICHAEL SWY DE WASK D	project engineer: J DAVIS	SCALE:	P
					ALL ST	designed by: J DAVIS	date: AUGUST 2020	
					PH 43775	drawn by: J VALLUZZI	checked by: D FRAZER	SH
ISTRUCTION					A STER OLNE	APPROVED BY:		
	NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION				

![](_page_50_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_16.jpeg)

Horizontal Scale in Feet: 1"=5'

## PORT OF EVERETT

BAY WOOD INTERIM ACTION -**IORELINE RESTORATION & CLEANUP** 

LOW AREA CLEANUP SECTIONS

	DWG. NO.					
_	25					
	CIP NO. ##-04					
	PROJECT NO. 0147053.010.017					
	SHEET NO. 25 OF 25					

![](_page_51_Figure_0.jpeg)

LANDAU Associates 

and Compliance Monitoring **Sampling Locations** 

Figu	re
2	

![](_page_52_Figure_0.jpeg)

City of Everett Stormdrain

2021 As-Built Excavation Contour (1ft interval)

Limits of Critterfence/Geotextile Cap

Site Boundary

\_\_\_

\_ \_

**Excavation** Limits

LANDAU Associates 

Legend

0

Low Area Compliance Monitoring Sampling Location

Low Area Characterization Test Pit/Sampling Location

Soil Sample Location (SLR 2018)

### Note

1. Black and white reproduction of this color original may reduce its effectiveness and lead to incorrect interpretation.

Source: Strider Construction, 2021; GeoEngineers 2018; Metron 2018; SLR 2018; ©Bing 2019

80

Scale in Feet

**Baywood Products** 

2nd Interim Action

Everett, Washington

Low Area Cap Extent

![](_page_52_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Legend

- Low Area Compliance Monitoring Sampling Location
   Low Area Characterization Test Pit/Sampling Location
- Soil Sample Location (SLR 2018)

 SD
 City of Everett Stormdrain

 Site Boundary
 Site Boundary

 7
 2021 As-built Finished Grade Contour (1ft interval)

 Extent of Finished Grade
 Limits of Critterfence/Geotextile Cap

Baywood Products Engineering Design Report Everett, Washington

Scale in Feet

80

![](_page_53_Picture_6.jpeg)

### Note

1. Black and white reproduction of this color original may reduce its effectiveness and lead to incorrect interpretation.

Source: Strider Construction, 2021; GeoEngineers 2018; Metron 2018; SLR 2018; ©Bing 2019

Low Area Finished Grade

Figure **4** 

![](_page_54_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Legend

2021 As-Built Shoreline Restoration Contour (NGVD29 Vertical Datum, 1ft interval)

As-Built Trail Alignment

### Note

1. Black and white reproduction of this color original may reduce its effectiveness and lead to incorrect interpretation.

![](_page_55_Figure_7.jpeg)

Source: Strider Construction, 2021; GeoEngineers 2018; Metron 2018; SLR 2018; ©Bing 2019

Shoreline Restoration Finished Grade Figure 6

### Appendix B Site Photographs

![](_page_57_Picture_2.jpeg)

Exhibit B-1: Photo Point 1 (P1) Facing North from South End of Transect 1 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_57_Picture_4.jpeg)

Exhibit B-2: P2, September 29, 2021, Facing North from South End of Transect 2 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_58_Picture_2.jpeg)

Exhibit B-3: P3, September 29, 2021, Facing Northeast from West End of Riprapped Stormwater Channel Inlet (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_58_Picture_4.jpeg)

Exhibit B-4: P4, September 29, 2021, Facing West from East End of Transect 3 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_59_Picture_2.jpeg)

Exhibit B-5: P5, September 29, 2021, Facing West from East End of Transect 4 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_59_Picture_4.jpeg)

Exhibit B-6: P6, September 29, 2021, Facing Southeast (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_60_Picture_2.jpeg)

Exhibit B-7: P7, September 29, 2021, Facing Northwest from Southeast End of Transect 5 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_60_Picture_4.jpeg)

Exhibit B-8: P8, September 29, 2021, Facing Northwest from Southeast End of Transect 6 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_61_Picture_2.jpeg)

Exhibit B-9: P9, September 29, 2021, Facing Southeast (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_61_Picture_4.jpeg)

Exhibit B-10: P10, September 29, 2021, Facing Northeast from Southwest End of Transect 7 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_62_Picture_2.jpeg)

Exhibit B-11: P11, September 29, 2021, Facing Northeast from Southwest End of Transect 8 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_62_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Picture_6.jpeg)

Exhibit B-12: P12, September 29, 2021, Facing South from West End of Site at the Corps' Training Wall (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_63_Picture_2.jpeg)

Exhibit B-13: P13, September 29, 2021, Facing Southeast from Northwest End of Transect 9 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

![](_page_63_Picture_4.jpeg)

Exhibit B-14: P14, September 29, 2021, Facing Southeast from Northwest End of Transect 10 (Left: As-Built on September 29, 2021; Middle: Year 2 on August 4, 2023; Right: Year 3 on August 6, 2024)

### Appendix C Native Woody Cover Data

### Exhibit C-4: Year 3 Transect Data

Start (Feet)	End (Feet)	Cover (Feet)	Species
ransect 1, Transect Le	ngth 65 Feet		
2.2	3.8	1.6	Twinberry
6.6	10.2	3.6	Willow
14.2	14.6	0.4	Big-leaf maple
36.5	38.2	1.7	Snowberry
44.5	46.1	1.6	Snowberry
58.5	60.1	1.6	shore pine
	Total Cover	10.5	
	Percent Cover	16.2%	
ransect 2, Transect Le	ngth 65 Feet		
3	22.4	19.4	willow
23.4	27.8	4.4	willow
30.8	31.5	0.7	willow
42.4	45.7	3.3	willow
	Total Cover	27.8	
	Percent Cover	42.8%	
ransect 3, Transect Le	ngth 100 Feet		
31.6	33.5	1.9	Shore pine
37.1	37.5	0.4	Oregon grape
42.4	42.8	0.4	Oregon grape
58.2	59.2	1	Oregon grape
52.8	53.4	0.6	Big-leaf maple
62	65.6	3.6	Rose
66.2	67.1	0.9	Rose
68.3	70.5	2.2	Rose
73.6	75.3	1.7	Rose
78.3	78.6	0.3	Boxelder maple
83.2	85.3	2.1	Rose
96.4	97.2	0.8	Twinberry
	Total Cover	15.9	
	Percent Cover	15.9%	
ransect 4, Transect Le	ngth 100 Feet		
0.1	0.7	0.6	willow
13.6	14.9	1.3	willow

### **SHANNON & WILSON**

### Bay Wood Interim Action Cleanup and Shoreline Restoration Project Year 3 Monitoring Report

Start (Feet)	End (Feet)	Cover (Feet)	Species
36.4	37.9	1.5	willow
46.8	47.8	1	willow
49.3	51.1	1.8	willow
61.4	63.8	2.4	willow
74.3	77.7	3.4	willow
83	86.5	3.5	willow
97.6	97.8	0.2	willow
	Total Cover	15.7	
	Percent Cover	15.7%	
Transect 5, Transect Lengt	th 100 Feet		
98	98.9	0.9	Elderberry
93.1	93.4	0.3	Oregon grape
86.6	87.6	1	Oregon grape
83	83.6	0.6	Oregon grape
77	77.9	0.9	Serviceberry
71.5	72.4	0.9	Serviceberry
66.8	67.8	1	Serviceberry
61.7	62.6	0.9	Serviceberry
56.3	57.2	0.9	Serviceberry
35.5	38.6	3.1	Douglas-fir
31.2	32.1	0.9	willow
26.4	27.2	0.8	willow
13.9	15.7	1.8	willow
8.6	9.9	1.3	willow
3.6	3.9	0.3	willow
	Total Cover	15.6	
	Percent Cover	15.6%	
Fransect 6, Transect Lengt	th 100 Feet		
91	92.8	1.8	willow
78	78.4	0.4	willow
54.5	55.2	0.7	willow
49.4	50.1	0.7	willow
27.2	27.6	0.4	willow
17.3	17.7	0.4	willow
10.0	10 /	0.2	willow

Start (Feet)	End (Feet)	Cover (Feet)	Species
0.6	3.8	3.2	willow
	Total Cover	7.8	
	Percent Cover	7.8%	
ransect 7, Transect Le	ength 100 Feet		
81.9	83.4	1.5	Twinberry
67.1	67.6	0.5	Snowberry
63.4	64.1	0.7	Snowberry
55	55.9	0.9	Serviceberry
39.7	40.3	0.6	Oregon grape
19.9	20.4	0.5	Thimbleberry
15.4	15.8	0.4	Kinnikinnick
10.2	10.7	0.5	Thimbleberry
5.6	6.5	0.9	Thimbleberry
	Total Cover	6.5	
	Percent Cover	6.5%	
ransect 8, Transect Le	ength 65 Feet		
40.9	42.7	1.8	Willow
37.5	37.7	0.2	Willow
31.8	32.2	0.4	Willow
25.9	26.5	0.6	Willow
11.7	12.7	1	Willow
	Total Cover	4	
	Percent Cover	6.2%	
ransect 9, Transect Le	ength 100 Feet		
34.6	35.5	0.9	Twinberry
39	39.5	0.5	Twinberry
65.3	68.7	3.4	Willow
72	73.9	1.9	Willow
76.9	79.4	2.5	Willow
83.7	84.9	1.2	Willow
90.4	92.8	2.4	Willow
93.7	98.6	4.9	Willow
98.8	100.0	1.2	Willow
	Total Cover	18.9	
	Percent Cover	18.9%	

Start (Feet)	End (Feet)	Cover (Feet)	Species			
Transect 10, Transect Length 100 Feet						
41.7	43.9	2.2	Rose			
47.2	49	1.8	Rose			
52	52.2	0.2	Rose			
52.7	54.3	1.6	Rose			
58.2	59	0.8	Rose			
63.4	63.9	0.5	Thimbleberry			
	Total Cover	7.1				
	Percent Cover	7.1%				

## Important Information

About Your Wetland Delineation/Mitigation and/or Stream Classification Report

### A WETLAND/STREAM REPORT IS BASED ON PROJECT-SPECIFIC FACTORS.

Wetland delineation/mitigation and stream classification reports are based on a unique set of project-specific factors. These typically include the general nature of the project and property involved, its size and configuration, historical use and practice, the location of the project on the site and its orientation, and the level of additional risk the client assumed by virtue of limitations imposed upon the exploratory program. The jurisdiction of any particular wetland/stream is determined by the regulatory authority(ies) issuing the permit(s). As a result, one or more agencies will have jurisdiction over a particular wetland or stream with sometimes confusing regulations. It is necessary to involve a consultant who understands which agency(ies) has jurisdiction over a particular wetland/stream and what the agency(ies) permitting requirements are for that wetland/stream. To help reduce or avoid potential costly problems, have the consultant determine how any factors or regulations (which can change subsequent to the report) may affect the recommendations.

Unless your consultant indicates otherwise, your report should not be used:

- If the size or configuration of the proposed project is altered.
- If the location or orientation of the proposed project is modified.
- If there is a change of ownership.
- For application to an adjacent site.
- For construction at an adjacent site or on site.
- Following floods, earthquakes, or other acts of nature.

Wetland/stream consultants cannot accept responsibility for problems that may develop if they are not consulted after factors considered in their reports have changed. Therefore, it is incumbent upon you to notify your consultant of any factors that may have changed prior to submission of our final report.

Wetland boundaries identified and stream classifications made by Shannon & Wilson are considered preliminary until validated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and/or the local jurisdictional agency. Validation by the regulating agency(ies) provides a certification, usually written, that the wetland boundaries verified are the boundaries that will be regulated by the agency(ies) until a specified date, or until the regulations are modified, and that the stream has been properly classified. Only the regulating agency(ies) can provide this certification.

### MOST WETLAND/STREAM "FINDINGS" ARE PROFESSIONAL ESTIMATES.

Site exploration identifies wetland/stream conditions at only those points where samples are taken and when they are taken, but the physical means of obtaining data preclude the determination of precise conditions. Consequently, the information obtained is intended to be sufficiently accurate for design but is subject to interpretation. Additionally, data derived through sampling and subsequent laboratory testing are extrapolated by the consultant who then renders an opinion about overall conditions, the likely reaction to proposed construction activity, and/or appropriate design. Even under optimal circumstances, actual conditions may differ from those thought to exist because no consultant, no matter how qualified, and no exploration program, no matter how comprehensive, can reveal what is hidden by earth, rock, and time. Nothing can be done to prevent the unanticipated, but steps can be taken to help reduce their impacts. For this reason, most experienced owners retain their consultants through the construction or wetland mitigation/stream classification stage to identify variances, conduct additional evaluations that may be needed, and recommend solutions to problems encountered on site.

### WETLAND/STREAM CONDITIONS CAN CHANGE.

Since natural systems are dynamic systems affected by both natural processes and human activities, changes in wetland boundaries and stream conditions may be expected. Therefore, delineated wetland boundaries and stream classifications cannot remain valid for an indefinite period of time. The Corps typically recognizes the validity of wetland delineations for a period of five years after completion. Some city and county agencies recognize the validity of wetland delineations for a period of two years. If a period of years has passed since the wetland/stream report was completed, the owner is advised to have the consultant reexamine the wetland/stream to determine if the classification is still accurate.

Construction operations at or adjacent to the site and natural events such as floods, earthquakes, or water fluctuations may also affect conditions and, thus, the continuing adequacy of the wetland/stream report. The consultant should be kept apprised of any such events and consulted to determine if additional evaluation is necessary.

### THE WETLAND/STREAM REPORT IS SUBJECT TO MISINTERPRETATION.

Costly problems can occur when plans are developed based on misinterpretation of a wetland/stream report. To help avoid these problems, the consultant should be retained to work with other appropriate professionals to explain relevant wetland, stream, geological, and other findings, and to review the adequacy of plans and specifications relative to these issues.

### DATA FORMS SHOULD NOT BE SEPARATED FROM THE REPORT.

Final data forms are developed by the consultant based on interpretation of field sheets (assembled by site personnel) and laboratory evaluation of field samples. Only final data forms are customarily included in a report. These data forms should not, under any circumstances, be drawn for inclusion in other drawings, because drafters may commit errors or omissions in the transfer process. Although photographic reproduction eliminates this problem, it does nothing to reduce the possibility of misinterpreting the forms. When this occurs, delays, disputes, and unanticipated costs are frequently the result.

To reduce the likelihood of data from misinterpretation, contractors, engineers, and planners should be given ready access to the complete report. Those who do not provide such access may proceed under the mistaken impression that simply disclaiming responsibility for the accuracy of information always insulates them from attendant liability. Providing the best available information to contractors, engineers, and planners helps prevent costly problems and the adversarial attitudes that aggravate them to a disproportionate scale.

### READ RESPONSIBILITY CLAUSES CLOSELY.

Because a wetland delineation/stream classification is based extensively on judgment and opinion, it is far less exact than other design disciplines. This situation has resulted in wholly unwarranted claims being lodged against consultants. To help prevent this problem, consultants have developed a number of clauses for use in written transmittals. These are not exculpatory clauses designed to foist the consultant's liabilities onto someone else; rather, they are definitive clauses that identify where
the consultant's responsibilities begin and end. Their use helps all parties involved recognize their individual responsibilities and take appropriate action. Some of these definitive clauses are likely to appear in your report, and you are encouraged to read them closely. Your consultant will be pleased to give full and frank answers to your questions.

## THERE MAY BE OTHER STEPS YOU CAN TAKE TO REDUCE RISK.

Your consultant will be pleased to discuss other techniques or designs that can be employed to mitigate the risk of delays and to provide a variety of alternatives that may be beneficial to your project.

## Contact your consultant for further information.