

MIDDLE SAMMAMISH RIVER, 09/14/17

Current Status: Accepted

Inspection Details

Inspection Type: Compliance	Inspected By: JoshL
Inspection Method: Desk & Field Review	Inspection Date & Time: 09/14/17 12:00 PM
Data Sources:	Inspection Reference #: 1181
Compliance Area: MIDDLE SAMMAMISH RIVER	Inspection Note: with Amy Lucas and Kye Iris of Snohomish County

Worksites Inspected

Snohomish County

Project # Proj Type	Project Name WorkSite Name	Status	Primary Pgm
99-1705 Acq	Paradise Valley #1 Paradise Valley	Active Completed	SALMON FED PROJ

Sponsor Contacts

Snohomish County

Person Name	Project Role	Phone Number	Email Address
Amy Lucas Snohomish County Parks Dept	Project Contact	(425) 388-6620	amy.lucas3@snoco.org
Chris Mueller Seattle Parks & Rec Dept	Alt Project Contact	(206) 684-0998	chris.mueller@seattle.gov
Dianne Bailey Snohomish County Parks Dept	Alt Project Contact	(425) 388-6622	
Jason Wilkinson King County of	Lead Entity Contact	(206) 477-4786	jason.wilkinson@kingcounty.gov

Questions

All Projects

#1: Function - Does the site continue to function as originally approved and as reflected in the project agreement(s)? If no or unsure, describe how or why.

Yes. Although inspection did not cover all 664 plus acres, the critical areas (wetlands, Bear Cr) appear well protected with gates and the upland area (that have user trails) appear well maintained by the County and user groups. Snohomish County personnel did show me a residential landfill adjacent to a unnamed tributary (to bear cr) behind the old farmstead property that is considerable in size. Some may even be filling adjacent wetlands. They had a contractor inspect some of the contents and it was stated that what was inspected did not contain contaminating or toxic materials. It is on the County's priority list to remove this material when funds are available. Site is located on the former living estate.

#2: Worktypes (or Elements) - Are the worktypes (or elements) funded by the grant in conformance with the project agreement? If no or unsure, describe the worktypes (or elements) that are missing, no longer functioning as intended, or obsolete.

No. A ~29.5 acre living estate that has extinguished is currently under agricultural use, by lease to a private party (Farmer Frog) with a portion of the area currently being developed for additional parking area (gravel surface) adjacent to the existing parking lot (paid for with RCO Grant 05-1159) for trial users but also for Farmer Frog. Both the agricultural use of the living estate and the additional parking is under review for eligible use under the Salmon Deed of Right that covers the entire property. It is noted that a covenant was recorded at transfer between Forterra and Snohomish County to allow the farm infrastructure to be retained for preservation and as a museum, but that the use was designated to be passive open space/ recreational use.

#3: Missing Worktypes (or Elements) - If there are missing or non-functioning worktypes (or elements), do they negatively affect the function of the project overall? If no, process a minor element change. If yes, describe the negative effects and process a major element change.

Unsure. A ~29.5 acre living estate that has extinguished is currently under agricultural use, by lease to a private party (Farmer Frog) with a portion of the area currently being developed for additional parking area (gravel surface) adjacent to the existing parking lot (paid for with RCO Grant 05-1159) for trial users but also for Farmer Frog. Both the agricultural use of the living estate and the additional parking is under review for eligible use under the Salmon Deed of Right that covers the entire property. It is noted that a covenant was recorded at transfer between Forterra and Snohomish County to allow the farm infrastructure to be retained for preservation and as a museum, but that the use was designated to be passive open space/ recreational use.

#4: Project Area - Does the project area continue to function as originally intended without impairment from other public or private non-project related uses? If no, describe the non-project related uses in the project area.

Yes. A ~29.5 acre living estate that has extinguished is currently under agricultural use, by lease to a private party (Farmer Frog) with a portion of the area currently being developed for additional parking area (gravel surface) adjacent to the existing parking lot (paid for with RCO Grant 05-1159) for trial users but also for Farmer Frog. Both the agricultural use of the living estate and the additional parking is under review for eligible use under the Salmon Deed of Right that covers the entire property. It is noted that a covenant was recorded at transfer between Forterra and Snohomish County to allow the farm infrastructure to be retained for preservation and as a museum, but that the use was designated to be passive open space/ recreational use.

#5: Indoor Facilities - Is the project area free of ineligible indoor facilities? If no, describe the ineligible indoor facilities in the project area.

No. Hoop houses have been constructed and are in the process of being constructed for the purposes of agriculture. If it is deemed that agricultural use is ineligible, these structures would be considered ineligible as would any new closed structures built on site. The existing farm infrastructure is expected to be allowed to remain per the special covenant on the deed for retaining these as historical buildings for public use as museum.

#6: Ineligible Facilities - If there is an ineligible facility in the project area, has it been approved by RCO?

Yes. Hoop houses have been constructed and are in the process of being constructed for the purposes of agriculture. If it is deemed that agricultural use is ineligible, these structures would be considered ineligible as would any new closed structures built on site. The existing farm infrastructure is expected to be allowed to remain per the special covenant on the deed for retaining these as historical buildings for public use as museum.

#7: Funding Acknowledgement - Are the funding programs and partners acknowledged at the site? This question does not apply to acquisition projects with conservation easements.

Yes. RTP program, but not PSAR/SRFB signs.

#8: Funding Acknowledgement - If the acknowledgement sign is missing, has the sign requirement been waived by RCO? This question does not apply to acquisition projects with conservation easements.

N/A.

Acquisition Projects

#1: Property Boundary - Is the property (or the 6f boundary) intact without the appearance of any property rights conveyed for non-project related uses? If no, describe the potential property interests conveyed for non-project uses.

No. A ~29.5 acre living estate that has extinguished is currently under agricultural use, by lease to a private party (Farmer Frog) with a portion of the area currently being developed for additional parking area (gravel surface) adjacent to the existing parking lot (paid for with RCO Grant 05-1159) for trial users but also for Farmer Frog. Both the agricultural use of the living estate and the additional parking is under review for eligible use under the Salmon Deed of Right that covers the entire property. It is noted that a covenant was recorded at transfer between Forterra and Snohomish County to allow the farm infrastructure to be retained for preservation and as a museum, but that the use was designated to be passive open space/ recreational use.

#2: Property Ownership - Is the property still owned by the project sponsor?

Yes.

#3: Property Ownership - If the property is no longer owned by the project sponsor, is it owned by an entity eligible to receive a grant in the funding program(s)? For yes or no, identify who now owns the property.

N/A.

#4: Interim Uses - For acquisition projects that have not yet been developed or restored as originally intended, are the interim uses of the project in agreement with grant program policies? If no, describe the interim uses and whether they have been previously approved by RCO.

Yes.

#5: Future Development or Restoration - For acquisition projects acquired for future development or restoration, has the site been developed or restored within 5 years? If yes, describe how the site has been developed or restored.

N/A.

All Acq projects and RCFB Dev and Rst projects

#1: Public Use - Is the project area available for public use? If no, describe how the area is not available for public use. This question does not apply to acquisition projects with conservation easements.

Yes. A large portion of the property is developed with trails and a parking lot specifically for public use. Another portion (east side of Paradise rd.) is restricted to public use without Park permission due to sensitive resources and a lack of planning and development for safe public access (based on info from County's website). County Code in the PVCA Adaptive Management Plan states:

22.04.060 Undeveloped park property.

Any property under the management and control of the parks division and not open for public use shall be defined as undeveloped park property. It shall be unlawful for any person to enter onto or remain on any posted undeveloped park property without prior approval of a parks employee.

#2: Public Use - If there is no public use, has it been waived by RCO? This question does not apply to acquisition projects with conservation easements.

No. I have found no evidence of a waiver to allow restricted access but I believe the restriction may be considered justifiable given the sensitive resources in this area.

#3: Public Use - If there is a public use restriction in the project area, will it last 180 days or less? This question does not apply to acquisition projects with conservation easements.

Yes. A portion (east side of Paradise rd.) of the PCVA is restricted due to sensitive resources and a lack of planning and development for safe public access (based on info from County's website). County Code in the PVCA Adaptive Management Plan states:

22.04.060 Undeveloped park property.

Any property under the management and control of the parks division and not open for public use shall be defined as undeveloped park property. It shall be unlawful for any person to enter onto or remain on any posted undeveloped park property without prior approval of a parks employee.

Acquisition projects with conservation easements

#1: Conservation Easement Terms - Are the terms of the farmland, habitat, or recreation conservation easement being met? If no, describe the potential easement issues? This question only applies to acquisition projects with conservation easements.

N/A.

#2: Conservation Easement Monitoring - Has the project sponsor submitted an easement monitoring report at least once in the last five years? If yes, identify the date of the report and the PRISM attachment number. This question only applies to acquisition projects with conservation easements.

N/A.

Acquisition and Restoration Projects

#1: Specific Species - If the project was originally funded for a specific plant or animal and that species has been lost from the project area, is the loss something that was out of the project sponsor's control? If no, describe the impacts to the species that were within the project sponsor's control. This question applies to restoration projects and only those acquisition projects where the primary purpose is "habitat conservation" or "habitat restoration".

N/A.

#2: Functioning Habitat - If the project was not originally funded for a specific plant or animal, does the project area continue to provide properly functioning habitat conditions? If no, describe how the project area lacks functioning habitat. This question applies to restoration projects and only those acquisition projects where the primary purpose is "habitat conservation" or "habitat restoration".

Yes.

#3: Stewardship Plan - If there is a stewardship plan for the project area, has the project sponsor followed the details outlined in the plan? If not, describe what has not been implemented. This question applies to SRFB projects and only those WWRP projects with the stewardship plan in the scope of work.

Yes. Although it is not attached to PRISM

Attachments

ALL PHOTOS AND FILES

Attachment Type	Title	File Name	User, Attach Date
Inspection Photos	99-1705 _Compliance	99-1705 _Compliance	JoshL, 10/06/2017
	Inspection_Updated	Inspection_Updated.pptx	

Issues/Tasks From This Inspection

#	Issue/Task Title	Type	SubType	Status	Assigned	Relationships	Sponsor
265	agricutlural use of living estate area	Compliance Issue	Conversion	Open	JoshL	#1181: MIDDLE SAMMAMISH RIVER, 9/14/17, 99-1705 Acq, Compliance, JoshL, Snohomish County ofINSPECTION	Snohomish County
266	Parking expansion eligibility review	Use Request	Allowable use request	Open	JoshL	#1181: MIDDLE SAMMAMISH RIVER, 9/14/17, 99-1705 Acq, Compliance, JoshL, Snohomish County ofINSPECTION	Snohomish County

Other Open Issues/Tasks

#	Issue/Task Title	Type	SubType	Status	Assigned	Relationships	Sponsor
---	------------------	------	---------	--------	----------	---------------	---------