

Natural and Human Environments

Snohomish county covers 2,064 square miles between Puget Sound on the west and the crest of the Cascade Mountains on the east. The flat river bottoms and gently rolling hills of the county's western half rise into foothills and the Cascade Mountains of the eastern half. In the western lowlands, a natural corridor of accessible land extends north from the Seattle area. Most of the county's urban development has occurred and is expected to continue within this corridor.

The county's position between western ocean salt water and eastern mountains along 48° north latitude gives it a maritime climate. Winters are generally moist, with temperatures dropping into the 30°'s F; summers are generally dry with temperatures in the 70°'s F. Precipitation falls mostly as rain in the lowlands, snow in the mountains, and varies from 30 inches per year near Puget Sound to as much as 200 inches in the Cascades.

Melting snow and glacier ice from these mountains provide the water to start three rivers running through the county — the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish. The non-permeable Cascade rock surfaces enable abundant runoff to reach the lowlands, and provide water for the county's industrial, farm and domestic consumers.

The western lowlands were built up from glacial deposition and erosion by rivers and streams. Soils there are more permeable, and while they provide good sources of groundwater, all three river drainage basins typically flood in spring, as do most county stream beds. These flood plains limit land development. Two other factors likewise limit development: (1) steep slopes — 69 square miles of county slopes exceed 15%; and (2) "wet soils" — 214 square miles of land are periodically flooded, are poorly drained, or are constantly wet. The remaining county lands are economically usable.

Urban development and agriculture have displaced most of the original coniferous forests that covered the county. Most forest land is now in second and third growth timber. Timber species in lowland areas are mostly deciduous.

Jurisdictional Roles and Authorities

Twenty-one general-purpose municipalities and three special-purpose districts affect solid waste management in Snohomish county. The general purpose entities include the County government, 19 cities and towns and the Tulalip Tribes. The special districts include the Snohomish Health District, the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority, and Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1. Each of the twenty-one municipalities must formally adopt this Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan for it to be applicable within their jurisdiction.

The State Department of Ecology (DOE) and Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) also perform important planning, financial assistance, and regulatory functions regarding solid waste management.

Following is a summary of solid waste management roles in Snohomish county.

Department of Ecology

State law (RCW 70.95) assigns to local governments the primary responsibility for solid waste management planning in their jurisdictions. The planning framework must follow that established by DOE, which is charged with creating the state's long-range plan, goals, and policies.

The state controls compliance with RCW 70.95 through its review and approval of solid waste management plans and facility permits. The state delegates regulatory authority over solid waste facilities to local health departments. Issuance of permits by local health departments may be appealed by DOE to the state Pollution Control Hearings Board.

The 1989 "Waste Not Washington" revisions to RCW 70.95 set forth a new order of priorities (RCW 70.95.010 (8)) for solid waste management, as follows:

- (1) Waste reduction
- (2) Recycling, with source separation of recyclable materials as the preferred method
- (3) Energy recovery, incineration or landfilling of separated wastes
- (4) Energy recovery, incineration or landfilling of mixed wastes

By stating in RCW 70.95.010 (9) that "It is the state's goal to achieve a fifty percent recycling rate by 1995," and in (10) that "Steps should be taken to make recycling at least as affordable and convenient to the ratepayer as mixed waste disposal," the state law makes clear that landfilling is the last resort to consider in solid waste management.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

The WUTC regulates garbage and refuse hauling under RCW 81.77, through the issuance of certificates entitling a hauler to provide solid waste collection services of a certain type (garbage, refuse, demolition) within a specified geographic area. This franchise system under which haulers are permitted to solely operate in particular areas is of importance to Snohomish county because of the county's significant rural population. The franchise system permits the spreading of hauler costs over large populations, which results in lower costs for rural customers. Because their costs are lower, more customers sign up for service, there is less self-

haul traffic to county facilities, and there is less likelihood of illegal dumping and illegal waste storage. However, municipal annexations are increasing. If such annexations result in rural populations being left to pay higher hauler costs, there could be health and environmental related impacts, as well as effects on system facilities.

The authority of the WUTC under RCW 81.77 is limited to collection of solid waste from generators and does not extend directly to the regulation of hauling of solid waste from transfer stations or of recycled materials. The WUTC regulates private companies providing the latter services through issuance of common carrier permits under RCW 81.80.

Snohomish County

Snohomish County, through its Department of Public Works, Solid Waste Management Division (SWMD), is currently the primary solid waste planning agency in the county. Snohomish County's specific authorities include:

- Preparing and updating the CSWMP under the advisory overview of a Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
- Managing a countywide transfer and disposal system. This includes the authorities to:
 - design, construct, and operate facilities
 - seek and accept state and federal financial assistance
 - issue general obligation or revenue bonds to cover capital costs
 - assess and collect user fees to offset operating costs, including management and financing costs
 - establish operating rules for system disposal sites.

Snohomish County's authority over and options regarding solid waste collection in unincorporated areas is restricted by the provisions of RCW 36.58A. These, in effect, vest such authority in the WUTC. Although the County may establish mandatory collection districts, in which all solid waste generators must receive and pay for collection services, the WUTC rules on the form of service to be provided. The County may not provide the collection service itself or through direct contract if any qualified garbage and refuse collection company is willing to do so. In addition, if such a district is established, the County becomes ultimately responsible for the collection of fees owed to the collection company.

Local Municipalities

Under state law, cities and towns have a broad range of authority to determine how they wish to manage or delegate control of solid waste generated within their jurisdictions. In Snohomish County, all cities and towns have delegated responsibility for solid waste transfer and disposal operations to the County and all, except the City of Everett, have adopted Resolutions of Concurrence designating the county as their solid waste management planning agency for the purposes of comprehensive plan update. Cities and towns have the option, during each update of a county CSWMP, to keep or change their local approach to solid waste management. Interlocal agreements and other contracts may constrain the approaches available.

In April 1988, the Everett City Council resolved to authorize and develop a separate CSWMP for the city. The resolution required that Everett coordinate its plan with the County's. In October 1990, the City and County entered into an Interlocal Agreement, under which the City assumes responsibility for collecting solid waste generated within its borders, and for using or disposing of recyclable materials outlined in the Agreement. The City uses the system for disposing of all other solid waste.

During 1996 the City updated its CSWMP. This update called for the City and County to negotiate an agreement concerning system decision making, services available to City residents and businesses, and the prices to be paid for these services. If these negotiations proved unsuccessful, the update called for the City to leave the system and develop its own waste disposal mechanism.

Since the system financially depended upon the City's waste, sold bonds stating that the City was part of the system, and considered the 1990 Interlocal Agreement binding, the County filed a declaratory judgment lawsuit to uphold that Agreement. Court rulings to date have upheld the Agreement, and this Plan accordingly assumes that waste from Everett will continue to flow into the system at least until 2010, when the Interlocal Agreement expires.

Tulalip Tribes

The Tulalip Tribes is a federally recognized Indian entity. It retains all jurisdiction over solid waste management on tribal and trust lands within the Tulalip Reservation, which includes about 36 square miles within the County. Its authority also extends over other lands within the Reservation, a fact which effectively excludes the County from extending its planning or regulatory authority or functions over tribal lands.

Solid waste generated on the Reservation is currently handled by a small, relatively unsophisticated drop box on the Reservation, or hauled to system facilities, primarily by certificated public carriers. County jurisdiction over this waste attaches as soon as it enters the unincorporated area of the county or is transported to a system facility within an incorporated city. By virtue of this jurisdiction, the County could prevent and regulate passage of Reservation generated waste through the county.

Because of this and other potential jurisdictional conflicts between the County and the Tribes, the Tribes should be involved in waste management planning processes, and both parties should strive for an interlocal solid waste handling and disposal agreement. Progress in this direction has been made over the last several years, with the Tribe now represented in a nonvoting capacity on the SWAC. In addition, the County and Tribes have begun discussion on a possible solid waste related interlocal agreement.

Snohomish Health District

The Snohomish Health District (SHD) is the county's primary regulatory authority for environmental and public health aspects of solid waste management. The District includes the entire county, the 19 cities and towns, but not the Tulalip Reservation.

Under regulations adopted pursuant to RCW 70.95 and WAC 173-304, SHD's authority covers construction and operation of all solid waste facilities; the storage, collection, transfer and disposal of solid waste; sewerage systems, septic tank installation and pumpers, noise emissions, and other public health activities that might affect the solid waste management system. This charge permits the District to assert regulatory control over both public and private facilities. The County also regulates these facilities through its land use and building regulations process.

Applications for proposed private facilities must be submitted to the Snohomish Health District for review and comment regarding their consistency with this comprehensive solid waste plan. If required by the appropriate zoning code, facilities proposed for unincorporated areas of the county are subject to the County's conditional use permitting process, and facilities within incorporated areas must meet the conditional use permit requirements of the applicable city or town.

Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority

The Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority (PSAPCA) regulates mobile and stationary sources of air pollutants. Through its urban area burn bans, it has effectively moved woody wastes and slash that was formerly burned into the waste stream. Some of this additional waste goes through the system, and some goes to private facilities. Other areas in which PSAPCA actions affect the system include its regulatory authority over emissions from solid waste equipment (including landfill emissions), composting facilities, and from other facilities that the system might build in the future.

Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1

The Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1 (PUD) plays a key role in power supply in Snohomish County. It has the authority to construct electrical generating facilities and to purchase and sell electrical power. These authorities may also give the PUD a role if the system decides to build resource recovery and landfill gas extraction systems.

County Demographics and Employment

The Washington State Growth Management Act requires counties to designate urban growth areas (UGA) based upon the 20-year population projections made for them by the state Office of Financial Management (OFM). By definition, these areas must contain enough space and density to accommodate the projected growth. Counties then allocate data gathering tasks for more specific forecasts, which are essential for planning by cities, towns and rural areas.

Snohomish County's process involved all jurisdictions, the County's Planning Department and the Economic Development Council, through Snohomish County Tomorrow. Subcounty allocations of population and employment were based on the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2020 forecasts, and subsequently refined as the comprehensive planning process evolved.

The OFM forecasts 180,000 additional people taking up residence in this county over the next 15 years. In the Snohomish County proposed comprehensive plan, county forecasters expect to attract into the UGAs 85% of that population, and up to 96% of the accompanying employment growth.

The intentions of the management plan are to retain open space and prime agricultural land in the rural areas, and to prevent further development within the flood plain areas. As a result of policies the county and local jurisdictions are

setting with regard to the natural environment, transportation, community facilities, and utility improvements, the portion of Snohomish county lands unavailable for development, reserved for parks or covered by streets is expected to grow from approximately 28% now to almost 33% by 2020.

Population

Snohomish county population has increased steadily since the beginning of this century, but between 1980 and 1990, it jumped by nearly 38%, and has grown another 18% so far this decade. Just over half of the county's population (50.04% in 1997) resides in unincorporated areas. Snohomish county's 19 incorporated cities and towns have largely increased their populations by annexing adjacent areas. Now, in the late-'90s, Snohomish is the state's third most populous county at over 550,000 people.

This rapid growth puts pressure on transportation networks, services and county lands, and requires critical assessments of how to manage the over 40% boost, to 715,000 people, anticipated through 2012. The Growth Management Act of 1990 was the state legislature's response to these developments in Snohomish county and the rest of the central Puget Sound region. The counties are directed to create plans within this framework. The table below illustrates this growth.

Average household size, projected by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), will continue its long-term decline from 3.25 persons per occupied housing unit in 1960 to 2.47 in 2010. Contributing factors include postponement of marriage and childbearing to later years, fewer children per family now than in the past, increased frequency of divorce and separation, and elderly surviving spouses living alone for longer periods of time than in the past.

Median age will rise from 32.1 to 36.2, and small population gains in the under 25 age group will not offset the dramatic gains by the 45 and over group. While annual birthrates are high in the county (8,285 in 1990), most population increase results from in-migration. Most people settle around Everett and in the southwest portion of the county. In 1970, the county's population density was 1.44 persons per acre; in 1980, 1.83 persons per acre, and by 2010, that density is forecast to reach 3.65 persons per acre — an average some 40 percent higher than elsewhere in the Puget Sound region.

| CITY | POPULATION | | | PERCENT CHANGE | |
|----------------|------------|---------|---------|----------------|---------|
| | 1980 | 1990 | 1997 | 1980-90 | 1990-97 |
| Arlington | 3,262 | 4,037 | 6,010 | 23.0% | 48.9% |
| Bothell (part) | N/A | 350 | 12,500 | N/A | 3471.4 |
| Brier | 2,915 | 5,633 | 6,185 | 93.2 | 9.8 |
| Darrington | 1,064 | 1,042 | 1,185 | - 2.1 | 13.7 |
| Edmonds | 27,679 | 30,743 | 35,470 | 11.1 | 15.4 |
| Everett | 54,413 | 69,974 | 84,130 | 28.8 | 20.2 |
| Gold Bar | 794 | 1,078 | 1,520 | 35.8 | 10.9 |
| Granite Falls | 911 | 1,080 | 1,830 | 16.4 | 41.0 |
| Index | 147 | 138 | 141 | - 5.4 | 2.2 |
| Lake Stevens | 1,860 | 3,435 | 5,290 | 106.9 | 54.0 |
| Lynnwood | 22,641 | 26,637 | 33,070 | 26.5 | 24.2 |
| Marysville | 5,544 | 10,326 | 18,770 | 86.3 | 81.8 |
| Mill Creek | N/A | 7,180 | 9,798 | N/A | 36.5 |
| Monroe | 2,869 | 4,275 | 8,670 | 49.0 | 102.8 |
| Mtlk. Terrace | 16,534 | 19,320 | 20,360 | 16.9 | 5.4 |
| Mukilteo | 1,428 | 6,962 | 15,890 | 389.9 | 128.2 |
| Snohomish | 5,294 | 6,499 | 7,856 | 22.8 | 20.9 |
| Stanwood | 1,646 | 1,961 | 3,050 | 19.1 | 55.6 |
| Sultan | 1,578 | 2,236 | 2,658 | 41.7 | 18.9 |
| Woodway | 832 | 914 | 985 | 9.9 | 7.8 |
| Incorporated | 151,229 | 205,832 | 275,390 | 36.1 | 33.8 |
| Unincorporated | 186,491 | 259,796 | 275,810 | 39.3 | 6.2 |
| TOTAL | 337,720 | 465,628 | 551,200 | 37.9 | 18.4 |

Snohomish County Projected Households, Existing Conditions (000s)

| HOUSEHOLD TYPE | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Single-family | 129.2 | 166.7 | 197.5 | 228.2 |
| Multi-family | 42.5 | 63.3 | 80.5 | 96.3 |
| Total | 171.7 | 230.0 | 278.0 | 324.5 |

Employment

Snohomish county added more than 70,000 jobs between 1980 and 1991, according to the Washington State Employment Security Department. It is forecast to add another 90,000 by the year 2010, for a total of 263,252, a 62 % gain over 1980. As

with population, employment is growing more rapidly here than elsewhere in the region.

| | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | % +/- |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Manufacturing | 34,500 | 50,009 | 65,133 | 68,786 | + 37.5 |
| Wholesl/Transport/ Comm/Utility | 8,900 | 12,897 | 16,596 | 20,778 | 61.1 |
| Retail | 21,400 | 35,390 | 48,846 | 60,960 | 72.3 |
| Services | 20,600 | 38,490 | 54,191 | 69,144 | 79.6 |
| Govt/Educ | 18,000 | 25,691 | 38,309 | 43,584 | 69.6 |
| Total Employment | 103,400 | 162,477 | 223,075 | 263,252 | 62.0 |

Historically, Snohomish county has been economically dependent upon agriculture, forest products and fishing. The economy has diversified, however, and now barely 1 % of total county employment is in these areas. Though manufacturing now employs the largest number of people in Snohomish county, OFM and PSRC forecast that the retail and services sectors will grow faster in the next two decades (72.3 % and 79.6 % respectively vs. 61.1 %), and that services will surpass manufacturing as the largest employment sector by 2010.

Currently, the county's top employers by employee count are:

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| 1 Boeing | 34,000 |
| 2 Naval Station Everett | 6,250 |
| 3 State of Washington | 4,200 |
| 4 Edmonds School District | 2,800 |
| 5 Providence Gen'l. Med. Center | 2,300 |
| 6 Tramco/ BF Goodrich | 2,200 |
| 7 Everett School District | 2,180 |
| 8 GTE Northwest | 2,142 |
| 9 Snohomish County Government | 2,041 |
| 10 Safeway | 1,500 |
| 11 Fluke Corporation | 1,500 |
| 12 Tulalip Tribes Enterprises | 1,350 |
| 13 Blue Cross of WA and AK | 1,345 |
| 14 Marysville School District | 1,300 |
| 15 Advanced Technology Labs | 1,297 |
| 16 Stevens Healthcare | 1,200 |
| 17 Kimberly Clark | 1,000 |
| 18 QFC | 1,000 |
| 19 Snohomish County PUD #1 | 970 |
| 20 City of Everett | 950 |

Land Use

Major industries are currently and expected to continue to remain concentrated around Everett and south along I-5 and I-405, while lighter industries extend along I-5 as far north as Arlington. The flood plains of the Stillaguamish and Snohomish River systems cross the urban corridor and serve as a constraint to urban land uses.

Other urban land uses in the county are concentrated in and around the communities located in the Snohomish, Skykomish, and Stillaguamish River valleys. Much of the river bottom land has been developed for farming, while the land at higher elevations and the mountainous eastern portion of the county remains largely in timber. The eastern part of the county lies within the national forest.

Approximately 17% of the county's land is developed for residential purposes, while 6% is used for employment. This 3:1 ratio is expected to fall to 2:1 by 2020, as industrial development continues within the county. By 2020, land used for employment is projected to more than double to over 14% of total land use, while residential land use is expected to grow more slowly to 26%.

Solid Waste Collection Services in Snohomish County

All of Snohomish county is served either by a private or municipal collection service. In unincorporated areas, solid waste collection is currently provided to residents on a voluntary basis by seven private companies operating under certificates issued by the WUTC. They include:

- Rabanco/Lynnwood Disposal
1600 - 127th Avenue NE, Bellevue, WA 98005
- Rubatino Refuse Removal, Inc.
PO Box 1029, Everett, WA 98206

- Sound Disposal, Inc.
P.O. Box 487, Edmonds, WA 98020
- Stanwood-Camano Disposal, Inc.
26020 64th Avenue N.W., Stanwood, WA 98292
- Waste Management Northwest
P.O. Box 12070, Mill Creek, WA 98082

Three industrial refuse-only collection companies also provide services to points and premises in the county. The service areas for refuse-only collectors are not specified in their WUTC certificates. The companies include:

- Rubatino Refuse Removal, Inc. (see above)
- Amalgamated Services, Inc.
21318 103rd Place W.,
Kent, WA 98031
- Environmental Transport, Inc.
P.O. Box 84661 Seattle, WA 98124

As WUTC records indicate, no formal complaints filed against certificated collection companies in Snohomish county, the private collectors apparently provide reliable and consistent service to residential and commercial accounts.

In the more rural areas, certificated collection and self-haul programs appear to maintain adequate service levels, although rural municipalities that provide collection service in their incorporated areas generally do not have the resources or equipment suitable to serve the larger commercial accounts. One alternative measure for these municipalities may be to contract with a private collection company to service their large commercial accounts.

Type of Collection Service by Municipal Jurisdiction

| Municipality | Form of Collection Service | Mandatory Regulation |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Arlington | Contract | Yes |
| Brier | License | No |
| Darrington | License | Yes |
| Edmonds | License | No |
| Everett | WUTC Certificate | No |
| Gold Bar | Contract | No |
| Granite Falls | Contract | No |
| Index | Municipal | Yes |
| Lake Stevens | WUTC Certificate | No |
| Lynnwood | Contract | No |
| Marysville | Municipal | Yes |
| Mill Creek | License | No |
| Monroe | License | Yes |
| Mountlake Terrace | Contract | Yes |
| Mukilteo | WUTC Certificate | No |
| Snohomish | License | Yes |
| Stanwood | License | No |
| Sultan | Municipal | Yes |
| Woodway | License | No |

Licensed Collection: Municipalities may require that haulers operating within their jurisdiction have a license, as well as a WUTC certificate. The license is issued by the municipality, and allows the municipality some measure of control over collection through monitoring of collection and operating conditions and establishment of rates. Under the licensing system, collectors usually do their own billing, and subscription for service is voluntary. Fees charged by city-licensed private collection companies are generally fixed by a resolution of the city or town council, but are based upon WUTC approved tariff. It is the collector's responsibility to collect fees for services rendered and to remit a franchise tax, and frequently a fee based on gross receipts, to the municipality it serves.

Contracted Collection: A municipality may contract with private collectors for residential and commercial collection services within all or part of its incorporated area. By using the contract mechanism the municipality can exert the greatest control over collection without operating its own municipal collection system. Under the contract system, management and regulation are the responsibility of

the municipality. The contract controls collection frequency, rates, billings, and other operating conditions the municipality negotiates with the hauler. Fees charged by contracted collection companies are generally established by the city or town council. Collection of fees may be the responsibility of either the municipality or the collection company, and is determined by the contract specifications.

Municipal Collection: Municipalities may also use their own equipment and staff to operate their own collection systems. A municipality determines its own collection frequency, rate structures, and other operating conditions. The municipality is responsible for billing, and collection service is generally provided to the residents on a mandatory basis.

The future demand for solid waste collection in each service area will depend on population growth patterns within the county. Collection needs in county areas projecting moderate growth should be met easily by the collection companies currently serving them. However, meeting the collection needs of rapidly growing areas (e.g., in the southwest and east service areas) will require planning by the collection companies and evaluation of the potential need for additional facilities such as new transfer stations or drop boxes.

Increases in population density will, in some cases, result in concentrated collection routes and therefore more efficient and less costly operations. Future service improvements, including modifications to support curbside recycling and other new solid waste programs, will also affect the projected operational and equipment needs of solid waste collection systems.

As the table indicates, only 8 of the 19 cities and towns in the county require mandatory collection of residential solid waste. Significantly, some of the largest municipalities such as Everett, Edmonds, and Lynnwood do not have mandatory collection service.

While mandatory collection programs tend to sometimes be unpopular, they do have significant benefits, including the following:

- Aesthetics—guaranteed waste removal on a regular schedule
- Health—regular removal eliminates the potential for breeding diseases and harmful insects and attracting rodents
- Economics of scale — costs drop as system usage increases
- Environmental —controlling the ultimate disposition of wastes
- Energy—energy consumed per residence served decreases as service area density increases

The greater the housing unit density and population, the more economically and environmentally beneficial mandatory waste collection and curbside recycling become. These areas enable collection to operate more efficiently because of the short travel distances between stops.

Transportation Network

Most arterials and highways between Marysville and the south county line are in urban areas with high traffic volumes and side friction from parking and drive-ways. Outside of this corridor, the county is largely rural. Most area highways have light traffic volumes, few intersection controls and little side friction.

North-south highways through the county include State Routes (SR) 99, 9, 203, and 527, and Interstates 5 and 405. Portions of these roadways in south Snohomish County are routinely congested during the morning and evening commute periods.

East-west routes through the county are mostly streets and avenues not designed for the increasingly heavy traffic they carry. Snohomish County has been upgrading key routes, such as 132nd Street Southeast between SR 527 and Seattle Hill Road, 164th Street Southeast and Southwest 36th Avenue west to Mill Creek, and 128th Street Southwest (Airport Road) from 8th Avenue West to SR 99. These improvements ease traffic congestion in the most populous and fastest-growing southwestern portions of the county. To the east of Everett, SR 2 has been upgraded between Hewitt Street causeway and Monroe, but future improvements to SR 2, 92, and 530 depend on increased traffic volumes.

Vehicle Use Regulations

None of the major arterials includes restrictions below standard WUTC dimensions. Allowable vehicle weights under normal conditions depend upon the configuration of the vehicle. Emergency load restrictions are occasionally imposed in spring during periods of thaw, and if flooding is severe enough, some collection and transport activities must be postponed. Thanks to the mild climate, however, emergency restrictions are infrequent and usually of short duration.

Rail System

The freight rail system in Snohomish county is served by Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. Routes run from the north to the south along the coast in the county, as well as west to east from Everett to Stevens Pass. Passenger rail system is provided by AMTRAK. In the state of Washington, AMTRAK is operated on the same trackage as Burlington Northern Santa Fe. Passenger stations within Snohomish County are located in Edmonds and Everett.